



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2011

No. 54

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 13, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL 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 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

RECOGNIZING ALCOHOL AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this week, during Alcohol Awareness Month, I will introduce what I believe is the next logical step in Federal efforts to prevent underage drinking. My bill, the Reauthorization of the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act, builds on the successful public health efforts of the original bill, better known as the STOP Act.

Since the STOP Act became law in 2006, there have been increased community efforts to address underage drinking as a public health crisis, and we have seen localized improvement in teen drinking statistics.

While these positive results are encouraging, the fact remains alcohol still is the primary drug of choice of our youth. In 2009, about 10.4 million teens aged 12 to 20 reported drinking alcohol in the past month. Of these, approximately 6.9 million were binge drinkers, and 2.1 million were heavy drinkers. Alarming, according to the latest publication of the Monitoring the Future survey, 53.7 percent of 12th graders believe drinking five or more alcoholic beverages once or twice each weekend is not a significant risk. These facts leave little doubt about the need to continue Federal underage drinking prevention efforts to educate our society about the dangers of alcohol abuse among our youth.

The STOP Act reauthorization bill will continue the successful programs of the original STOP Act, including the anti-underage drinking national media campaign directed at parents, the coordination of Federal efforts through the interagency council, and the grant program to help communities address underage drinking.

As a result of the recent research, the bill also directs the Institute of Medicine to report on the impact of drinking alcohol on the development of the adolescent brain, and it establishes grants to train pediatric health care providers on how best to screen and treat children and teens who have had alcohol exposures.

Mr. Speaker, continuing the investment of the STOP Act is a cost-effective strategy to reduce the \$53 billion annual cost of underage drinking to our Nation. Most importantly, it will reduce the suffering, violence, and death that far too often are caused by underage drinking.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the STOP Act reauthorization bill and keep our country moving forward in addressing this public health crisis facing our youth.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BAY OF PIGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs operation.

On April 17, 1961, the anticommunist patriots of Brigade 2506 were determined to help their homeland and their loved ones who were living under a repressive regime. Even though the operation was not successful, the dedication and the commitment that these brave individuals illustrated during the conflict was exceptional. During the operation, one hero was asked if he wished to be evacuated, and he said, "I will never leave this country." These individuals showed a strong sense of heroism as they were up against the repressive regime's armed forces.

President Ronald Reagan was a long-standing supporter of individuals taking action to free themselves from oppressive socialist and communist regimes. When referring to the Bay of Pigs, President Reagan stated, "By supporting courageous freedom fighters around the world, we're shining a light on the path out from communism."

These heroes reached the beaches of Playa Giron to fight against communism in Cuba that was being supported by the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The evil empire made a strong push into Cuba that became a national security threat to the United States.

A strong Soviet Union presence in Cuba led to the Cuban Missile Crisis.

□ 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.

H2607

The intrusion cemented the dangers of the Soviet Union having very close ties to the Cuban regime. Democracy and liberty of the people in the Western Hemisphere were in severe jeopardy as the communist forces were looking to expand their control. But the will of freedom-loving people who seek a better future will not be deterred by the evils and the power of communism. The protection of human rights and freedom of expression are fundamental necessities under a free society.

As the spread of communism crumbled during the Cold War, democracies throughout the Western Hemisphere flourished in open societies. However, the United States must remain vigilant that history does not repeat itself.

At this moment, Russia is currently infiltrating the Western Hemisphere by joining forces with antidemocratic tyrants such as Chavez, Ortega, and Morales. Recently, reports have indicated that Russia has sold \$15 billion worth of weapons and military equipment to Chavez. In addition, senior Russian military officials have mentioned the possibility of establishing refueling bases for Russian bombers in Cuba. Russian activities in the Western Hemisphere raise serious concerns as they are arming rogue regimes that are counter to the interests and the security of our beloved Nation.

The veterans of the Bay of Pigs symbolized this struggle between communism and freedom. The brave Brigade 2506 patriots decided to risk their very lives in order to liberate an oppressed society. These men fought courageously on that historic day. They came from many backgrounds, but all of them cared about freedom and liberty for the people of Cuba.

Even though the Bay of Pigs operation was not successful, their call to serve rose again to protect our Nation from enemies abroad. Many of these veterans continued to serve the United States by joining our Armed Forces and fighting with honor during the Vietnam War.

I would like to acknowledge all individuals who consistently are working toward fulfilling the dreams of a free Cuba, which is the dream of the veterans of Brigade 2506 who aspired and fought for a free and democratic Cuba.

I would also like to recognize the veterans of the Bay of Pigs who are with us today in the gallery. Gentlemen, thank you very much for your sacrifice and your commitment for a free Cuba and a strong United States.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to bring attention to occupants of the gallery.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF LANCE CORPORAL HARRY LEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Harry Lew.

Harry Lew was a marine serving the mission of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. Freedom, however, does not come without a price. Harry Lew died in Afghanistan on Sunday, April 3, 2011. He was 21 years old. He was the son of Sandy and Allen Lew, the brother of Carmen Lew, and he was my nephew.

Lance Corporal Harry Lew died while serving on watch duty in Helmand province. He had joined the Marines in August 2009 and reported to his unit in February 2010.

□ 1010

He was based in Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, with the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marine Regiment, 3rd Marine Division, III Marine Expeditionary Force. His unit was deployed to the Middle East in November, where they joined a Marine combat team for counterinsurgency work with the Afghan National Security Forces. Their goal was to provide security to locals and to promote development in the regime.

He was set to return home in July 2011, 3 months before his death.

Harry was a popular and outgoing student, both at Santa Clara High School, where he graduated in June 2008, and at Mission College, where he took classes for a year. He was known for joking, smiling, and for wanting to keep the mood light. One of his teachers said he brought "life and laughter to his classroom."

He loved physical sports, especially "tricking," a form of breakdancing involving kicks, flips and twists. It combines wushu, Chinese martial arts and gymnastics. He was so accomplished in this sport that as a member of the club called the Sidestep Breakdance Club, he performed several times in front of the high school. His friends said his best trick was the butterfly twist, where one spins 360 degrees in a horizontal flip. Upon his death, his friends honored him with a tricking session at his high school.

Harry's best friend, Travis Trotter said, "Everyone here has been influenced by him in some way or another, whether it be through his dancing, his artistic talents, his tricking or just being the person he was, friendly with everyone."

Of his service, his superior in the Marines said: "Only a small portion of our society volunteers to serve their country. Lance Corporal Lew was one of those volunteers. Within the 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marines, he was well liked by his fellow marines and was known for getting along with everyone because of his easy-going nature.

"He took his job seriously and performed his duties with enthusiasm. In Afghanistan, he volunteered for the dif-

ficult missions and demonstrated uncommon endurance on 4- to 8-hour foot patrols. Lance Corporal Lew also demonstrated his commitment and courage on two separate occasions when his unit came under enemy fire. One of those events is captured in the following:

"At approximately 7:30 p.m. on March 21, 2011, 3rd Squad of 3rd Platoon, Golf Company, 2nd Battalion, 3rd Marines, was engaged by enemy small arms fire while defending a position in Gawraggi village, Nawa-e-Barazkai district, Helmand province, Afghanistan. The enemy engaged with several bursts of automatic weapons fire. At that time of contact, the majority of the squad was in a small hole in the ground, taking cover to eat evening chow. Lance Corporal Lew immediately identified the enemy position approximately 200 meters to the southeast and engaged the enemy position initially with an M203 grenade launcher located at his post. He then picked up his M240 squad automatic weapon and engaged the enemy with an estimated 200 rounds until they had had enough and broke contact. His squad then continued with their mission.

"This is an example of Lance Corporal Lew's service. It serves as a reminder of all those who today serve in harm's way. Like Lance Corporal Lew, they serve to protect our country, our freedom, and our way of life. I am grateful for the courage and sacrifice of Lance Corporal Lew."

Harry Lew was a good son and brother, a friend to many, a great performer and a dedicated soldier. His ready smile and warm attitude will be remembered by all who knew him. His sacrifice for his country will never be forgotten.

For his service, Harry Lew will be honored with the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Afghanistan Campaign Medal.

TRIBUTE TO LANCE CORPORAL ANDREW PAUL CARPENTER

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lance Corporal Andrew Paul Carpenter who tragically lost his life while bravely serving our country.

Andrew enlisted in the United States Marine Corps on September 7, 2007, where he was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. In August of 2010, Andrew was deployed to Afghanistan for the second time, where he bravely served on the front lines during combat operations.

While patrolling the Helmand province in Afghanistan, Lance Corporal

Carpenter sustained fatal combat-related injuries and died on February 19, 2011.

Andrew graduated in 2002 from Columbia Central High School in Columbia, Tennessee. He was active in the school's marching band where he played trombone and helped the band win a State championship during his senior year. Andrew went on to further his education at Middle Tennessee State University.

He enjoyed numerous activities such as playing golf, soccer and paintball, and made friends easily through his dependable and loyal nature. He is remembered by those who knew him as someone who was constantly looking for ways to help those in need. It is no wonder that serving the United States Marine Corps was a natural choice for him.

Before joining the Marines, Andrew worked at the YMCA Fun Company, where he pursued one of the things that he enjoyed most in life—working with children. Andrew would often dress up in Batman costumes to entertain kids at the YMCA after-school program. He was known for his tender heart and his ability to positively impact the children he encountered.

On January 1, 2010, Andrew married the love of his life, Crissie. She was truly his best friend and soul mate, and he would often say that their wedding day was by far the best day of his life. Shortly before Andrew was deployed to Afghanistan, he and Crissie learned that they would be blessed with a baby boy. Landon Paul Carpenter was born March 18, 2011.

Landon, no words can sufficiently express the gratitude or repay the debt that we owe your father for his selfless service in protecting our great Nation. He laid down his life so that we may all be blessed with our Nation's most fundamental tenets—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Your father, simply put, is a true American hero. As you grow up in this great Nation, know that you are given that privilege because of men like your father who make great sacrifices to protect our freedoms.

Crissie, during this difficult time, I hope that you can find some solace in the fact that your husband nobly gave his life so that you and your son can continue to live in the land of the free.

And, finally, thank you to Andrew's family for raising such an extraordinary young man.

Today we honor and remember Andrew Paul Carpenter. We will never forget the sacrifices he made in order to ensure that we continue to be blessed with the precious gift of freedom.

God bless America.

DISASTROUS PRIORITIES OF 2012 BUDGET

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from two Members on each side

of the aisle who, without respect of course to any partisan differences, raised their voices in sadness about the loss of two of our brave Americans in the defense of freedom. I join their sentiments.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. Those two Americans whose lives we have now lost showed extraordinary courage, extraordinary honesty in their willingness to serve. We in this body will now be called upon to show such courage and honesty as we address the extraordinary fiscal crisis that confronts us.

Today, President Obama is speaking on a plan to confront our Nation's unsustainable deficits. I believe it will stand in stark contrast to the budget that is going to be offered by Mr. RYAN, a budget of disastrous priorities, in my opinion, that concentrates its plan on middle and working class Americans in terms of its cuts, while creating yet another windfall for the wealthiest in our country, at a time when income inequality is at a height we haven't seen since the 1920s.

□ 1020

The Republican budget ends Medicare as we know it, transforming a system of guaranteed health care into a system that provides seniors with less coverage and greater expenses year after year after year. It dismantles Medicaid, putting seniors' nursing home care at very substantial risk, and, in fact, with an inability to pay, and cutting off care for disabled and poor Americans.

These entitlements must be addressed, but we must address them in a way that both keeps them sustainable and makes them available for generations to come. Somehow, however—after undermining the social compact of Medicare, after cutting care for the most vulnerable, after sending more than 30 million Americans back to the ranks of the uninsured—the Republican budget finds trillions of dollars to give as tax cuts to the wealthiest among us.

Republicans say we are too broke to afford the promise of Medicare, but we are flush enough to spend trillions in tax cuts for those of us who are the best off. In fact, the Republican budget spends so much on corporate subsidies and tax breaks for the wealthy and loses so many savings by repealing the cost controls in the Affordable Care Act that it fails to balance the budget for 10 years or even 20 years.

We have been down this so-called "Path to Prosperity" before. It leads to skyrocketing deficits because the supply-side dogma that lower taxes mean higher revenues has proven false over the last three decades. Read the facts. If Republican tax dogma made sense, then our debt would not have increased 200 percent under Ronald Reagan or 115 percent under the second President Bush, but it did. In fact, we've seen Republican promises of prosperity proven wrong time and time again over the 30 years that I have served here in Congress.

In 2007, now-Majority Leader CANTOR said that the Bush tax cuts "have spurred spectacular economic growth." That was in 2007. Let me remind all the Members of this body, it was in December of 2007 that we fell into the Great Recession, the deepest recession we've had since Herbert Hoover. The growth was spectacular only for the top 1 percent, but for the rest of America, the Bush economy produced what The Wall Street Journal called "the worst track record for job creation since the government began keeping records." That's what The Wall Street Journal said of the Bush economic program, which CANTOR said would be a job creator.

Throughout the Bush years, middle class incomes stayed stagnant and deficits soared. What did Republicans say about a budget that actually helped create unprecedented prosperity, the 1993 Clinton budget? Here's what now-Speaker BOEHNER said: "How does this create any real new jobs? Who does this spending stimulate except maybe the liberal faculty at Harvard or Berkeley?" Of course, contrary to the Speaker's assertion, the Clinton years saw the biggest production of jobs since I have been serving in Congress of 22.7 million new jobs—in the private sector, almost 21 million jobs as opposed to the private sector loss of jobs under President Bush, about 7,000 loss of jobs per month, versus 216,000 new jobs every month on average under Bill Clinton.

Those words represent the same flawed priorities we see in this new Republican budget: tax breaks for the wealthy, a failure to invest in the future, and a heavier burden on working families.

Our country deserves better, Mr. Speaker. Let's reform our entitlement programs with a scalpel, not an axe. Let's look for savings in every part of the budget, defense included. Let's close tax loopholes, but let's also use the Tax Code to reduce the deficit and ensure that all of us, even the most privileged, pay their fair share.

Republicans have taken us down this primrose path before, Mr. Speaker. It has demonstrably led to higher debt, stagnation for working Americans, and, most recently, an economic implosion. We must not choose that dead end again.

UMD NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to the players, coaches, and supporters of the Minnesota-Duluth Bulldogs men's ice hockey team for their historic victory this past Saturday on April 9, 2011.

In dramatic fashion, Kyle Schmidt, who grew up just minutes from Duluth in Hermantown, Minnesota, scored the game-winning goal 3 minutes and 22

seconds into overtime to help the Bulldogs win their first championship in school history by a score of 3–2 over the University of Michigan. The thrilling win culminated in a fantastic season for UMD's men's ice hockey team, with the Bulldogs amassing an impressive record of 26–10–6.

The NCAA hockey title win comes in the same academic year as the NCAA Division II football title for the Bulldogs, making the University of Minnesota-Duluth just the second college ever to win both a hockey title and a football title in the same academic year. Mr. Speaker, that's quite a feat.

I know I speak for the Eighth District and for all Minnesotans to say how proud we are of our Bulldogs. And it is great to have the NCAA championship trophy back in the State of Hockey, Minnesota.

KOREA FTA AND ITS EFFECTS ON WORKING PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this morning to address the House and the American people regarding the Korea Free Trade Agreement and its effect on working families.

Let me start by saying that I am committed to trade. Trade can benefit our Nation, our businesses, and our working families. In fact, I am a member of President Obama's Export Council. Our goal is to double American exports in 5 years, not to export American jobs.

But the problem with our current trade policy, the one that started with NAFTA and has gone downhill from there, is that its benefits are skewed. The benefits are concentrated in a few powerful multinational corporations, and it is hardworking middle class families who pay the price.

The Korea FTA doesn't fall far from the NAFTA tree. A few stock prices and CEO bonuses may go up, but the Korea FTA will kill jobs, push down American wages, and drive small American companies who face unfair competition out of business.

Perhaps the biggest problem with the Korea FTA is that it opens the door for more illegal trade from China. Members on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the FTA debate have concerns about trading with China. We all know that China manipulates its currency, doesn't protect intellectual property, and engages in illegal transshipment to escape U.S. tariffs. You can go on the Internet right now and find Web sites bragging that they can hide the source of Chinese goods and thereby avoid paying duties owed to the U.S.

The illegal transshipment, mislabeling, and duty evasion rob the American people of money that we are owed. They also drive U.S. businesses out of business. U.S. businesses often

go to great length and expense to prove that Chinese goods are being dumped and are receiving illegal subsidies. When the duties the U.S. imposes aren't paid, hardworking Americans lose their jobs when their workplaces shut their doors forever. From New York to South Carolina to Lynwood, California, in my own district, American businesses have turned off the lights and sent workers home due to unfair Chinese competition.

And China doesn't even have to break the rules to reap the benefits of the Korea FTA. This agreement, which was negotiated by President Bush, only requires that 35 percent of a Korean car be made in Korea to be eligible for tariff benefits. That means that 65 percent of the car can be made in China by child labor, prison labor, and workers who lack the right to form free and independent unions.

America has lost about 7.5 million jobs since the recession began. We cannot afford another job-killing trade agreement that ignores America's middle class families.

□ 1030

We have learned some very hard lessons after more than 15 years of NAFTA-style free trade agreements. We've heard many promises, just like the promises we're hearing about the Korea FTA. But the fact is that there are failures.

NAFTA was supposed to solve illegal immigration by developing a robust economy in Mexico that would allow hardworking people to provide for their families by staying home. That didn't work. CAFTA was supposed to include bold new safety and wage protections for workers, but these protections are disappointingly weak, allowing countries to downgrade their own labor laws. And in the Oman FTA, the administration actually negotiated a deal with a country that, as our own State Department reported, was experiencing a forced labor problem. Forced labor. How are our American families supposed to care for their families and send their kids to college when they are competing with forced labor?

Free trade was supposed to increase economic opportunity for everybody, for big businesses as well as small, and for hardworking families at home and abroad. This has not happened. Too many communities have been left to rot because corporations shut down U.S. plants to chase increasingly cheap labor and weak environmental standards abroad.

After 15 years of living with NAFTA and its clones, real wages for American families are down. Our trade deficit is in the tens of billions of dollars. Our manufacturing base is falling apart. The American worker is now more productive than before, but that increased productivity has not led to higher wages. The truth is the NAFTA free trade models favor the wealthiest few and the corporate fat cats at the expense of small businesses, workers, families, and our communities.

In the coming weeks and months we'll be asked to consider at least two of the Bush administration's trade deals with Korea and Colombia. Despite the long record of failed FTAs, we are going to hear that there is a consensus of support for these FTAs. We'll hear that anyone who knows anything about trade supports these agreements. Don't believe it, because it's not true. Advocates for America's families, both inside and outside of Congress, have grave concerns. We want a new path that creates real opportunities for workers and the businesses that employ them. We want trade agreements that don't sell our environment short, close doors for our children, or substitute the judgment of international trade lawyers for our courts.

Some of my colleagues say that the Korea FTA isn't that bad. That we can live with it.

That argument misses the point. Why are we settling for "not that bad"? We should be fighting for the best trade agreements possible.

NAFTA-style FTAs simply aren't good enough. We should focus on creating a trade policy that creates and saves well-paying jobs here in America.

Our trade policy should help small businesses hire more employees, not shut their doors.

It should help our trading partners to grow and flourish, not race to the bottom in labor and environmental standards.

Our trade policy should not reward bad actors like China, but reward playing by the rules.

If we stand united for working Americans, we can deliver a trade policy that accomplishes these goals.

Minor adjustments to NAFTA-style deals aren't good enough.

I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to stop settling for "not that bad" and embark on a trade path that promotes development and prosperity for all.

TIME FOR AN AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN STUDY GROUP

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House legislation I am introducing to create an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group, modeled after the Iraq Study Group, to bring fresh eyes to the war effort in Afghanistan, which is now in its 10th year.

Last August, I began pressing the administration to convene an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. While reticent at first, to their credit President Bush, Secretary of State Rice, and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld came to support the Iraq Study Group, ably led by bipartisan chairs, former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton.

It has been my hope that the Obama administration would come to view this bipartisan fresh eyes approach as something which is ultimately good for our men and women in uniform and

good for the country as a whole. Aside from the specific policy recommendations, the Iraq Study Group helped force a moment of truth in our national conversation about the war effort. It was apparent last summer and is still truer today that with roughly 100,000 U.S. troops presently in Afghanistan, no clear end is in sight to our Nation's longest running war, at 10 years and counting. Public support for the war is at an all-time low. A national conversation about Afghanistan is what is urgently needed.

Before proposing this idea to the Obama administration, I spoke with a number of knowledgeable individuals, including former senior diplomats, public policy experts, and retired and active duty military. Many believed, all believed our Afghanistan policy was adrift. And there was a near unanimous position that an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group was needed. Among the distinguished individuals who embraced the idea was former ambassador to Iraq Ryan Crocker.

Sadly, the war has remained distant for many Americans. It is rarely spoken of from the Presidential bully pulpit. In fact, a recent Fox News piece reported, "The last time Obama specifically devoted a full public speech to Afghanistan was December 9, 2009, 16 months ago, when he announced at West Point that he was sending an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to that war-torn country." And this Congress ought to be looking at this also.

Further, the war is seldom covered in great depth in the news. And yet, for the husbands and wives, and mothers and fathers, sons and daughters who have sent off a loved one in uniform, the war in Afghanistan is anything but distant. It is uncertainty and sacrifice, it is separation and worry, and many times it is life and death.

Despite my several letters to the President and other senior administration officials calling for a, quote, "vigorous, thoughtful, and principled debate and discussion among some of our Nation's greatest minds," the idea for the study group has languished.

So today, after the Obama administration has neglected this, I am introducing legislation to create an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group comprised of nationally known and respected individuals who love their country more than they love their political party, and who would, I believe, serve to provide much needed clarity to a policy that appears adrift at best, and highly politicized at worst.

In reading "Obama's Wars," I was deeply troubled by Bob Woodward's reporting, which indicated that discussions of the war strategy were infused with political calculations. Woodward also wrote of an administration that wrestled with the most basic questions about the war: What is the mission? What are we trying to do? What will work? These are questions that demand answers. I believe that Americans of all political viewpoints can embrace this

fresh eyes approach, for it is always to our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation. This Congress, both political parties, cannot do what this administration is doing. We cannot ignore this issue.

HOW GOP BUDGET IMPACTS SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. For decades, Medicare has been a lifeline for older Americans, providing quality and affordable health care for all seniors. But this week House Republicans are proposing to strip seniors of this guaranteed benefit. The Republican budget proposal dismantles Medicare as we know it, telling seniors they are going to be on their own to find insurance no matter what the cost or how sick they are. And it slashes Medicaid coverage for seniors who need long-term care, threatening our sickest, most frail elderly in nursing homes with no care at all. This is absolutely the wrong approach to solving our Nation's budget problems.

Every day, 48 million elderly and disabled Americans across this country count on Medicare for their life-saving medications, doctor visits, and hospital care. Sixty-nine percent of people over the age of 65, and they are both Democrats and Republicans, oppose Medicare becoming a voucher program. Seniors know that changing Medicare to a voucher program means that they will no longer have access to a guaranteed set of health benefits, that the value of a limited voucher won't keep up with rising health care costs, that the voucher would become insufficient over time, and the care they need could become unaffordable, that too many taxpayer dollars will be spent on advertising campaigns and administrative costs instead of actual medical expenses.

And seniors know that privatizing Medicare means limits on benefits, obstacles to care, uncertain reimbursements, copayments for primary care or specialty care, exclusions for certain services, discrimination based on income, illness, or age, and more uncertainty if a serious illness or need for long-term care occurs. Seniors know that privatizing or voucherizing Medicare will mean that they pay more in premiums or do without. And it doesn't end there.

In addition to Medicare cuts, Republicans also want to take away Medicaid for the nearly 6 million seniors who depend on it for nursing home or long-term care. They say proudly that they will cut funding to States by \$1 trillion. This means that disabled and frail elderly Americans will be placed on waiting lists for services or have no access to care at all.

□ 1040

In Pennsylvania, my home State, nearly 40 percent of funds spent on long-term care would be at risk. This includes 62 percent of nursing home residents and 25,000 Pennsylvanian seniors who receive home health services.

And yet when Republicans had the opportunity to reduce costs while maintaining and strengthening care for our seniors, they demonized the plan, voting time and again to stop important improvements in Medicare. And they still want to repeal the law that eliminates copayments for preventive care services, that makes prescription drug benefits more affordable and improves coordination of care and health outcomes, reduces errors and reduces costs for seniors.

They want to repeal the law that curbs the growth in Medicare spending, saves taxpayers almost \$500 billion by ending overpayments to insurance companies, and extends the life of the Medicare Trust Fund for 12 years. Instead, the Republicans here in Washington want to end Medicare as we know it and put health care for American seniors at great risk.

As a senior member of the Budget Committee, I know how important it is to find solutions to reducing the deficit. To do this right, the solution must include spending cuts, tax policy reform, and economic growth.

We should not fix our budget problems by failing to meet our obligations to our seniors. Every day we hear how determined Republicans are to slash billions of dollars from the central programs because we simply can't afford it. They say we can't afford to make investments in the future. We can't afford to educate our children or fix our roads or fuel innovation or cover health care costs for seniors.

Yet in the same proposal to slash Medicare and Medicaid for millions of seniors, Republicans make permanent tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans. In the very same budget proposal where Republicans take away guaranteed benefits for seniors, they protect billions of tax subsidies to the oil and gas industry.

In the very same budget proposal where Republicans give seniors a limited voucher to pay for higher insurance premiums, they protect the Pentagon from spending cuts on unnecessary weapon systems.

One trillion dollars in tax expenditures, \$700 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy few, \$40 billion in tax breaks for oil companies, and billions of dollars to continue inefficiencies at the Pentagon—all of this spending is protected by the Republican budget. And instead, they choose to slash benefits to our seniors and our disabled Americans.

Budgets are about priorities and they're about our values. Yes, we should get serious about our Nation's deficit, but let's be sure that our priorities are right and we do not threaten our obligations to our seniors, to our children, or to America's future.

SUPPORT NATIONAL
AUCTIONEERING DAY

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of the cornerstones of American capitalism and my profession for over 30 years, that being auctioneering. Auctioneers sell approximately \$250 billion in assets each year in the United States, and this figure does not include the millions of transactions that occur online with online auctions.

It's estimated that there are 20,000 auctioneers in the Nation, the vast majority of which are small business owners. Auto auctions make up the largest volume of auctions, with over \$80 billion in vehicles being sold by auctioneers annually in the United States. If you drive a used car, chances are very good it's been across the auction block.

Auctions and auctioneers have existed for over 2,000 years. Auctioneering was fundamental in the creation of commerce here in the United States. Auctioneers first arrived in the United States when the Pilgrims arrived.

You go to an auction in Kalamazoo, Michigan; Branson, Missouri; Tucson, Arizona; Portland, Oregon; Miami, Florida—anywhere you go to an auction in this country, we all go by one handle, and that handle is "colonel." You can walk up to an auctioneer in any auction in the United States, you don't know that auctioneer's name, you say, "Hey, Colonel," they'll turn around and answer you.

Why "colonel"? That dates back to the Civil War in this country. After the Civil War, they needed a way to get rid of the mules and tack and things they had left over, supplies; so they did that by a matter of public auction. They nominated the Army colonels to serve as the auctioneers. Now, they didn't have any professional training as auctioneers; however, they would just say, "I'm at a dollar for this saddle, a dollar-fifty. Anyone give two dollars? Sold at a dollar-fifty." So when you hear the term "colonel," that's where it originated, back in the Civil War.

Auctioneers were instrumental in the formation of early commerce by selling crops, imports, livestock, tools, tobacco, fur, and farms. Even President George Washington was a big auction fan and an avid buyer at public auction.

For over 30 years, I had the honor of selling real estate at public auction. Did I sell depressed, distressed real estate? Once in a very great while. But I sold real estate as people's first option, not their last resort. So keep in mind, auctions could be a way to achieve the highest value in the shortest amount of time. If you've got a hot property, instead of having it listed and sold in 1 day or 2 days, put it up at public auction and see what happens.

Every day auctioneers work with banks, attorneys, accountants, busi-

nesses, individuals, and government agencies to liquidate property seized and surplus property. Auctioneers create a competitive marketplace and connect buyers with sellers every day.

The National Auctioneers Association and its members strive to advance the auction methods of marketing and upholding the highest standards of professionalism to the national public. For over 20 years, National Auctioneers Day has been observed by State and local governments.

For those reasons and more, JEFF DUNCAN, another freshman auctioneer Member of Congress here, and I want to make this, the third Saturday in April, National Auctioneers Day. We will be dropping a bill to that effect. This would heighten the awareness of people in the United States of the contributions made by auctions and auctioneers to the history of the Nation and its economy.

Auctions are the last stronghold of the competitive free market enterprise system and continue to be the most effective means of establishing a fair market value.

Also, one other thing. Being an auctioneer in Congress, the way our debt is running out of control, they find it very handy to have JEFF DUNCAN and me here in Washington. We are two of the few people that can actually keep up with the national debt:

I'm at a trillion now 2, 2 trillion dollars now 3 woodygive 3 trillion, 3 trillion bid and now 4, 4 trillion, now 5, 5 trillion dollars now six are ye able to buy 'em at 6, 6 trillion now 7, woodygive 7 trillion, 7 trillion dollars bid now 8, 8 trillion dollars now 9, 9 trillion now 10 woodygive 10 trillion dollars, 10 trillion dollars now 11, 11 trillion now 12, do I hear 12 trillion dollars, 11 trillion bid now 12, 11 trillion bid now 12 now 12 woodygive 12 trillion dollars, 12 now 13, 12 trillion bid now 13, 13 trillion now 14 woodygive 14, 14 trillion dollars now 15 woodygive 15 trillion. Sold, 14 trillion dollars.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, we also can say those numbers backwards; so when we get the spending under control here, I'll be back.

ELIMINATING HIV/AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank you for the opportunity to greet a group of ministers that have come to the Nation's capital in order to support the resources to eliminate HIV and AIDS virus infections.

It is strange how God has made us forget the blessings that we have with good health until, of course, that health is endangered, and then we recognize that what we have depended on may be threatened or may be gone or may not even exist for the 40,000 people that don't enjoy health insurance.

But because this disease has such a stigma and because a million Ameri-

cans suffer from it, and 500,000 Americans have died from it, it has been a very costly situation in terms of providing the medication to stop the disease and to prevent death. And death is certain without treatment.

These ministers have formed, some 20 years ago, in a group that was headed by Deborah House—and today it is directed by C. Virginia Fields, and Pastor Calvin Butts from the Abyssinian Baptist Church, a landmark in Harlem, New York City, and the country—have brought together ministers from all over the country as well as the National Medical Association and other outstanding people to make people aware of the fact that this disease is not only caused by the infection of the virus, but it's caused by reckless sex, unprotected sex, actions of men that are in prison, actions that when they come home they transmit through sexual activities to their wives.

□ 1050

So to a large extent, it is the ignorance of people that has caused this disease to explode and to spread beyond the communities where it was initiated.

It has cost a lot of money in order to make certain that we control the spread of this disease, but it doesn't really take that much money to be active in making certain that people are educated about the threat of those diseases.

And that is why they come to Washington today, when there is a belief that Medicaid that provides health care for the very, very poor—that it is not in jeopardy by people who want to transfer a Federal, a national, responsibility to the States, as we find proposals coming up this week.

That is why Medicare, which is a national program, is being threatened by the idea that people can get a voucher and go out and get insurance from an insurance company. Imagine going to an insurance company, being infected with AIDS, a terminal disease, and seeing what costs the private insurance company would ask you for without Federal assistance.

So it seems to me that all people—black, white, Catholic, and Protestant—could come together in terms of answering the question, How do you treat the lesser among us? How do you treat the poor in our community? And isn't it a fact that if we reach out a hand and provide the medicine and the support for those people who are infected with HIV and with AIDS, in the longer sense what we are doing is allowing Americans to be more productive, healthy, having healthy families and healthy children so that they will be able to get an education, a decent job, and provide America with the type of talent that is so important if we are going to meet the obligations of this new age where technology is going to be so important if we're going to be competitive.

So now is the time, where these ministers have come to our Nation's Capital, perhaps to reach out to people of

all faiths—whether they come from the mosques, whether they come from the synagogues, whether they come from our churches—to go back to the Biblical writings as we look at what we are faced with today. And that is, how does a great nation, as the United States of America—how do we treat our powerless? How do we treat our poor? What opportunities do we have for people who are poor to leave poverty and move to the middle class?

The answer to those questions, Mr. Speaker, is in our hands, and I do hope that we vote and do the right thing.

RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, to highlight the epidemic of rape and sexual assault in the military.

As I said last week, the Department of Defense, by its own calculations, estimates that over 19,000 servicemembers, mostly women but some men, are raped or sexually assaulted every single year; and, furthermore, only 13 percent report these rapes or sexual assaults. Why is that? Because the system of justice designed to adjudicate cases of rape in the military is in complete shambles. Victims are blamed. Assailants are promoted. Unit commanders, whose promotions are dependent on the conduct and performance of the soldiers they supervise, have an incentive to see that allegations are few and convictions are fewer.

Meanwhile, what are we doing here in Congress? Over the last 16 years, there have been reports and there have been hearings, 18 of them, and we make lots of noise; but then nothing is done about it. As a result of this code of silence, the overwhelming majority of cases get swept under the proverbial rug.

Last week I told the story of Technical Sergeant Mary Gallagher. The feedback I've gotten is considerable. A woman named Katie wrote on my Facebook page: "I am one of those victim soldiers. Jackie, thank you for fighting for a basic right. I have no idea why this is still not being handled properly. I dream that soon women and men will be able to serve our country without the threat of rape that will go unpunished."

But stopping military rape should be more than just a dream; it must be a reality. We owe our servicemembers the same protection that they provide to all Americans.

Today I want to share the story of Seaman Panayiota Bertzikis. Seaman Bertzikis served in the Coast Guard from November 2005 to May of 2007. Her allegation is as follows:

On May 30, 2006, Seaman Bertzikis was raped by a shipmate when she stationed in Burlington, Vermont. During a hike, her rapist threw her onto the

ground, punched her in the face, and raped her.

She reported the rape to command, who told her to cease speaking about it or she would be charged with the military equivalent of slander. She later obtained photographs and admissions made by her rapist through the Freedom of Information Act, but command failed to bring him to justice in any way. Instead, they forced Seaman Bertzikis to live on the same floor with her rapist, where he would remain a constant threat. Command also told the seaman to work with her rapist and use the time together to "work out their differences."

Command was well aware, but did not stop, further assaults and harassment of Seaman Bertzikis. Instead, she was transferred to Boston where Coast Guard personnel called her a "liar" and a "whore."

When she was on base performing her duties, a group of Coast Guard personnel cornered Seaman Bertzikis and tried to rip off her uniform. They called her a "crazy lying whore" and said she would "pay for snitching" on their friend. They threatened to rape her again.

When she reported this harassment, the Coast Guard's "victim advocate" told her not to pursue disciplinary action because she would be seen as "difficult." In addition, her appointed attorney said if her rapist did not have a history of sexual assault, "why would he assault anyone now?" Seaman Bertzikis was denied rank because of the pending investigation, despite the fact that she had met all the necessary requirements.

She described her horrific ordeal this way: "If I told them that my house was broken into, not one person would question me, blame me, or say that I was lying. But when I say that my body was broken into, people automatically feel that they have the right to judge me, to doubt me, and to blame me."

What a profound statement by Seaman Bertzikis. She has now started the Military Rape Crisis Center to help her fellow colleagues and victims. Turning pain into purpose, she is truly an American shero.

Seaman Bertzikis's story shows the urgent need to protect servicemembers from abuse.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Jack Graham, Prestonwood Baptist Church, Plano, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we are blessed by Your presence, amazed by Your grace, and dependent upon Your strength for every day. We praise You for Your abundant provision, and we are forever grateful for Your sustaining love. We do not take these blessings for granted. We make it our holy ambition to glorify You as we offer our lives in devoted service to Your Kingdom first, and to our beloved country.

We pray for one another with the confidence that You hear repentant hearts and respond to those who humbly seek to obey You and live by Your wisdom.

We pray for personal renewal, for robust faith, and a vibrant vision for the future. Remembering that righteousness exalts a nation, we turn to You and trust You to not only make us great, but to make us good.

We pray in the name of God, who is able to raise His dear Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, to life and give us eternal hope in Him.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. JACK GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is with great privilege that I welcome my dear friend Dr. Jack Graham, pastor of Prestonwood Baptist Church in Plano, Texas, one of the Nation's largest, most dynamic congregations, as our guest chaplain for today's opening prayer.

The mission at Prestonwood Baptist is to glorify God by introducing Jesus Christ as Lord to as many people as possible and to develop them in Christian living using the most effective means to impact the world, making a positive difference in this generation.

Pastor Graham is an anointed and amazing speaker, accomplished author, community servant and bold leader who truly walks by faith. It is an honor to have him here in the people's House blessing our Nation's business and government leaders in Jesus' precious name.

Thank you, Pastor Graham, for all you do as a true servant of the Lord. God bless you and I salute you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ILLEGALS REJOICE OVER COURT RULING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Arizona border ranchers tell me that when illegals enter Arizona with their maps and their lists of churches that give sanctuary, they also know about U.S. courts. When some illegals are actually captured, they oftentimes ask the Border Patrol if their case will be in the ninth court or the 10th court. Illegals want their cases in the ninth circuit court because they believe, based on history, the ninth court is liberal, tolerant and more lenient regarding illegal immigration and border security than the nearby 10th court.

The ninth circuit court proved the illegals correct when the liberal court wrongly threw out the Arizona law that allows State law enforcement officers to enforce laws against illegal entry. Arizona had to enact this law because the Federal Government doesn't adequately secure the border. And how can a court possibly say it's unconstitutional for a State to protect its citizens?

But there is hope. The ninth court has been reversed more than any other court by the Supreme Court, and hopefully the Supreme Court will rule that Arizona and the Federal Government have constitutional authority to protect the border from illegal entry.

And that's just the way it is.

BUDGET REALITIES

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the realities of the Republican budget are starting to come into focus, especially health care. Vouchers to insurance companies will cost seniors and society more.

Today, Members of Congress are being inundated by visits from hospitals and health care providers who are in a panic about the Medicaid block grant that will allow the Federal Government to shift its burden for the poor and the disabled to States who often cannot or will not make up the difference in the fund loss.

Most disappointing, Republicans have abandoned the work on Medicare reform. The reform provisions in the Affordable Care Act used to be bipartisan. Instead of increasing the total cost of health care and shifting the burdens to the elderly, poor and disabled, we should be taking our medical spending—already the highest in the world—and showing how we can get more out of it.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, this week the House and Senate will consider a bill to fund the government for the rest of the fiscal year that reduces spending by \$38.5 billion.

Considering that the position of HARRY REID at the beginning of the year was that we shouldn't cut a single dime, we have moved the conversation in the right direction.

Senator SCHUMER called Republican cuts "extreme," but even the full \$61 billion that the House pushed for would have only made a small dent in our huge deficit.

The real extreme position is to do nothing. If we do nothing, interest payments and entitlement spending will consume the entire budget. If we do nothing, we will lose the capability to defend our Nation. If we do nothing, our roads and rails will crumble.

This week Republicans will present an alternative to the do-nothing strategy. For that, we will certainly be labeled "extreme." We have a great Nation; but as long as we are beholden to our creditors, foreign and domestic, we risk losing prosperity and freedom.

We shouldn't wait any longer to get our budget in order. We can begin this week, but we shouldn't stop until we have passed long-term solutions.

PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Speaker, later today we are taking up

a bill to repeal funding for prevention and public health. Members will have a simple choice; the choice is to pay now or pay later.

Staying healthy and treating disease will always have a price. In my State of Maine, treating preventable chronic diseases held a price tag of \$1.4 billion last year alone. But there is a better way. We can invest in preventing these life-threatening expensive illnesses, we can invest in slowing the spread of HIV/AIDS, and we can promote better nutrition to reduce obesity. That is exactly what the Prevention and Public Health fund does in my State and throughout the country. It invests in prevention and good health, and it reduces chronic disease. Spending just \$10 per person in preventative programs will save this country \$16 billion a year in health care costs.

Madam Speaker, our choice is not just pay now or pay later; it's pay less now or pay a lot more later. And that's a choice we can't afford to make.

□ 1210

CELEBRATING NATIONAL AUCTION WEEK

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. On this day in 1743, our Founding Father, Thomas Jefferson, was born.

But I rise today to talk about the National Auctioneers Association celebrating National Auction Week. I'm proud, as an auctioneer for over 16 years, to serve with fellow auctioneer in our Auction Caucus here in Congress, Representative BILLY LONG from Missouri.

Auction and auctioneers help families and businesses all over this great land sell trillions of dollars worth of assets every year.

And so I will leave you with this thought: Hey, now, wouldya give 25 now, 35—sold.

And we sell it every day.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Disabled American Veterans, an organization representing our Nation's wartime disabled vets.

Disabled American Veterans works to ensure our government fulfills its promise to those who so bravely served our Nation. And I am pleased to honor their service at their 67th annual convention this week in Rhode Island.

The greatest tribute that we can pay to our disabled veterans is providing them access to quality health care and education and mental health services, housing, and employment assistance. For their courage and commitment, and for the burdens borne by their families, our disabled veterans and their

loved ones must receive the support and the services they rightly deserve.

These men and women of valor have made tremendous sacrifices in the name of freedom and in advancement of our Nation's security. We live in a free society today because of the service these men and women and their families have given our Nation.

I applaud the work of the Disabled American Veterans for their dedicated service to our Nation's heroes and their families.

RECOGNIZING HOLLOWAY TERRACE FIRE COMPANY OF DELAWARE

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

Mr. CARNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the many volunteer fire companies that play such an important role in protecting public safety in my home State of Delaware.

Like many Delawareans who have seen or been helped directly by one of our volunteer firefighters, I continue to be amazed and humbled by their professionalism and willingness to sacrifice to put the safety of others ahead of their own.

Today, I'd like to recognize the Holloway Terrace Fire Company, which is celebrating 90 years of service to our community. For generations, members of the Holloway Terrace Fire Company have given their all to protect those who live and work in New Castle, Delaware.

In that time, no one has given more to the fire company than Mr. William "Bill" Maxwell, Sr. This year Bill is celebrating 50 years of service in the Holloway Terrace Fire Company. He joined as a junior member and has risen through the ranks to become deputy chief, fire chief, and now a member of the board of directors.

I would like to thank every volunteer firefighter who works to protect Delaware communities and encourage them to continue their service for many years to come.

HIV/AIDS

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask this Congress to address a grave public health crisis facing not only my district but my country.

Too many of our young people are dying. Many high school students in metro Detroit, the area that I represent, many of whom are African American, are being hit by an epidemic of HIV/AIDS.

I urge this Congress to support a piece of legislation sponsored by the National Black Clergy for the Elimination of HIV/AIDS to address this issue, save the lives of our young people, and provide them with hope for a promising future.

HONORING BILL SAMUELS, JR., PRESIDENT OF MAKER'S MARK DISTILLERY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a giant of Kentucky's legendary bourbon industry, Bill Samuels, Jr., president of Maker's Mark Distillery, on the occasion of his retirement.

His father's recipe first got bourbon invited to the top shelf. His mother had the radical idea of dipping bottles in red wax. His godfather was Jim Beam.

Bill's career path seemed obvious, but "obvious" was never Bill's path.

Everyone agrees distilling bourbon isn't rocket science, but only Bill makes the claim with authority—he's excelled at both. He designed fuel injectors for Polaris missiles and graduated from Vanderbilt Law School. Finally, four decades ago, he decided to give the family business 1 year—but he never left. When his time came, he didn't merely take over. He took Maker's Mark to unimaginable heights.

Then a little-known brand, Makers is now among the world's most sought-after spirits, its red wax a renowned icon. And every barrel maintains the same recipe and craftsmanship as Bill, Sr.'s first batch in 1954.

As cochair of the Congressional Bourbon Caucus, I urge my colleagues to join me in toasting Bill as he passes the wax-tipped baton into the capable hands of his son, Rob.

Bill's service to Maker's Mark and Kentucky—like his bourbon—continues a family's tradition, makes our Commonwealth proud, and is simply the stuff of legend.

BUDGET CUTS MUST FOCUS ON WHAT MATTERS

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, this week, the Republicans are rolling out their budget. And some people say it's a new, bold budget. I'd say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, it's the same old budget: misplaced priorities, focus on making sure we continue to have the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America, tax cuts for oil and gas companies when we're at \$110 a barrel—and not focus the cuts on NPR or Planned Parenthood or energy efficiency. Those aren't what created the debt that this country faces.

We obviously have a problem, but those things came from big tax cuts, prosecuting two wars, and not policing Wall Street. That's where this budget should be focused. Let's get to the real issues that this country faces.

So I would say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, go back, start over with your budget, and let's really hit the things that are impor-

tant. We need to be making things in America, not giving tax breaks to send things offshore.

So let's focus our real efforts, come together as a country, and deal with this budget.

RECOGNIZING ACE MENTORS

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the mentors and high school students participating in the ACE Mentor Program, headquartered in Stamford, Connecticut.

ACE brings together nearly 6,000 volunteers in the integrated construction industry to mentor more than 10,000 students in 32 States each year. Most of the high school students in this program come from disadvantaged backgrounds. ACE matches teams of these young men and women with volunteers in the construction industry, creating career and education pathways for disadvantaged youth.

Each year, leading companies in the construction industry contribute an estimated \$22 million in volunteer time to this program. Connecticut-based companies providing volunteers to ACE include the EMCOR Group, United Technologies, and Lane Construction.

I applaud the volunteers, students, and companies involved in the ACE Mentor Program, and I'm encouraged by their commitment to create jobs and improve young lives.

"ROAD TO RUIN" REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, tomorrow marks the 100-day celebration for congressional Republicans taking control of the House. How will we celebrate? Well, not by focusing on jobs or the economy or growing the middle class, but, rather, with the road to ruin budget that will end Medicare while extending tax breaks for Big Oil.

The road to ruin Republican budget proposal will end Medicare. It will end a program that 46 million seniors and disabled individuals depend on for their health care. Rather than the Path to Prosperity, as its been designated, this budget is more like the road to riches, a road paved in gold with lavish handouts for special interests paid for and built with dollars from senior citizens who will see their hard-earned benefits rationed.

We must stop this road to ruin budget lest it lead to a cliff of catastrophe for our Nation's seniors.

IN MEMORY OF SIDNEY HARMAN

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I was very saddened this morning to hear the news of the passing of the husband of our former colleague Jane Harman.

Sidney Harman lived to, as the report came out, the ripe young age of almost 93. He was an amazing individual. I knew of him because of his great work in an organization called BENS, Business Executives for National Security. He also very famously took on the responsibility of what he described as an American icon, Newsweek magazine, when he made the decision to ensure that it would continue to thrive. And he has done a phenomenal job.

And I'd like to say that our thoughts and prayers are with our former colleague Jane and the entire Harman family. The world is a greater place for Sidney Harman having lived and a lesser place for his passing.

□ 1220

SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Before Medicare, 25 percent of the seniors in America lived in poverty, many driven there by the lack of affordable, decent health insurance. Medicare passed with virtually no Republican support. It solved that problem. Seniors today are guaranteed quality, affordable health care. They pay about 27 percent of the cost.

While under the guise of fiscal responsibility, the Republican budget wants to turn back the clock to the good old days. Throw the seniors into the private health care market again. And the estimates are seniors would have to pay 68 percent of their health care costs under the Republican plan. That would drive many into poverty.

It's opening day of the 2012 fiscal budget year, and President Obama has a chance to hit the first pitch out of the park by declaring Medicare will not end during his Presidency, on his watch. He won't stick it to seniors. He's going to stand up for seniors.

THE RYAN BUDGET

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. You know, budgets aren't just about a series of numbers. Budgets fundamentally are moral documents. And I fear that Republicans have made clear that their moral compass puts the wealthy and big business ahead of the American middle class, our seniors, disabled, and poor.

In order to pay for an enormous tax cut for millionaires and billionaires, they are ready to abolish the guarantee of Medicare. In order to protect tax cuts for the oil industry, they would cut Medicaid, resulting in seniors and the disabled being forced out of nursing homes and causing poor children to

lose health care coverage or pay more. In order to pay for tax cuts for businesses that ship American jobs overseas, they would cut investments in education and job training programs.

The Republican budget does not represent Americans' core values and should be rejected.

LEMOORE PILOTS

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to two heroic officers from the Naval Air Station in Lemoore, California, that I represent, who tragically lost their lives on April 6, 2011, Lieutenant Matthew Ira Lowe and Lieutenant Nathan Hollingsworth Williams. These pilots were among our best, doing extraordinary things.

Lieutenant Lowe, of Plantation, Florida, received his commission in 2002, and later was assigned to Strike Fighter Squadron 94 based at Lemoore Naval Air Station. Throughout his service, Lieutenant Lowe earned the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, and was training to become a pilot for the Blue Angels exhibition team.

Lieutenant Williams, of Oswego, New York, received his commission in 2004, and following his training served in Afghanistan aboard the USS *Theodore Roosevelt*. Returning home, Lieutenant Williams became a flight instructor at Lemoore Naval Air Station, training other officers on the aircraft the Super Hornet.

Madam Speaker, the deaths of these two individuals, Lieutenant Williams and Lieutenant Lowe, are a tragic reminder that the men and women who serve our Nation every day in harm's way throughout the world put their lives at risk.

Please join me for a moment of silence as we honor the service of these two individuals for our country.

SAVE MEDICARE

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, Medicare is a guarantee that senior citizens, regardless of their economic circumstances, will have the medical care that they need in their twilight years. Medicare plays a critical role in removing doubt from people's minds that if they have an ailment and are otherwise uninsurable in the marketplace, as many are, that their needs will be met. Not to say that the program doesn't have its problems. We periodically need to do a "doc fix," and we have to find a way to pay that in the long term. There are real issues with regards to the reimbursement rates and making

sure they are adequate so seniors can get their care.

But the answer, Madam Speaker, is not phasing out Medicare. There is a need to mend it, not end it. I think by improving the quality of care for seniors and ensuring that seniors have access to preventative care, we can help decrease overall health care costs without abolishing and phasing out Medicare, as is contained in the Republican budget proposal.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1473, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 35, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 36, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-60 part 2) on the resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 218 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 218

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. (a) If H.R. 1473 is passed by the House, it shall be in order to consider separately in the House the concurrent resolutions specified in subsection (b). All points of order against consideration of each concurrent resolution are waived. Each concurrent resolution shall be considered read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except 20

minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(b) The concurrent resolutions specified in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and

(2) the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473.

SEC. 3. If the House receives a message from the Senate transmitting its passage of H.R. 1473 without amendment, then the Clerk shall not certify an enrollment of the bill until notified by the Speaker or by message from the Senate that the Senate has taken the question on adoption of each concurrent resolution specified in section 2 that was adopted by the House.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order against consideration of H. Res. 218.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, I object to consideration of this rule because the rule in its final language says that the Clerk shall hold the enrollment of this bill until the Senate considers bills to defund health care reform and considers a bill to defund Planned Parenthood.

As such, it violates the rules of the House which require that anything passed by this House be filed forthwith. And with your permission, I will read that section:

“The Clerk shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions after passage by the House and, in cooperation with the Senate, examine all bills and joint resolutions that have passed both Houses to see that they are correctly enrolled and forthwith present those bills and joint resolutions that originated in the House to the President in person after their signature by the Speaker and the President of the Senate, and report to the House the fact and date of their presentment.”

In fact, what this rule does is it says that after this is passed, it shall not be sent to the Senate, shall not be sent to the President until the other body, the Senate, takes an action, considers these two things which already have been considered here.

□ 1230

This is clearly a violation of the rules and a very dangerous violation of the Constitution as well, because we believe in this House that our actions, once taken, trigger an action in the other body or by the President.

If we are to say that bills, when passed by this body, are held in spaces at the desk by an officer of this institution, a non-elected officer of this institution, we are, in fact, violating this rule.

It is very important, Madam Speaker, that you rule that this rule needs to be sent back and cleansed of that lan-

guage, or else we are, in effect, saying the passage of an act here shall be contingent upon the consideration of something in the Senate. That is a dangerous precedent, violates the laws, and violates the Constitution of the United States.

I ask for your ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to address the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

Enrollment is the process by which a proposed act of Congress is printed on parchment for presentment to the President. A House-originated measure is enrolled by the Clerk of the House. A Senate-originated measure is enrolled by the Secretary of the Senate.

After the two Houses have agreed to a unitary text for a measure, they still may agree to alter that text before presentment. The usual vehicle for this is a concurrent resolution. Such a concurrent resolution typically directs the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate to make specified changes in the text previously cleared for enrollment. Such a concurrent resolution might even be proposed in anticipation of the actions of the two Houses to clear the presumptive text for enrollment.

It is not unusual for the Clerk to take notice of the pendency of such a concurrent resolution and to seek guidance from the Speaker on the prospect that the concurrent resolution might be adopted by the two Houses. The Speaker, likewise, might assess the likelihood of adoption of such a concurrent resolution before seeing that the enrollment is signed by the presiding officer of each House or presented to the President. The two Houses might even adopt a concurrent resolution asking the President to return an enrollment so that they might change it.

Just as section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—as a matter of rulemaking—contemplates the possibility of holding an enrollment for a time, so also might a proposed special order of business enable such an interim hold of an enrollment.

The point of order is overruled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Madam Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall state it.

Mr. WEINER. Am I to understand this rule correctly that under the rule we are about to consider, if the House of Representatives approves the continuing resolution, that bill, despite the fact that the government is going to cease operating unless it passes, could theoretically sit at the desk, never to be sent to the President, never to be sent to the Senate ad infinitum if the Senate fails to take a specific action?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has inquired about a matter that may be debated by the Members during consideration of the pending

resolution, rather than being addressed from the Chair.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Boulder, Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this measure, all time yielded will be for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter before us.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of three measures: H.R. 1473, H. Con. Res. 35 and H. Con. Res. 36. H.R. 1473 funds the government for the remainder of fiscal year 2011. H. Con. Res. 35 and 36 are enrollment correction measures that end Federal funding for the President's health care plan and Planned Parenthood. As these measures represent a final agreement on this fiscal year's funding, on par with a conference report, this rule provides simple up-or-down votes on all three of these items.

Furthermore, this rule directs the Clerk of the House to refrain from finalizing the enrollment of H.R. 1473 until the Senate has acted on all three measures to ensure that the enrollment corrections resolutions get full consideration. H.R. 1473 will be debatable for 1 hour. H. Con. Res. 35 and 36 will be debatable for 20 minutes each.

Madam Speaker, it has been a long, difficult, ugly, messy process; but we have finally achieved an important victory for the American people.

Today's underlying continuing resolution is a step toward, a step toward the fulfillment of a fundamental promise that was made to the taxpayers. We will halt the practice of reckless and unchecked growth in Federal spending; and critically important, Madam Speaker, we will reverse the course that we have been on. This final continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011 imposes the single largest cut in non-defense spending in our Nation's history. It also implements a number of reforms that will ensure greater accountability in how tax dollars are spent.

Madam Speaker, this is not the end of our work to restore discipline and accountability of the Federal budget, far from it. After fighting so hard to get to this point, it's important to point out that the truly difficult work still lies ahead for us.

This resolution is also not the perfect measure we were all working for. Many of us fought hard to have even greater cuts and more significant reforms.

But today's action is so critical because it is the turning point; it is the

turning point, Madam Speaker. It is that profoundly important first step. The American people have said enough is enough, and this Congress is finally responding.

We are ending an era that has seen growth in non-defense discretionary spending over the past few years of 82 percent. Under Speaker PELOSI, Madam Speaker, we have had an increase in non-defense discretionary spending of 82 percent. We are making serious, meaningful cuts in the size and the scope of government.

But as I said, these are only just the beginning. When we conclude this debate, we will turn directly to the fiscal 2012 budget. Our very thoughtful Budget Committee chairman, Mr. RYAN, has put forth a bold budget plan that seeks to tackle the fundamental reforms that are absolutely essential to the future viability of our economy.

If the process we have just come through has been difficult, the task that lies ahead is Herculean. A \$1.6 trillion deficit poses an almost unfathomable challenge. It demands a tremendous level of seriousness and resolve that each and every one of us must rise to.

The consequences of failing to do so would be both disastrous and predictable. We have already gotten a strong dose of the economic challenges that would ensue. For months and months on end, we have dealt with a moribund economy and a very painful lack of job opportunities. The stifling nature of the national debt, the tax and regulatory uncertainty, the policies that favor government intervention over entrepreneurial empowerment, all of these have contributed to our economic challenges.

It is increasingly apparent that the recent positive movement on job creation has been fueled by our effort to rein in wasteful government spending and restore the certainty that businesses need to make new investments.

As we continue our efforts to impose fiscal discipline, I hope and believe we will continue to see positive news on the jobs front. But these economic challenges are far from over for most hardworking Americans.

We know what difficult times we and the American people are facing. We know very well how painful these challenges have been, but they pale in comparison to the crisis that will come if we do not have the courage to fundamentally transform the way this government spends money.

We need look no further than the euro zone to see what's in store without a dramatic change in course. We have seen Western European economies come to the brink of collapse, crippled under the weight of their sovereign debt and nearly dragged some of the world's largest, most stable economies along with them.

The coming budget debate will be a seminal moment in which we must reject this failed, economic model. Today, with this historic spending cut,

we are paving the way to do just that. Madam Speaker, this is not the end of our work; but it is, as I said, just the beginning.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolutions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1240

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, for all the talk of Republicans' commitment to cutting spending, there are several odd things about this bill before us that would lead one to believe that it's more of a partisan political exercise than a serious attempt to get the Nation's fiscal house in order, which we need and deserve as Americans.

Under this bill, critical services that many Americans rely on to educate our children, to keep our streets safe, to improve public health, to keep our water and air clean would face tens of billions of dollars worth of real and difficult cuts. Times are tough. We know we have to cut spending. Okay. So why does this bill then provide the Pentagon with an additional \$5 billion above the previous request at a time when the civilian and uniformed military, including thoughtful policymakers from both parties, believe that we need to reduce spending across the board?

Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen stated that our national debt is our biggest national security threat. He also noted that the past decade's doubling of the budget of the Department of Defense has led to undisciplined spending and waste within the department. Secretary Gates concurs, stating that we can't hold ourselves exempt from the belt-tightening. Yet, despite members of the military and civilians involved with defense saying that they, too, can't be spared, not only have they been spared by the Republican majority, but their budget has been increased by \$5 billion.

The recent bipartisan Commission on Fiscal Responsibility, often called the "Simpson-Bowles commission," called for substantial defense reductions over the next 10 years. They recommended cuts that would have led to \$60 billion in savings and security spending in the first year and would have kept our Nation safe. In fact, if we were to implement the commission's recommendations around security spending, we would save \$100 billion in 2015 alone.

But Republicans didn't go after their favorite areas of Big Government spending. Instead, they went after our efforts to strengthen our schools, to keep our air and water clean and to keep our streets safe; and the rest of their so-called "spending cuts" don't seem to be saving much at all. In fact, yesterday, we had an interesting discussion in the Rules Committee about whether this bill really even saves close to the \$38 billion claimed. Appar-

ently, most of the savings are from allocations of money that wouldn't be spent anyway.

An Associated Press story yesterday called this bill "budget tricks," saying that \$23 billion of the \$38 billion aren't even real savings, that they're counting savings from unspent census money. This is from the AP: leftover Federal construction funding; \$2.5 billion from the most recent renewal of highway programs that can't even be spent because of restrictions that have already been set by other legislation. Today's Wall Street Journal calls the Republican spending bill "spending cut hokum." Now, the "spending cut hokum" bill identifies that there was \$18 billion in real cuts and \$20 billion in fake accounting tricks that are not real cuts.

Yesterday in Rules, I actually had the opportunity to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he could explain that discrepancy between the claimed cuts and the real cuts which those who have dived in have identified, and he demurred on that account. So, in the end, what have the Republicans accomplished?

I'd like to talk about this graphically and sort of show the American people what we're talking about here:

Now, with these charts, I use the Wall Street Journal's figures, which credit the Republicans for more cuts than does the Associated Press, but out of caution, I want to trust the Journal in this case as a well-researched source and use their figures even though they have less than the AP. The Wall Street Journal still says that the majority of the Republican cuts are, in fact, hokum cuts. So here is what we're talking about, Madam Speaker:

This is the deficit. This is the CBO's, the Congressional Budget Office, estimate of the deficit. It is \$1.399 trillion. This is what we're talking about here. This is the continuing resolution savings. That's it; not one penny more. Let me sort of take an example of an American family. We'll have to take a few zeros off of this for most Americans to even understand these figures.

Let's say the deficit is \$139,000 and not \$1.399 trillion. I was a small business man before I came to Congress; so I understand how to balance a budget. I know most American families are trying to balance their family paychecks, to stay in their homes, to make their mortgage payments. It's \$139,000 you lose in a year. That's tough. You have to take out a second mortgage and max out your credit cards, and you try to cover that \$139,000, okay? Then you know you've got to make some serious changes. What are you going to do? You hem and you haw for a couple of months; you argue with your creditors; you threaten to shut down your business. On the eve of shutting down your business, because you can't afford another loss of \$139,000, what do you do? You figure out how to lose \$137,000 the next year. Do you know what? That \$137,000

is going to put that American family out of business just as surely as that \$139,000, but that is the Republican approach to this bill.

Now let me talk about some of the alternatives we have before us.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I would be happy to discuss this on the gentleman's own time. I want to go through this excellent chart. If the gentleman wants to come over, he can look at what we have here and what the Democrats have presented.

If we were serious about deficit reduction, Republicans could have supported several amendments offered by Democrats and voted on in the House when we debated H.R. 1. The Democratic amendments alone would have cut spending by nearly \$129 billion, more than three times the amount that's even claimed in this bill.

Here are some examples: Congressman STARK and Congresswoman LEE offered one amendment that would have reduced defense spending to its level 3 years ago—we were already in two wars at that time as well—saving \$36 billion in the first year alone, and that would have left intact the defense budget of \$688 billion, more than enough to meet the security needs of our Nation. Congressman NADLER offered an amendment that would have finally ended our support for the war in Afghanistan, saving \$90 billion. Congresswoman WOOLSEY offered an amendment that would have saved \$415 million by ending the V-22 Osprey program.

In fact, just yesterday in Rules, I also proposed an amendment that would have reduced our troop presence in Europe, which would have saved \$415 million. Our European allies, Madam Speaker, are some of the richest countries in the world. It's time they paid their fair way. What is the strategic rationale for an ongoing presence in Germany? The Nazis are gone. The Soviets are gone. Even former Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has questioned the ongoing presence of our troops in Europe. I also proposed an amendment eliminating the drug czar. The drug czar's office spends \$21 million a year; yet drug use has gone up since its inception.

Madam Speaker, we are never going to balance the entire budget just by reducing the funds Congress spends each year as part of the appropriations process—clearly, we all can agree we need to look at revenues and entitlements—and you're not going to make even the slightest dent in the deficit if you exempt defense spending from any cuts.

In this continuing resolution before us, Republicans have exempted more than half of the domestic discretionary spending from any cuts, and it becomes very clear that the Republican plan isn't so much about serious deficit reduction than it is about protecting their favorite Big Government spending while simultaneously slashing

away at their favorite targets, like education, the environment and the safety net.

Here is what we could potentially accomplish if we work together: This shows the Republican cuts in this CR. We even add in, for the sake of argument, the hokum cuts. We put them in here too—it's the Wall Street Journal's term, not mine—and we include the proposed Democratic amendments. I think this is something that we could be proud of. Do you know what, Madam Speaker? I think more Democrats would support a program that didn't only cut the program which so many on my side of the aisle feel strongly about but that also makes some of the difficult decisions with where the real money is with regard to defense and security spending.

Yes. Just like that American family that we raised, digging its way out of a \$127,000-a-year loss, we need to make a real impact on reducing the Federal budget deficit. This will take action across the aisle to make sure that we can leave our country in a better situation and that we can help the next generation fight its way out from the burden of debt that we risk placing upon them if we continue the big spending policies of the Republican Party.

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 13, 2011]

SPENDING CUT HOKUM

A mini-revolt is brewing among Republican backbenchers on Capitol Hill now that the specific spending cuts in Friday's budget deal are being revealed. After separating out the accounting gimmicks and one-year savings, the actual cuts look to be closer to \$20 billion than to the \$38 billion that both sides advertised. This is not going to help Speaker John Boehner's credibility with the tea party.

Even \$20 billion is worthwhile, and the genuine reductions include cuts in high-speed rail, Pell grants, highway projects, renewable energy programs, housing subsidies, low-income home energy assistance, agriculture programs, contributions to the United Nations, and many more. There is also an immediate across the board 0.2% reduction in all nondefense accounts.

But the continuing resolution also saves money on paper through phantom cuts. The whopper is declaring \$6.2 billion in savings by not spending money left from the 2010 Census. Congress also cuts \$4.9 billion from the Justice Department's Crime Victims Fund, but much of that money was tucked away in a reserve fund that wouldn't have been spent this year in any event.

The budgeteers claim \$630 million in cuts from what are called "orphan earmarks," or construction that never started, and \$2 billion more for transportation projects, some of which were likely to be canceled. The Associated Press reports that \$350 million in savings comes from a 2009 program to pay dairy farmers to compensate for low milk prices. Milk prices are high this year, so some of that money also would never have been spent.

An estimated \$17 billion comes from one-time savings in mandatory programs. The cuts are real, but the funding gets restored by law the next year, which means Republicans will have to refight the same battles. States lose some \$3.5 billion in bonus money to enroll more kids in the Children's Health Insurance Program, but many states failed

to qualify for that extra funding. These cuts don't reduce the spending baseline, so there are no compound savings over time.

None of this is enough to defeat the budget at this point, but it is infuriating given the GOP leadership's flogging of that \$38 billion top-line figure. On Sunday we heard the leadership might lose 30 backbenchers on the budget vote, but yesterday we were hearing it may be closer to 50 or 60. This will only heighten skepticism over the next budget showdown, and Mr. Boehner will have to drive a harder bargain. Above all, the hokum belies the House GOP's promise to usher in a new era of lawmaking candor and transparency.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, let me begin by congratulating my friend from Boulder, my Rules Committee colleague, for his very thoughtful remarks, and I would like to respond with a few important points.

First, I was struck by the fact that he went through the litany of amendments that were debated on H.R. 1, underscoring again that we have, for the first time in decades, seen a free and flowing debate and an opportunity for votes to take place here in this institution. It hadn't happened before on a continuing resolution as we saw it in our consideration of H.R. 1.

□ 1250

I also want to say that while my friend continued to point the finger of blame somehow characterizing this as a Republican plan, I'd like to remind him, Madam Speaker, that this happens to be the result of a negotiation that has taken place with three Democrats—the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the majority leader of the United States Senate—and one Republican, the Speaker of the House of Representatives. By a 3-1 margin in the negotiation process, the Republicans were outnumbered. And so I think that it's a mischaracterization to describe this as somehow a Republican plan that is before us.

Now to the issue that was raised about a cut being a cut, Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, made it clear, and he called it that—a cut is a cut. I know this attempt is being made to somehow characterize the fact that dollars have not been spent so that means you're not actually cutting them. Well, last night in the Rules Committee, the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friend Mr. DICKS, pointed out something that everyone in this institution should know, and that is the process of reprogramming takes place within government agencies. We know full well that the movement of money, since money is fungible, that takes place within these different agencies, is standard operating procedure. So, Madam Speaker, to claim somehow that if dollars haven't actually been spent that they're not being cut is just plain wrong.

Now, Madam Speaker, while I talked about the negotiating process that ended up with the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the majority leader of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House, leading up to that, we had our very, very diligent and hardworking new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my friend, Mr. ROGERS, who has stepped up to the plate and taken on the responsibility, in fact, some call it tongue in cheek, but he has been very serious about being the “enforcer” of ensuring that we cut spending, and he has actually renamed his Appropriations Committee the “Disappropriations Committee” by virtue of the fact, Madam Speaker, of the recognition that if we don’t get our fiscal house in order, we are going to be in deep, deep trouble.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to say that, again, he was one of the negotiators leading up to the final process here.

I would like to now yield such time as he may consume to my very good friend, the chair of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for the time here. And I thank him for the diligent work that he continues to do as chair of the Rules Committee, the sort of traffic cop for the bills that reach this floor.

I want to expand a bit, Madam Speaker, on a point that Chairman DREIER alluded to earlier, and that is the historic nature of the bill that we will be considering on the floor. As the chairman pointed out, under Speaker PELOSI, discretionary spending in those 2 years increased by 82 percent—a record. With this bill, we not only are arresting that growth, but we are receding actual discretionary spending by a record amount, nearly \$40 billion in actual cuts in spending. That has not ever been accomplished by this body in its history, in the history of the country. The cuts in this bill exceed anything ever passed by the House. It’s the largest cut ever—by four times. The largest previous single cut was in 1995, when we cut around \$9 billion. With this bill, you cut almost \$40 billion.

Now I don’t understand sometimes my friends on the other side of the aisle when they criticize this bill. It’s being supported by your President. He says, pass the bill. It’s what we agreed upon. It’s being supported by Senator REID, the leader on the Senate side. It’s being supported by the Speaker of the House. And it’s being supported by an overwhelming number of Members on this side of the aisle, and I predict a great number of Democrats likewise support the bill.

Now on the Defense portion of this bill, let me briefly refer to it. The provisions in this bill about the Defense budget are much like they were when all parties last December on both sides

of the aisle in this body and on both sides of the aisle in the Senate body agreed to the expenditures for the Department of Defense. We simply lifted those agreed-upon provisions for the Defense Department and dropped them into this bill.

There are two people in this body that know more about Defense spending than any of the rest of us, and that’s the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on Appropriations, BILL YOUNG of Florida, and my good friend, NORMAN DICKS, the ranking member of that subcommittee and the ranking member on the full Appropriations Committee. He worked long and hard with BILL YOUNG for these provisions. And I salute him for it. It’s good work. It does the right things. It cuts back on the President’s request for Defense. It does increase in real dollars, about \$5 billion, over the current spending rate. But we’re in three wars. And there’s no reason at all for us to shirk from the responsibility to provide adequate funding for our troops in combat. And that’s the reason why, one of the big reasons why we support this bill, why the President supports the bill, and why Senator REID and the Senate supports the bill.

And so let’s focus on actual cuts in spending. We all profess that we want to cut back on the deficit for the year and for the ensuing years. The deficit this year, \$1.4 trillion in just 1 year, the largest in history, adding to a debt that exceeds all of our fears of some \$14.2 or \$14.3 trillion. We all say, let’s cut back on spending. Here is your chance. Here is your opportunity.

If you profess to be a fiscally responsible Member of this House, you have a chance, yea, an obligation, to vote for this bill and support it. It’s historic. We’ve never been here before. We’ve reached a pinnacle and a great opportunity for us to show to the rest of the country that we’re serious about controlling the free-spending nature of this body. This is your chance. Don’t miss it.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself 1 minute to respond.

The gentleman from Kentucky called this an historic bill. I think much more of this kind of history, and we risk making our country’s solvency history by drowning ourselves in a burden of debt. Again, effectively, for a family business that lost \$139,000, losing \$137,000 might be nice, but it puts you out of business just the same. I continue to express our wish that we included some of the Democratic cuts in this that added up to four times the amount of the proposed Republican cuts in this bill.

As the Bard put it, the cutting in this bill is a lot of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

With that, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about a different historic perspective. This bill is different, all right, and I want to try to explain that to you. But first, I want to say we weren’t elected, any of us, to Congress to prove that we can barely keep the government open and alive. That was never why we were sent here. We’re here to make America stronger. And looking at this bill, we are utterly failing in achieving that goal.

In addition to the unnecessary and politically driven cuts in the legislation, the process that brought the bill to the floor is a mockery of regular order. Never before, again, let me say it, in the history of our Nation has this rule—what we’re doing here today are three bills under one rule. You think we’re going to vote for one, that would be the budget for the remainder of the year, but there are two other bills here to be voted on that I think you might be surprised at. It certainly took us by surprise. One of them completely defunds Planned Parenthood, having nothing in the world to do about cutting the deficit.

□ 1300

The second one takes away the health care bill. A matter of that importance is added as a correction onto this bill. What they said they would like us to do is to correct legislation that has not even been passed. That takes a lot of imagination.

But what is more serious, and I believe that is what they have done here, they have added an unprecedented provision that raises serious constitutional questions. Under this rule, and pay attention here, except I don’t want children to believe it. This is not the way we do things. After the House and Senate have passed this bill and it comes back over, the House will hold it and will not send it to the President. They will hold it themselves, letting the government shut down again until the Senate votes to defund Planned Parenthood and to kill America’s health care.

Now, that is very similar to what we did here a few weeks ago, a couple of weeks ago. It may have been last week for all I can remember, we have been working so hard. But what we did was probably one of the silliest things done in any legislative process in the world. They really passed a bill on this floor that said: we have already passed a bill and sent it to you, Senate. The Senate took the bill up, and it failed. So then the House response to that failure was: if we don’t hear from you by date certain, then we’re going to just say that the House bill is the law of the land.

Now, all of you who have been to school know that what we do to pass a bill is the House passes a bill, the Senate passes a bill. If necessary, a conference committee reconciles the two bills, makes them the same, and it requires the President of the United States’ signature to make it a bill. But not in this House. You can believe 10

impossible things before breakfast here easily because we're called upon to do that every day.

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

I would like to engage in a discussion with my distinguished ranking member, if she would like, on the issue that she just discussed.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Just one point. I think what the gentledady said is that the Senate will have to vote on it, not that they have to pass it, just to be clear.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, there were several things that were said that I would like to address.

First, I would like to say that the gentlewoman began by saying that before in our Nation's history have we had measures brought forward in this manner. Madam Speaker, that is just plain wrong. Time and time again under both political parties, we have seen the Rules Committee report out measures that do in fact cover multiple issues. So this is not unprecedented, as the gentlewoman has just said.

Second, I think it is very important for us to clarify the fact that what we are voting on is an agreement that is supported by the President of the United States and the majority leader of the United States Senate. Part of that agreement is that the Senate will not vote to defund Planned Parenthood or vote to actually bring an end to funding for the health care bill, but it will consider these measures. And I think it is important, Madam Speaker, to make it clear, the only thing we are doing in this rule is ensuring that that agreement is enforced.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that it is clear that many of our friends on the other side of the aisle are not happy with the fact that their President and the Senate majority leader have negotiated this agreement. Again, I don't like the agreement just like they don't like the agreement. I don't like it because I don't believe that it goes far enough, but it is very important for us to realize that this is simply a first step. It is a bold first step.

As the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has just said, Madam Speaker, it is a step which in fact is the largest, four times the largest, cut we have ever had in the past. It is a cut of \$40 billion. By virtue of that agreement, we are making that first step. But if you extend this out, it will have cuts that total \$315 billion. And as I said, we are just beginning the debate this week with this very, very important budget that will be considered in the Rules Committee today and tomorrow and Friday on the House floor.

I also have to say that one of the reasons we are having this debate on the rule today and voting on Thursday on the actual continuing resolution is because we put into place a very impor-

tant change in the rules at the beginning of this Congress which states that unreported measures must in fact comply with the 3-day layover requirement that exists for reported measures. We are subscribing to that and enforcing that.

As we know, this measure was filed at 2 a.m. yesterday morning here in the House; and because of that filing, to ensure that it was put online, as the chairman of Appropriations Committee said, so that the full membership, the American people, the media have an opportunity to see this measure, we have done that. That is the reason we are going to be holding this vote on Thursday, and that is the reason we are able to have the kind of free-flowing debate that we will have.

Madam Speaker, this is an agreement that no one, no one is happy with; but it is an agreement that we have come to in dealing with the two political parties, and I am going to urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, this continuing resolution is a first step, all right. It is a first step towards bankruptcy with token cuts.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and to the underlying bill.

I want to reinforce the comments of the gentledady from New York when she said that the issue of defunding Planned Parenthood or what your opinion is about the Affordable Care Act really has no place in this debate. It shouldn't be tied to anything. The fact of the matter is the Republicans are intentionally injecting these very kinds of polarizing issues, and let me say to all of my friends on the Democratic side, that's the reason you should vote against this rule.

I'm pleased that the Republican leadership of the House decided it was not in anyone's interest to shut down the government. I am also pleased that the leadership ignored the chants of "shut it down" coming from the most extreme elements of their party. But I am not pleased, Madam Speaker, with this so-called compromise.

This bill cuts the wrong things too deeply and ignores some of the things that could stand to be cut. The cuts target the poor and the middle class, the very people who can least afford it as we struggle to recover from the Great Recession. Meanwhile, the very wealthy and the special interests get away scot-free. Student aid programs get cut. Children's health care would be cut. Transportation funding to repair our roads and our bridges would be cut. Environmental protection would be cut. The COPS program, which helps local communities stay safe, would be cut. Investments in science and technology research would be cut.

But the Department of Defense, well, they got a \$5 billion increase. Oil companies keep their sweet tax loopholes. And big agriculture keeps their subsidies. That's not fair, Madam Speaker, and that's not right.

I am all for a leaner government; but I'm not for a meaner government. I'm for balancing the budget; but I'm not for balancing the budget solely on the backs of the poor and the middle class. If you want to get to a balanced budget, there needs to be some fairness in this process. And if you think that this bill is troublesome, just wait because later this week we will be debating the Republican budget proposal for 2012, a budget that would represent the largest redistribution of wealth from the middle class to the rich in American history. It is a budget plan that ends Medicare as we know it. It is a budget plan that tells our seniors we want you to pay more, and you will get less.

Well, there are some things worth fighting for, Madam Speaker, and the protection of Medicare is one of them. So I look forward to that fight.

But in the meantime, I urge my colleagues to reject this yet again another closed rule, and I urge them to reject the underlying bill. We can do better than this.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say first to my friend from Boulder that the notion of arguing that a \$40 billion cut is going to take us down the road to bankruptcy is absolutely preposterous.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Boulder.

Mr. POLIS. Again, the cut is actually somewhere in the \$15 billion to \$20 billion range, according to both The Wall Street Journal and the AP.

□ 1310

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I will repeat this again so that he might be able to understand it. A \$40 billion cut, or a \$15 billion cut, cannot be characterized as taking us down the road toward bankruptcy. We all want to cut more in spending. I mean, it's very clear.

Now my friend from Worcester has just made this argument about the priorities that we have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself an additional minute, and I do so to say that I think it's important for us to look at the preamble of the United States Constitution whenever we're debating defense appropriations bills or the defense authorization bill. I'm so happy that my friend from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee and the defense appropriations subcommittee, is here. I always argue that the five most important words in the middle of the preamble of the United States Constitution are "provide for the common defense."

Now, with all due respect to the priorities that we have, ensuring that we do care for those who are truly in need, all of these things can be done at other levels of government. Only the Federal Government can deal with our Nation's security. As Chairman ROGERS pointed out, we are now, by virtue of a decision that the President of the United States has made, in the midst of three wars. I want to bring about spending cuts, and I believe that Governor Haley Barbour was absolutely right when he said: Anyone who says that you can't cut defense spending has never been to the Pentagon. We want to encourage defense sharing, and, in fact, we are focused on ensuring that we do get the best bang for our buck.

So, Madam Speaker, recognizing the priority that the Federal Government has for national security and recognizing that we're trying to bring about responsible cuts, I think this agreement is the right thing for us.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I appreciate the gentleman from California's willingness to look at defense spending. I know the gentleman from Kentucky mentioned we're in three wars. Perhaps part of the answer is to be in two wars or one war or, God forbid, perhaps we can be at peace again in our lifetime.

Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me and for his work on this bill.

Madam Speaker, the District of Columbia has no vote on the rule or the bill under consideration. Yet the only controversial attachments in this bill involve only the District of Columbia.

The bill is remarkably clean. Only four out of 50 or so attachments survived: one on gray wolves, one on Guantanamo prisoners, and, yes, there is the District of Columbia. These two, the only controversial amendments, violate the District's most basic right to self-government. One has to do with private school vouchers—only for the District of Columbia. A bill we didn't ask for, a bill we weren't consulted about, and a bill we don't want.

The Rules Committee refused to recognize my amendment, which would redirect the private school voucher money to the D.C. public schools and to our own public charter schools—40 percent of our children go to this alternative and our charter schools have long waiting lists—to our choice, not the Republicans' choice. My second amendment would strike a second rider that keeps the District from spending our own local taxpayer-raised funds on reproductive choice for our low-income women. Local money, local choice.

The majority proposed to close down the District government last week rather than pass my amendment to allow D.C. to spend its own local funds. Now the majority wants a closed rule

for a bill with attachments that profoundly affect only the District of Columbia.

I will have no vote on this floor on the Rule or on any part of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The majority will allow a vote of every other Member on what affects only my district. No wonder the D.C. mayor, the council and residents have taken to civil disobedience.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of my friend how many speakers he has remaining and also how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. We have three speakers. We are possibly expecting a fourth.

Mr. DREIER. Then I will reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I rise in favor of the commonsense compromise that says to the operating departments of our government, "See if you can get by on 95 percent of the money you had last year." I think that makes good sense, and I commend Chairman ROGERS and Mr. DICKS for making sure that Pell Grants, title I, special education are fully funded and protected and, frankly, salute both sides for leaving aside extraneous matters like not funding Planned Parenthood and not funding the health care bill. I think this is a worthy compromise. I'm glad to support it.

I do want to note my grave concern with the rule and the rather ambiguous position we find ourselves in with respect to the actions of the Senate. About 10 days ago, the majority attempted to pass a bill where the Senate would never have to act. Now they want to say, even if the House and the Senate have both acted, apparently the bill doesn't become law. Maybe we should have put a few more education funds in for constitutional studies here because I think this is very unwise and, frankly, ambiguous. So I'm going to oppose the rule on the grounds that this very novel idea of giving the Clerk of the House the instructions not to enroll a bill that's been passed by both House and Senate I think is very troubling.

Having said that, I think that the underlying bill merits the support of both Republicans and Democrats and I will be voting "yes."

Mr. DREIER. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. As one who voted for cutting some of President Obama's spending requests last year and who has already voted three times this year to cut spending from the budget, I believe we do need to ferret out every bit of unnecessary spending, to demand greater efficiency and to seek common ground on securing our long-term financial future by addressing our national debt. But this resolution is only a belated companion to the deal that tied a Christmas bow around another tax cut for the wealthiest few in December. It represents another unbalanced approach to achieving balance in our budget. There is no shared sacrifice here.

And like that December deal, this concession literally sets up tomorrow's demand for adoption of the House Republican budget—a pathway to less economic, educational, and health care security.

Instead of asking for a dime from ExxonMobil or other polluters, this deal makes severe cuts in the budget to assure us clean air and clean water. Instead of asking for a dollar from General Electric or another of these giant corporations that won't pay their fair share of taxes, this places the burden on hundreds of thousands of young Americans who are trying to seek a future job in the United States.

Almost one-fourth of the budget is eliminated for YouthBuild, a program that provides vital education and employment skills to young people. In Austin, I have seen up close the difference that our local YouthWorks makes in trails constructed, in homes weatherized, in the vital employment and training skills provided. With every energy efficient home for which a foundation is laid, a foundation is also laid for the future of some enterprising young Texans. Additionally, about another 100,000 young people at universities like Texas State will lose the counseling, academic instruction, tutoring and encouragement from TRIO that helps them achieve academic success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. That's not balanced. Fair and balanced? Yes, I know it's a distorted slogan, but I think it could have real meaning for our budget. But this budget is balanced on our young people and our future. We need a budget that's fair. This is not it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1320

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

America is in a very dangerous place on this budget, and it's not an

unsolvable problem. We can get from where we are to where we need to be—and that is fiscal balance—if we put everything on the table and have a balanced approach. If, instead, we limit our consideration to essentially 12 percent of the budget, the so-called “domestic discretionary”—things like low-income heating assistance, the Small Business Administration, scholarships for our kids wanting to go to college, scientific research—if we limit our attention to that 12 percent of the budget, even if we cut that entire 12 percent we would have trillion dollar deficits for as far as the eye can see. It won't work. There is a design defect here.

We have aggravated it with the deal that was made to extend the tax cuts at the high end when we were here in our special session after the last election, that \$750 billion that we have to borrow in order to pay for those tax cuts for the top 2 percent.

We have to put everything on the table. It has to include the Pentagon, it has to include revenues, it has to include eliminating wasteful and unproductive, non-job-generating tax expenditures to mature and profitable industries like the oil industry. It has to include eliminating the ethanol subsidy, something that was promoted by the Member from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN). We put everything on the table. We can get from where we are to where we need to be.

One thing we also cannot do is start playing budgetary hostage taking. There is looming ahead of us the question of whether we will raise the debt ceiling or use that as a leverage point, as some are suggesting. This is not a leverage point; it's a moral obligation.

America was in fiscal balance in the 8 years of the Clinton administration. When he handed the keys over to the new President, Mr. Bush, there was a projected \$5.7 trillion deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I again want to bring it back to the hypothetical American family, small business we're talking about, because the \$1.399 trillion figure is boggling to most people. So lop off the zeros there and say, hey, I have a small business, I'm an American family, I will lose \$139,000 next year. Let me tell you, is losing \$137,000 the next year a step towards solvency or a step towards bankruptcy? I would submit, Madam Chair, ask any small business man in America or small business woman, losing \$137,000 instead of \$139,000 is a step towards bankruptcy.

Just like that family, we in the United States Congress, we in this country need to come together and make hard choices about where to find additional income, where to cut expenditures, how to get this budget out of red and into the black. That's the difference between where the Democrats stand and the proposal of our friends on the other side. And another difference: A Democratic President has

actually balanced the budget. That's a claim that the other side can't make for more than a generation.

It is clear that the Republicans are not serious about the deficit. If they were, this would be a different bill. Again, this is what we're talking about: Taking our Nation another step down the road towards fiscal insolvency and leaving a legacy of debt for the next generation.

Rather than holding the line on spending, the majority is feeding the beast. And yet, what do the Republicans cut rather than rooting out waste at the Pentagon? They cut \$1.6 billion from the EPA's effort to protect public health and keep our air and water safe; \$950 million from Community Development Block Grants to strengthen neighborhoods and create jobs; \$815 million from FEMA grants that help communities prepare for disasters; \$10 million to keep our food safe.

When you look at the winners and losers in this budget, it becomes clear what the majority party does and does not value. And they clearly do not mind leaving the next generation a legacy of deficits and debt.

What we're doing in this continuing resolution is increasing the favorite government spending of the majority party, running up the deficit, continuing big tax cuts for special interests while slashing the effort to educate our children, ensure access to health care, keep our air and water clean—oh, and while they're at it, taking away a woman's right to choose.

This is where we could be by working together, Democrats and Republicans. This process, this rule and this bill, are not examples of working together to solve our budget crisis.

We can do better, we must do better. To save America from bankruptcy, we must do better than sound and fury signifying nothing. We need to work together to make the cuts we need to make, to increase the revenues we need to increase, and to examine our entitlement programs to put our Nation on proper fiscal footing for the next generation and remove the mounting burden of debt that faces the next generation of Americans.

I don't see how anyone can argue that somehow reducing—again, at the family level, a \$139,000 loss to a \$137,000 loss, while it might be a fine thing to do, leaves that family in every bit as dangerous and precarious a fiscal situation as they were before—ask any small business man or small business woman in this country. And after passing this continuing resolution and keeping our government in business another year, we're just punting further down the field about making the cuts we all know we need to make to balance the budget, return to a surplus, and help remove the next generation of Americans from the legacy of debt that is threatening to crush them.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, according to the schedule, in about 9 minutes, the President of the United States, at George Washington University, is scheduled to give a very important address in which he is going to talk about fiscal responsibility—the need to bring about spending cuts and all—and how to get our economy growing.

I want to congratulate the President. I want to congratulate the President for coming to this position. It obviously is much different than what we've gone through so far. As I said earlier, we've had an 82 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending. The President proposed a budget that has deficits in excess of \$1.5 trillion and would exacerbate the debt. He came out a few weeks ago and proposed a freeze in spending. We know that if we had not done what we are about to vote on here with this rule making in order a vote that will take place tomorrow, we would see an increase of \$78.5 billion more in spending if we had not taken the action that this House, in a bipartisan way, is about to take.

But the reason I want to congratulate the President is that I have just taken a look at the early reports of what he is about to say in this speech, and he does call for us to look at the issue of entitlements—he specifically says Social Security, not Medicare or Medicaid, but he talks about Social Security. But I believe that is, again, a first step towards what I believe is absolutely essential, and that is, for us, in a bipartisan way, to tackle the issue of entitlement spending. As Mr. DICKS said in the Rules Committee yesterday, that's two-thirds of the spending. We know that entitlement spending is something that needs to be addressed, and there is bipartisan recognition that we need to get our fiscal house in order.

Madam Speaker, what we have before us is a measure that I don't like. I don't like it. I don't believe that it does enough to reduce the size and scope and reach of government. I believe that we need to do more. But we have to remember that we've got to take that first step.

Last November 2, the American people sent a very loud and powerful message to Washington, D.C. There are 96 newly elected Members of this House, nine of them happen to be Democrats, 87 of them are Republican. Now Madam Speaker, I think it's important for us to recognize that that's a pretty powerful message. They were saying, End the nonsense, bring an end to this dramatic expansion of government, and that's exactly what we're doing with this first step.

Margaret Thatcher, the great former Prime Minister of Great Britain, famously said, First you have to win the argument, then you win the vote. I believe that we've won the argument, Madam Speaker, because the message has come through.

□ 1330

The message has come through that we are, in fact, going to have to get our fiscal house in order if we're going to ensure the strength and the pre-eminence of the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to urge my colleagues to support this rule, and tomorrow we will have a vote on the continuing resolution itself. Then we will begin tomorrow, after we've had that vote, to debate the budget, which is going to be far reaching, it's going to be difficult, but it is clearly the right thing for us to do.

And I will say again, Madam Speaker, that I do hope that on these issues we will be able to continue to work together in a bipartisan way to solve our Nation's problems.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1217, REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 219 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 219

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the

question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 219 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1217, which repeals the Prevention and Public Health Fund and rescinds any unobligated funds.

Republicans are on the floor today to fulfill part of our Pledge to America that we would cut spending and we would repeal the Democrats' health care bill passed a year ago. On January 19, this House passed H.R. 2 to repeal ObamaCare completely. The ruling liberal Democrats in the Senate, however, have so far refused to consider H.R. 2, but House Republicans remain undeterred. We will repeal ObamaCare piece by piece if that is what it takes.

Because the liberal elites knew their government takeover of health care was unpopular and would likely have consequences at the ballot box, they included \$105 billion in mandatory taxpayer spending in the law itself to protect their favorite programs.

Let me take a moment to explain the difference between "discretionary" and "mandatory" government spending.

First, it's important to remember that the Federal Government does not have any money of its own, as it has only what it takes in taxes from hard-working Americans or money that it borrows from foreign creditors and our future generations. We are currently borrowing 43 cents of every dollar that the Federal Government spends.

Discretionary spending is appropriated by Congress annually and therefore subject to congressional oversight and review. Discretionary spending allows Congress to be wise stewards of the taxpayers' money by not funding ineffective or duplicative programs. However, what is called mandatory spending funds programs for people who meet certain criteria and occurs irrespective of congressional appropri-

tions and must be spent whether we have the money or not.

The most recognized mandatory spending programs are Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, which operate on autopilot and have not been subject to congressional oversight from year-to-year as funds automatically stream from the Treasury to anyone who qualifies, that is, meets the criteria for a particular benefit.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1217, would repeal a portion of mandatory ObamaCare spending and eliminate a slush fund established for Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius. This slush fund, known as the Prevention and Public Health Fund, will automatically receive \$1 billion when fiscal year 2012 begins in October of this year with automatic increases every year until it reaches \$2 billion annually in fiscal year 2015.

However, there's a very important distinction between this funding and that for Medicare and Social Security in that this funding does not state eligibility criteria.

The liberal elites in Washington think they know how to spend the taxpayers' money better than individual taxpayers and gives Secretary Sebelius \$2 billion a year until Congress acts to repeal her authority to spend without accountability.

Republicans are rejecting this slush fund by considering this bill which would repeal the fund and take back any money that has not already been spent this year. The slush fund is not subject to the annual appropriations process and therefore would not be subject to yearly congressional oversight.

The money will be made available to the Secretary regardless of how she chooses to spend it and whether or not the programs being funded are actually effective.

Again, this is not like Medicare and Social Security. There are no criteria for the spending of this money.

It's important to point out that this bill does not cut any specific program, because the slush fund is used by the Secretary to increase spending above congressionally appropriated levels for whatever program the Secretary chooses.

My colleagues across the aisle will argue that this money is being used to train primary care physicians, to prevent obesity, and to encourage healthy lifestyles. What they won't tell you is that they have absolutely no idea how the money is being used, because they abdicated the authority of Congress to an unelected bureaucrat.

The simple truth is that the money is just as likely to be spent on elective abortion as it is for any other purpose.

In the Democrats' dissenting views from the House Energy and Commerce Committee report, they say without mandatory spending for this slush fund, the programs will not be adequately funded. Well, Madam Speaker, that's what the whole process for appropriations is all about. If the programs need more money, it's up to them to come and justify that.

However, they sang a different tune when liberal House Democrats rammed through a government takeover of health care in November of 2009. They created this slush fund but made it subject to the regular appropriations process. That meant it was subject to yearly congressional oversight and direction for how the money would be spent.

□ 1340

But when the ruling liberal Democrats in the Senate sent over their version of the health care bill, which became law, the slush fund had been made mandatory. The liberal elites claim they put in a safeguard because part of the section creating this slush fund states that Congress has the authority to direct how this funding is spent. Well, as any high school junior civics student could tell you, Congress always has the authority to direct, re-direct, repeal, or increase funding. Congress can always pass a new law to change the direction of any funding stream. That's our job as legislators. The need to state explicitly that we have the authority to direct spending in a slush fund is pointless.

The simple truth is that we have a spending crisis in this town in large part due to mandatory spending that operates on autopilot. Instead of working to address our unsustainable spending habits, the ruling Democrats refused even to offer a budget resolution last year or pass a single appropriations bill. The liberal elites failed to lead despite having unchecked control of all levers of power in Washington.

I brought a chart with me today to help illustrate the fact that mandatory spending is out of control in Washington. Madam Speaker, let me show you that because of mandatory spending being on autopilot, by the year 2050 the mandatory spending will absorb all revenue coming into the Federal Government, all tax revenue coming into the Federal Government. That simply is unsustainable. We cannot operate our country when we let three programs take up all of the money that comes into the Federal Government. Something has to be done. And yet the Democrats want to add another program to this, which would speed up this process. We don't need that.

As Washington liberals ignored the growing autopilot spending crisis, adding more unaccountable mandatory spending in the hands of unelected bureaucrats, House Republicans are now working hard to protect the future for our children and grandchildren by restoring congressional oversight of spending.

Now, I am sure many Americans are wondering how a slush fund with a clever title would be spent and why it must be put on autopilot. Let me give you an example. Pitt County, in my home State of North Carolina, received funding from this fund to fix prices at convenience stores so that healthy foods would be less expensive and,

therefore, supposedly more attractive to the consumer. In addition, the Pitt County Health Department now plans to use some of this money to put up signs indicating the location of public parks, bike lanes, and alternate transportation.

Although I am certainly not opposed to parks or healthy eating habits, it seems quite clear that the Founders of this country did not intend the Federal Department of Health and Human Services in Washington, DC, to use taxpayer money to subsidize granola bars or purchase signs for bike lanes or parks.

The Federal Government has no business paying for local and community initiatives such as these, especially when we are borrowing 43 cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends to pay for it. The new House Republican majority is ready to lead this country out of our debt crisis. And it starts with voting for this rule and the underlying bill, which will save taxpayers \$16 billion.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Obviously, this measure amends the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and seeks to repeal those provisions that establish and appropriate funds to the Prevention and Public Health Fund. It also rescinds any unobligated balance appropriated to the fund.

As I listened to my friend from North Carolina, two things jumped out at me immediately. One is her usage and the ruling Republican majority House Members' usage of the term for the Affordable Health Care Act as ObamaCare. I said earlier in the Rules Committee I guess I could call it HastingsCare, because I supported—as did many Members of this Congress who are still here and some who are not, on both sides of the aisle—health care provisions for America long before any of us knew Barack Obama's name.

When it's used the way that it is, it's in some manner attempting to be demeaning of the President. He does not bear the sole responsibility for the Affordable Health Care Act. I would assume some of that responsibility. And what I would say is he and many others in this body did not go far enough in that we did not establish universal health care for all Americans in this country.

The other thing that jumps out on this particular matter, calling it a slush fund and then allowing that it is going to be in the hands of an unelected bureaucrat. It puts us in a strange position in the House of Representatives when my colleagues with the ruling majority of the House of Representatives have sought and been successful in eliminating the opportunities for Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to seek to have appro-

priations earmarked for respective undertakings in their congressional districts. Rather, they would eliminate those earmarks and—guess what?—put it in the hands of unelected bureaucrats.

So I find it inconsistent to make the argument on one hand, and then on the other hand say, Oh, it's okay for the unelected bureaucrats to have some opportunities to spend our money. Quite frankly, I take umbrage with that. I think I can do a better job defining a need for a treatment plant in Belle Glade than can an unelected bureaucrat.

The burden of chronic diseases, such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, and stroke, present a significant public health challenge to all of our communities and our Nation as a whole. In my home State of Florida, over 10 million cases of seven chronic diseases—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders, and pulmonary conditions—were reported early on in this decade at the cost of about \$17.6 billion in treatment, and resulting in \$68.7 billion in lost productivity and economic cost.

Simply put, we have a sick care system, not a health care system. Tens of millions of Americans are suffering from health conditions that could possibly be preventable. This is further exacerbated by the continuing rise of health care costs. Despite the fact that chronic diseases are responsible for seven out of 10 deaths among Americans each year and that they account for 75 percent of our Nation's health care spending, less than 3 percent of our health care spending goes to preventive health care services and health promotion.

As you know, the Affordable Care Act, or the HastingsCare Act, or the Hastings and ObamaCare Act, or the Hastings and Obama and DemocratCare Act created the Prevention and Public Health Fund in order to assist State and community efforts in preventing illness and promoting health. The Prevention and Public Health Fund represents an unprecedented investment of \$15 billion over 10 years to help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. It aims to transform the focus of our system of care from primarily treating illness to maintaining long-term wellness by leveraging the power of preventive medicine.

Through the Community Transformation Grants program, for example, the fund empowers State and local governments and partners to implement community prevention interventions that help reduce chronic disease and health care disparities.

□ 1350

In fact, the fund is already being used in all 50 of our States and the District of Columbia to prevent smoking, increase physical activity, reduce alcohol and drug abuse, increase immunizations, train the Nation's public health

workforce, prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS, and help control the obesity epidemic in our country.

In addition, the Prevention and Public Health Fund provides funding for States to help develop a health insurance exchange by 2014. Footnote there: We should have had a public option, where consumers will have access to a new market of more affordable, quality health coverage, as well as funding for up to 400 school-based centers in order to provide a safety net and improved access to care for children.

Since the enactment of the *HastingsCare*, *ObamaCare*, *DemocraticCare*, *RepublicansDon'tCare* measure last year, the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded approximately \$21.98 million in grants to organizations in Florida alone through the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help improve wellness and prevention efforts, including more than \$9.3 million for community and clinical prevention, more than \$3.1 million for public health infrastructure, and more than \$9.4 million for primary care training.

If we are to reduce health care costs, we must improve the health of all Americans. Investing in proven preventive measures can significantly reduce the risk of developing these diseases, improving people's lives and saving money.

According to a report from Trust For America's Health entitled "Prevention for a Healthier America," investing just \$10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increase physical activity, improve nutrition, and prevent smoking and other tobacco use could save our Nation more than \$16 billion annually within 5 years.

This is equivalent to and potentially greater than the amount as estimated by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office by which H.R. 1217 reduces direct spending over a 10-year period. Furthermore, a public opinion survey by Trust for America and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that 71 percent of Americans favor an increased investment in disease prevention.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is supported also by nearly 600 national organizations, including the American Diabetes Association, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, Families USA, and the AIDS Institute.

H.R. 1217, on the other hand, is nothing more than an attack on affordable health insurance, primary care and safety net care for children. This bill is yet another feeble attempt by the ruling majority Republicans to disrupt, dismantle, and ultimately destroy the *HastingsCare*, *ObamaCare*, *DemocraticCare*, *RepublicansDon'tCare* bill one piece at a time, including those programs that have already been funded and are helping millions of middle class, elderly, and working poor Americans and their families as we speak.

The misinformation that pervades the health care debate in this country never ceases to amaze me at all.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, the ruling Republican majority, would have the American people believe that the Prevention and Public Health Fund is a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to spend money freely without congressional oversight. This is simply not true. A specific funding amount is allocated for prevention efforts through the fund each year during the fiscal year period: \$500 million in 2010; \$750 million in 2011; \$1 billion in fiscal year 2012 and so on up to \$2 billion beginning in 2015.

This gives the Secretary, whomever she or he may be, under Republicans or Democrats, the flexibility and health care providers the funding certainty that they need to implement prevention and public health interventions that help Americans make healthier decisions for themselves and their families. The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the first and only Federal program with dedicated ongoing resources specifically designed to improve the public. It represents our commitment to preventing illness and investing in our Nation's long-term physical and fiscal health.

Let me say this, Madam Speaker: Every day that I awaken, I start my day by trying to figure what can I do to follow the scriptural mandate to help the least of us. I am curious whether my friends in the ruling majority have the same feeling.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I would just like to point out one small thing to my colleague from Florida. Yes, I do begin wondering every day wondering how I can make life better for other people. But I want to say that there is no accountability whatsoever in this provision of the bill, and we want accountability for every penny of money that we are spending on behalf of the American taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you, my learned colleague from North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the 2011 budget agreement that we have passed. We have already heard some of the aspects that this budget agreement addresses, and I am going to address some additional aspects.

I am very pleased to see this House once again value the culture of life. The FY 2011 budget now reinstates the D.C. Hyde amendment to ensure that no congressionally appropriated funds, Federal or local, are used to pay for elective abortions.

According to the Susan B. Anthony List president, Marjorie Dannenfelser, Congress will save the lives of an estimated 1,000 unborn children when it votes to restore this amendment banning the use of taxpayer dollars to pay

for elective abortions in the District of Columbia.

It adjusts the U.N. Family Planning Agency funding from \$55 million to \$40 million. It adjusts international population control/family planning funding from \$648 million to \$575 million.

It adjusts title 10 domestic family planning funding to \$300 million, which is a cut of \$17 million.

This budget also calls for an up-or-down vote in both the House and the Senate, Madam Speaker, on the defunding of Planned Parenthood.

While the fight is certainly not over, we are making great strides in the ongoing effort to not only get our country on a strong fiscal footing but to honor the value of lives born and unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Madam Speaker, you know, I was thinking we are approaching Mother's Day, and I thought of my mother. When it came to budgeting and appropriating money, she did not always have a great deal to work with, but she was a great budget analyst. She was an absolute wizard at crunching numbers, and she was an expert on knowing what worked and what did not.

As a matter of fact, she often told us that an ounce of prevention was worth much more than a pound of cure. And so she knew that when it came to health care, prevention measures are worth much more than their weight in gold. She knew that it would be penny-wise and pound foolish to cut or reduce the meager resources which we expend towards health education, health awareness, health promotion, and health screening.

□ 1400

If we don't think public health activities work, look for some cigarette smoke or cigar smoke in these Chambers. Look at the difference in the cost of treating lung cancer and cirrhosis of the liver versus preventing these diseases from occurring. In Illinois, we have a very proactive public health program, and we don't want to see it reduced, diminished or eliminated.

Yes, we do need to cut spending, and we are cutting spending, but let's not throw out the baby with the bath water. Let's not be penny wise and pound foolish. Let's vote down this rule, and let's vote down H.R. 1217.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to save taxpayers money by cutting wasteful government spending. The program that we are cutting out we cannot be sure does anything for preventative health care. It has designated that, but there is no idea as to where the money is going to be spent. Republicans certainly want to see Americans do a better job of preventing disease and of making their

health care better, but what we fear is that this money may be used for elective abortions, so we are also here today to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves.

This slush fund directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to invest in prevention and primary care by funding programs and initiatives under the Public Health Services Act. Title X of the Public Health Services Act provides funding for the abortion industry, including organizations like Planned Parenthood, which is the largest abortion provider in the country.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues across the aisle and the liberals in Washington have really outdone themselves to ensure their favorite constituencies are provided for in their new health care law. This slush fund is yet another Democrat trick to use taxpayer money to subsidize elective abortion. Despite what they may have you believe, supporters of taxpayer-funded elective abortion cannot honestly claim this money cannot be used for elective abortion under Title X. The liberal Democrat elites relinquished all authority over this slush fund to Secretary Sebelius. For far too long, abortion providers have used Title X money to subsidize their operating costs, thereby subsidizing elective abortion.

We've heard a lot of misinformation being circulated in Washington this week about Planned Parenthood, the largest elective abortion provider in the country. As I pointed out in the Rules Committee last night, one of my colleagues across the aisle said that Republicans were "here to kill women" and compared us to Nazis.

Liberal Democrats maintain that women will lose access to preventative care if the government stops funding for the abortion industry. What they are not telling you is that Planned Parenthood has almost \$1 billion in net assets and reported \$737 million in revenues for its most recent filing year. Any big abortion organization making \$737 million a year should be able to function without taxpayer subsidies, Mr. Speaker. This is not about women's health or access to preventative care. Through Federal and State Medicaid programs, low-income women have access to family planning and preventative health services at hospitals, doctors' offices and community health centers nationwide.

Another claim Planned Parenthood makes is that 97 percent of the 3 million patients they served in fiscal 2008 received preventative care services and that only 3 percent received abortions. These supporters of taxpayer-funded abortion ought to check their math. According to their own facts sheet for March 2011, Planned Parenthood clinics performed 332,278 abortions in fiscal year 2008. If they saw 3 million patients and performed 332,278 abortions, that means at least 11 percent of the services provided were abortions.

If they cannot be trusted regarding this simple math, what else are they

hiding from the American people, Mr. Speaker?

Another astounding statistic I would like to share is that 97.6 percent of pregnant women who received services at Planned Parenthood clinics received abortions. Only 2.4 percent of pregnant women received only prenatal or adoption referral services at Planned Parenthood.

Elective abortion is not health care, Mr. Speaker. This is not about preventative health care or about improving access to primary care. This is about subsidizing the big abortion industry. If this slush fund remains unchecked, the Secretary could fund whatever program she chooses to the tune of up to \$2 billion a year. That kind of money can purchase a lot of elective abortions, which strikes at the consciences of so many tax-paying Americans.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, that's just about the most convoluted, backward argument that I can imagine that I've heard in the 19 years that I've been here in the United States Congress.

There is not one dime in the Prevention and Public Health Fund that can or will be used for abortions. The law in this land, enunciated by a legend and an icon, among the other things that Henry Hyde was, is that Federal funds cannot be used for that purpose, and to carry us into that neverland that the previous speaker just spoke of is astoundingly wrong.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida, and I carefully and enthusiastically associate myself with his response.

We are all colleagues here. We call each other "distinguished colleagues," and I call my good friend from North Carolina "distinguished colleague," with whom I disagree with wide and well-versed opposition.

First of all, as we approach a sacred holiday for many of us in this country, it is one of sacrifice, and as we move into the month of May, we begin to look at how mothers sacrifice to take care of their children and not themselves. Many of us during this time frame will be fasting because we find that this draconian road that our Republican friends are on, with the minutest and the smallest of a majority that voted in this low voting election in 2010, is frightening. We need prayer, and we need to fast because this is truly the road to ruin. I just hope that my colleagues who communicate to the American people will tell

the truth. The budget, the repeal of the Prevention and Public Health, the CR, all of them are the road to ruin.

Whether you agree with our President or not, he has it right: the country we can believe in.

With regard to the CR, when you have The Washington Post or any newspaper saying that more than half of the \$38 billion in cuts that are used in this CR for tomorrow are taken out of education, labor and health programs while those at the top 2 percent or 1 percent of the tax bracket keep going on and on—many of whom said we are willing to sacrifice, that we are willing to offer to be able to help this country—and then when they want to repeal the Prevention and Public Health bill so that the brunt of the people going in for medical care will be in the emergency rooms because they will not have had cholesterol checks or high blood pressure checks or checks for sickle cell or diabetes—they won't have any of that. They'll go into the emergency rooms, laying out in comas—that's what the repeal of this legislation is all about.

The question you ask the Republicans is: What is the dream or the vision of America for them? It is a road to ruin, and the budget is an absurd ridiculousness that wants to cut Medicaid and wants to cut Medicaid.

In going back to the CR, how can you tell the District of Columbia citizens, who pay taxes, that they cannot take their own money and use it for the dictates of their elected body?

□ 1410

How can you tell them that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The gentleman is enormously kind.

I sat and listened to Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON who has lost a vote on this floor that she had, and the citizens of that community, the Mayor and the city council could do nothing but take to the streets to protest, How can you dictate what we do with our own dollars? And so over the next 48 hours, you will see the reason why many Americans are fasting, because they see that this country is going down the road of no return.

And it hurts my heart to think that we're going to rescind \$16 billion that can be used to make a healthier country, to make a country where children can have access to health care, where a little 10-year-old doesn't die because he has an abscess.

I ask my colleagues to vote against all these rules and stop this from going down the road to ruin.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I feel I have to respond somewhat to my colleague from Florida on some of the points that he made.

He said that it is the law of the land that no Federal Government money

can be used to fund abortions. I know my colleague from Florida has been here a lot longer than I have been, and I know that he understands the difference between discretionary spending and mandatory spending, and I know that he knows that the Hyde amendment is only on appropriations bills. And as I explained earlier, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bills are what we call discretionary spending, and that what the Democrats did in the health care bill was to put this \$2 billion in that bill and call it mandatory spending, which is not subject to the annual appropriations process and therefore does not have the restriction of the Hyde amendment to apply to it.

So I would like to ask my colleague from Florida if he can guarantee on his own word to the American people today that nothing from this \$2 billion that is put in for mandatory spending—it's on automatic pilot—would ever be spent for abortions.

Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Of course I will. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. FOXX. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Please, let's have a clear understanding that no dollars from this fund are going to be used for abortions.

Ms. FOXX. Can the gentleman guarantee that?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I don't have any opportunity to guarantee whether or not I'm going to be alive in the next 30 seconds, let alone tell you what may happen. But if you ask my belief, and yours was your belief that it may be used is what you said, my dear friend, all I'm saying is it is not going to be. And the law enunciated through Henry Hyde, and almost verbatim has been included in the Affordable Care Act, precludes the use of money for abortions.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman has just made my point. He cannot guarantee that this money will not be used for abortions, and neither can anyone else. And that is the point that we are making, Mr. Speaker. There is no accountability for this \$2 billion. It is a slush fund for the Secretary of Health and Human Services. And it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, for us to take the hard-earned money of American taxpayers and give it to the Secretary with no accountability and with the distinct possibility that the money could be used to fund abortions.

The liberals ruling Washington the past 4 years have failed to address out-of-control mandatory or discretionary spending. In fact, under their control, discretionary spending has increased 84 percent in just 2 years.

As I mentioned earlier, discretionary spending is the money Congress decides annually to spend on programs with inherent congressional oversight. Mandatory, or autopilot, spending is the

money that is automatically pulled from the Treasury without regular congressional oversight. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, when that decision was made for Congress to abrogate its responsibility, but it's a weasel way out. We should be looking at every dollar every year, because that's our responsibility.

Our debt and the liberals' insatiable appetite for perpetual government spending increases are sending America into a tailspin. In response to the complete lack of leadership and fiscal responsibility, House Republicans have been very aggressive in reducing wasteful government overspending, which is the real source of breathtaking budget deficits and private sector unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a chart that comes, I believe, from the Joint Committee on Economics, and it shows what happens when you increase government spending and when you decrease government spending when you're talking about private sector job creation. Every dollar the government takes from the private sector is one less dollar to be spent for private sector innovation and job growth. The government can create only government jobs.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to the 13.5 million Americans counted in the official unemployment rate, more than 900,000 Americans have stopped looking for a job because they think no jobs exist for them. I want to point out here that, again, when we saw increased government spending, you see a decrease in private sector jobs. When you see decreased government spending, you see an increase in private sector jobs. That's what the Republicans want to do. Americans want jobs. They want to work. We need to cut government spending and allow the private sector to grow.

More than 45 percent of Americans seeking work have been unemployed for more than 27 weeks. Real problems demand real solutions, Mr. Speaker. The track record in the House in 3 short months demonstrates that the new House Republican majority has heard the American people and is acting to provide the relief and solutions they deserve. Less government spending is crucial to encouraging private sector job creation and reducing unemployment. And where better to cut possible government spending than where money could be used for abortions?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from California (Ms. MATSUI), a former member of the Rules Committee that we miss.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to the rule and the bill before us today.

In 2008, I introduced legislation to create a Prevention and Wellness Trust Fund. Much of what I see in the Pre-

vention and Public Health Fund resembles the goals in my legislation. I introduced the legislation and fought for these preventive care provisions during the Energy and Commerce Committee debate on the health care law. I believe investing in preventive health care is vital to helping Americans access the care they need to stay healthy, reduce their health care costs, and ease the burden on our overcrowded emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, we spend more than \$2 trillion annually on health care, more than any other nation on Earth. Yet tens of millions of Americans still suffer from preventable and chronic diseases. In fact, approximately 75 percent of the Nation's health care expenditure is spent on treating chronic conditions. These conditions account for seven of 10 deaths in America.

For too long, the health delivery system in our country has been focused on only treating people after they get sick, not before. Prevention has been a luxury, if not an afterthought. Studies have shown that regular access to primary and preventive care can help keep people healthier, help avoid chronic conditions, catch diseases earlier, and therefore help lower costs.

Sacramento resident Tyler, an active teenager, was a picture of model health. One day he noticed that he was having heart problems during football practice. Taking precautions, his parents took him to a doctor to run tests and found that he had a cardiac abnormality. Today, after taking the necessary preventive steps, Tyler is healthy. Thankfully, he sought preventive measures early, which kept his condition from worsening and likely saved his life.

□ 1420

Not every story ends as happily as Tyler's, though. Millions of Americans every year are diagnosed with chronic diseases because they did not have such access to preventive care. That is the focus of this fund, to improve prevention. This funding will reduce individual and taxpayer cost while saving lives. However, that fact is being overlooked by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This bill before us will have a devastating effect on the future health of America, both in terms of our physical health and for our fiscal responsibility.

In order to truly improve both our health and our health care in this country, we must focus on prevention. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out again that Republicans would like to see more preventive care. However, the example that my colleague from California used says nothing about this bill because there is nothing in here to guarantee that this money will go to preventive care, absolutely nothing. There is no accountability in this legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my classmate and my good friend.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both this rule and H.R. 1217, the legislation to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund of the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act uses Hyde-like language. I was on the Energy and Commerce Committee; I still am. We put it into the Affordable Care Act that there will not be one penny of Federal funds that will go for elective abortions.

The Hyde Act may be on appropriations bills, but the Affordable Care Act has that language in there. I know there is going to be a lot of talk during debate about the legislation and how we need to reduce our deficits, and tough funding cuts will need to be made by Congress in order to bring down our national debt, H.R. 1217 is not meaningful legislation to reduce our debt, nor is it a plan to create jobs or spur the growth in our economy. This legislation is yet another attempt by the majority to dismantle and repeal the Affordable Care Act because they do not have the support to do the straight repeal of health reform.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I know that this bill would be the first of several pieces that will mark a reversal of position by the majority on what has been previously bipartisan-supported health care concepts.

I have worked across the aisle for years with my colleagues on many prevention provisions, including Prevention and Public Health Fund that would fund the integration of primary care services into publicly funded mental and behavioral health settings. To date, Texas alone has received \$495,000 for this program. I introduced this legislation for several years with bipartisan support from Representative TIM MURPHY. At the time it was called the Community Mental Health Services Improvement Act. And yet here we are today rolling back funding on these important bipartisan provisions to fulfill campaign promises.

We know that prevention programs will ultimately save our health care system in the future. What we did with the Prevention and Public Health Fund in the Affordable Care Act was to make a down payment on reducing preventable health conditions such as diabetes, obesity, strokes, and heart disease. The fund represents an unprecedented investment—\$15 billion over 10 years—that will help prevent disease, detect it early, and manage conditions before they become severe. By concentrating on the causes of chronic disease, the Affordable Care Act helps move the Nation from a focus on sickness and disease to one based on wellness and prevention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Don't let the majority fool you today by saying this legislation is a cost-saving measure. Several things that they won't be highlighting in relation to this legislation are the cost of treating these chronic diseases in Texas alone totaled over \$17.2 billion, and chronic diseases resulted in \$75.3 billion in lost productivity and economic costs to Texas.

If we want to have a debate on saving money and creating jobs, I would like the majority to show us their job-creating and deficit-reduction plan. They have been in power for 100 days, and we have spent most of the time by creating more debt by repealing provisions in health reform that would actually save my State billions of dollars. Today is yet another example of the majority's misguided priorities.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, please inform both sides the remaining amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule, it will bring up H.R. 1354, the American Jobs Matter Act of 2011.

To address that, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, in Washington over the last few months, we have seen a lot of what we are seeing today, a lot of talk from my Republican colleagues about ideological budget cuts and about divisive social issues. And today, once more, we are here debating repeal of part or all of the health care bill.

But back home, we are hearing about one thing and largely one thing only, and that is job creation. Now, I appreciate my friend from North Carolina dressing up her remarks with some talk about jobs, but this debate today isn't about creating jobs. It is about a political agenda to take on the Democratically passed health care bill.

But we need to start plugging into where Main Street is and having a real conversation about job creation in this country, and so I am here today to talk about one idea in particular that can reach out to the 5,000 manufacturers in my State, and the tens of thousands more of manufacturing employees who are looking for good middle class work and help from Congress that hasn't been forthcoming in the last 3 months.

Since 2001, this country has shut down over 42,000 manufacturing plants. We have lost about 5 million manufacturing jobs; but during that same period of time, we have increased spending on defense manufacturing in this

country by 81 percent. The problem is that 81 percent increase hasn't gone to factories in Connecticut or North Carolina or Florida or anywhere else. It has gone overseas because after building loophole after loophole into our domestic sourcing laws, like the Buy America Act, we are hemorrhaging manufacturing jobs in part because we are spending more and more taxpayer dollars overseas.

So we need to defeat this previous question so we can bring a commonsense jobs bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, the American Jobs Matter Act.

Now, let me explain what this bill does. It is pretty simple. It says that anytime a Federal agency is awarding a contract, in particular the Department of Defense, that they can give a leg up, that they can give preference to the bidder who promises and guarantees to create more U.S. jobs. Most of my constituents think that already happens. They already think we have some system in place to make sure that our taxpayer dollars are being used to give preference to American companies rather than foreign companies. It is not happening. The law doesn't allow it.

So let's pass today the American Jobs Matter Act. It will make sure that our money gets spent on our jobs here at home.

A quick story from Connecticut: I have a company that makes copper nickel tubing in Waterbury, Connecticut. They are the only American company that supplies that product to the Virginia submarine class. There is one company in Europe that makes it. But because we can't give them preference by law today, they have lost one of their two most important contracts to that European supplier, and along with it dozens of American jobs. That is our money going overseas, and we need to do something about it rather than debating the health care bill all over again.

When people really care about building back those manufacturing jobs, we should in fact be spending every day in this Congress talking about bills like the American Jobs Matter Act. Instead, we are talking about defunding Sesame Street, about destroying Planned Parenthood, and once again today talking about repealing the health care bill; and, in fact, a part of the health care bill that is going to create jobs through preventive health care services.

It is no wonder that Americans think so little of this Republican Congress, because they are not focused on what people out there are focused on, J-O-B-S, jobs. The American Jobs Matter Act, if we bring it to the floor today, is a commonsense measure to simply target taxpayer money to the creation of American jobs. We don't have to spend any more money to create American jobs. We just have to spend the money we are already spending better. We spend half the military dollars in the

world coming out of the U.S. budget, and this engine of expenditure should be used not only to make this country stronger militarily, but also to make it stronger economically.

□ 1430

The American Jobs Matter Act is one way to get there. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can get to the real business of this country—creating good-paying middle class jobs.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that the gentleman from Connecticut spoke to in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, no prevention and public health funds are or can be used to pay for abortions, and this bill has absolutely nothing to do with that. What it will stop, this bill as offered by the ruling Republican House, is immunization for kids and seniors, programs to stop childhood obesity and to prevent heart disease and diabetes. That's what they are stopping. Please don't be misled. No dollars from this fund will be used for abortion.

If we as legislators are to be about the business of helping Americans live healthy, productive lives, we must change our fundamental approach to health care by investing in illness prevention, not just treatment.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is the key to a coordinated, comprehensive, sustainable and accountable approach to improving our Nation's health outcomes. I would also add that at a time when Americans are looking to Congress for leadership, the Republican ruling majority in the House are continuing their assault on comprehensive health care reform that expands coverage to 32 million people instead of focusing on job creation.

It's time to stop playing games with the health of the American people and get down to business. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so that we can debate and pass a jobs bill without any further delay. I also urge a "no" vote on the rule.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just like to say in response to my colleague from Florida that I think this rule and the underlying bill have a lot more to do with elective abortions than they do with government contracting.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed at great length today why Secretary

Sebelius does not need a slush fund set on autopilot. The American people expect their elected representatives to be wise guardians of their hard-earned dollars. They vehemently objected to the ruling Democrat agenda of Federal overreach into their daily lives and sent a clear message to Washington last November: Government must be responsible and accountable.

All across America, American families are tightening their belts, cutting their budgets and living within their means. It's time Washington did the same.

For these reasons and many more, I urge my colleagues, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill so we can restore congressional spending oversight and save the taxpayers \$16 billion over the next 10 years.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 219 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1354) to amend titles 10 and 41, United States Code, to allow contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal contract, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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, this 15-

minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 219, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 218; and adoption of House Resolution 218, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 182, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—238

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

Ackerman Green, Al
Altmire Green, Gene
Andrews Grijalva
Baca Gutierrez
Baldwin Hanabusa
Barrow Hastings (FL)
Bass (CA) Heinrich
Becerra Higgins
Berkley Himes
Bishop (GA) Hinchey
Bishop (NY) Hinojosa
Blumenauer Hirono
Boswell Holden
Brady (PA) Holt
Braley (IA) Honda
Brown (FL) Hoyer
Butterfield Insole
Capps Israel
Capuano Jackson (IL)
Cardoza Jackson Lee
Carnahan (TX)
Carney Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL) Kaptur
Chandler Keating
Chu Kildee
Ciilline Kind
Clarke (MI) Kissell
Clarke (NY) Kucinich
Cleaver Langevin
Clyburn Larsen (WA)
Cohen Larson (CT)
Connolly (VA) Lee (CA)
Conyers Levin
Cooper Lewis (GA)
Costello Lipinski
Courtney Loebsack
Critz Lofgren, Zoe
Crowley Lowey
Cuellar Lujan
Cummings Lynch
Davis (CA) Maloney
Davis (IL) Markey
DeFazio Matheson
DeGette Matsui
DeLauro McCarthy (NY)
Deutch McColium
Dicks McDermott
Dingell McGovern
Donnelly (IN) McIntyre
Doyle McNeerney
Edwards Michaud
Ellison Miller (NC)
Eshoo Moore
Farr Moran
Fattah Murphy (CT)
Finer Nadler
Frank (MA) Napolitano
Fudge Neal
Garamendi Oliver
Gonzalez Owens

NOT VOTING—12

Berman Engel
Clay Giffords
Culberson Meeks
Doggett Reichert

□ 1459

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. COURTNEY and INSLEE, and Ms. EDWARDS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, not voting 15, as follows:

NAYS—182

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Bilirakis
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Schakowsky
Walz (MN)
Young (AK)
Young (IN)
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Billray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cansco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Clayton
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings

[Roll No. 258]

YEAS—237

Davis (CA)	Kissell	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Richardson
DeFazio	Langevin	Richmond
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ross (AR)
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Rothman (NJ)
Deutch	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Levin	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Doggett	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Donnelly (IN)	Loeback	Sánchez, Linda
Doyle	Lofgren, Zoe	T.
Edwards	Lowey	Sanchez, Loretta
Ellison	Luján	Sarbanes
Eshoo	Lynch	Schiff
Farr	Maloney	Schrader
Fattah	Markey	Schwartz
Filner	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Scott, David
Fudge	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Garamendi	McCollum	Sewell
Gonzalez	McDermott	Sherman
Green, Al	McGovern	Sires
Green, Gene	McNerney	Slaughter
Grijalva	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Miller (NC)	Speier
Hanabusa	Miller, George	Stark
Hastings (FL)	Moore	Sutton
Heinrich	Moran	Thompson (CA)
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Himes	Nadler	Tierney
Hinchev	Napolitano	Tonko
Hirono	Neal	Towns
Holden	Olver	Tsongas
Holt	Owens	Van Hollen
Honda	Pallone	Visclosky
Hoyer	Pascrell	Walz (MN)
Inslee	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman
Israel	Payne	Schultz
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Waters
Jackson Lee	Perlmutter	Watt
(TX)	Peters	Waxman
Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Weiner
Johnson, E. B.	Polis	Welch
Kaptur	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Quigley	Woolsey
Kildee	Rahall	Wu
Kind	Rangel	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Berman	Giffords	Palazzo
Cantor	Hinojosa	Reichert
Clay	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Engel	Meeks	Velázquez
Fleming	Olson	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1505

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 258, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1473, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 35, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 36, CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1473

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—242

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

Lankford	Palazzo	Scott, Austin
Latham	Paul	Sensenbrenner
LaTourette	Paulsen	Sessions
Latta	Pearce	Shimkus
Lewis (CA)	Pence	Shuler
LoBiondo	Petri	Shuster
Long	Pitts	Simpson
Lucas	Platts	Smith (NE)
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Lummis	Pompeo	Smith (TX)
Lungren, Daniel	Posey	Southerland
E.	Price (GA)	Stearns
Mack	Quayle	Stivers
Manzullo	Reed	Stutzman
Marchant	Rehberg	Sullivan
Marino	Renacci	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McCaul	Rigell	Thornberry
McClintock	Rivera	Tiberi
McCotter	Roby	Tipton
McHenry	Roe (TN)	Troiano
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Upton
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Walden
Meehan	Rokita	Walsh (IL)
Mica	Rooney	Webster
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	West
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Westmoreland
Miller, Gary	Ross (FL)	Whitfield
Mulvaney	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Murphy (PA)	Ryunan	Wittman
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
Neugebauer	Scalise	Womack
Noem	Schilling	Woodall
Noel	Schmidt	Yoder
Nunes	Schock	Young (FL)
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Olson	Scott (SC)	

NAYS—183

Ackerman	Fudge	Moran
Altmire	Garamendi	Murphy (CT)
Andrews	Gonzalez	Nadler
Baca	Green, Al	Napolitano
Baldwin	Green, Gene	Neal
Barrow	Grijalva	Olver
Bass (CA)	Gutierrez	Owens
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pallone
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Payne
Blumenauer	Himes	Pelosi
Boswell	Hinchev	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters
Braley (IA)	Hirono	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Holden	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Holt	Polis
Capps	Honda	Price (NC)
Capuano	Hoyer	Quigley
Cardoza	Inslee	Rahall
Carnahan	Israel	Rangel
Carney	Jackson (IL)	Reyes
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Richardson
Castor (FL)	(TX)	Richmond
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Ross (AR)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (MI)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kildee	Rush
Cleaver	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kissell	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kucinich	T.
Connolly (VA)	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Costello	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Courtney	Levin	Schrader
Critz	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz
Crowley	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Loeback	Scott, David
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Issa	Sewell
Davis (IL)	Luján	Sherman
DeFazio	Lynch	Sires
DeGette	Maloney	Slaughter
DeLauro	Markey	Smith (WA)
Deutch	Matheson	Speier
Dicks	Matsui	Stark
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McGovern	Tierney
Ellison	McIntyre	Tonko
Eshoo	McNerney	Towns
Farr	Michaud	Tsongas
Fattah	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Filner	Miller, George	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Moore	Visclosky

Walz (MN)	Watt	Wilson (FL)
Wasserman	Waxman	Woolsey
Schultz	Weiner	Wu
Waters	Welch	Yarmuth

Pitts	Ross (FL)
Platts	Royce
Poe (TX)	Runyan
Pompeo	Ruppersberger
Posey	Ryan (WI)
Price (GA)	Scalise
Quayle	Schilling
Reed	Schmidt
Rehberg	Schock
Renacci	Schweikert
Ribble	Scott (SC)
Rigell	Scott, Austin
Rivera	Sensenbrenner
Roby	Sessions
Roe (TN)	Shimkus
Rogers (AL)	Shuler
Rogers (KY)	Shuster
Rogers (MI)	Simpson
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)
Rokita	Smith (NJ)
Rooney	Smith (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Southerland
Roskam	Stearns

Stivers
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1217 and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 219 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1217.

□ 1520

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund, with Mr. CONAWAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Section 4002 of PPACA establishes a Prevention and Public Health Fund, which my bill, H.R. 1217, would repeal. The section authorizes the appropriation of and appropriates to the fund from the Treasury the following amounts: \$500 million for FY 2010; \$750 million for FY 2011; \$1 billion for FY 2012; \$1.25 billion for FY 2013; \$1.5 billion for FY 2014; and for FY 2015 and every fiscal year thereafter, \$2 billion.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services has the full authority to use this account to fund any programs or activities that she chooses under the Public Health Service Act without having congressional input, approval or oversight. HHS has already made disbursements from the fund, spending

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1512

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 179, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—241

Adams	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Aderholt	Duffy	Jones
Akin	Duncan (SC)	Jordan
Alexander	Duncan (TN)	Kelly
Amash	Ellmers	King (IA)
Austria	Emerson	King (NY)
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kingston
Bachus	Fincher	Kinzinger (IL)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Bartlett	Flake	Labrador
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Bass (NH)	Fleming	Lance
Benishek	Flores	Landry
Berg	Forbes	Lankford
Biggert	Fortenberry	Latham
Bilbray	Fox	LaTourette
Billirakis	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Black	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Gardner	Long
Bonner	Garrett	Lucas
Bono Mack	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Boren	Gibbs	Lummis
Boustany	Gibson	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	E.
Brooks	Gohmert	Mack
Brown (GA)	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Buchanan	Gosar	Marchant
Bucshon	Gowdy	Marino
Buerkle	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Burton (IN)	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Calvert	Griffin (AR)	McCotter
Camp	Griffith (VA)	McHenry
Campbell	Grimm	McKeon
Canseco	Guinta	McKinley
Cantor	Guthrie	McMorris
Capito	Hall	Rodgers
Carter	Hanna	Meehan
Cassidy	Harper	Mica
Chabot	Harris	Miller (FL)
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Coffman (CO)	Hayworth	Mulvaney
Cole	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Conaway	Heller	Myrick
Costa	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cravaack	Herger	Noem
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Nugent
Crenshaw	Huelskamp	Nunes
Culberson	Huizenga (MI)	Nunnelee
Davis (KY)	Hultgren	Olson
Denham	Hunter	Palazzo
Dent	Hurt	Paul
DesJarlais	Issa	Paulsen
Diaz-Balart	Jenkins	Pearce
Dold	Johnson (IL)	Pence
Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Petri

Ackerman	Green, Al
Altmire	Green, Gene
Andrews	Grijalva
Baca	Gutierrez
Baldwin	Hanabusa
Barrow	Hastings (FL)
Bass (CA)	Heinrich
Becerra	Higgins
Berkley	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Hinchey
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Holden
Boswell	Holt
Brady (PA)	Honda
Bralley (IA)	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Inslee
Butterfield	Israel
Capps	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Jackson Lee
Cardoza	(TX)
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Keating
Chandler	Kildee
Chu	Kind
Cicilline	Kissell
Clarke (MI)	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Langevin
Clay	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)
Cohen	Levin
Connolly (VA)	Lewis (GA)
Conyers	Lipinski
Cooper	Lipowsack
Costello	Lofgren, Zoe
Courtney	Lowe
Critz	Lujan
Crowley	Lynch
Cuellar	Maloney
Cummings	Markey
Davis (CA)	Matheson
Davis (IL)	Matsui
DeFazio	McCarthy (NY)
DeGette	McCollum
DeLauro	McDermott
Deutch	McGovern
Dicks	McIntyre
Dingell	McNerney
Doggett	Michaud
Doyle	Miller (NC)
Edwards	Miller, George
Ellison	Moore
Eshoo	Moran
Farr	Murphy (CT)
Filner	Nadler
Frank (MA)	Napolitano
Fudge	Neal
Garamendi	Oliver
Gonzalez	Owens

NOT VOTING—12

Berman	Hirono	Sullivan
Engel	Meeks	Tierney
Fattah	Reichert	Waters
Giffords	Stutzman	Young (AK)

□ 1519

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

\$500 million last year, and she has \$750 million available for her to spend this year to fund prevention activities, the Nation's public health infrastructure, workforce expansion, increasing immunizations, and preventing a variety of diseases.

The goals of some of these disbursements are laudable, but we must remember that this funding is over and above the amount that Congress has already authorized and appropriated for these activities. There have also been questionable projects that have been financed with these funds, including "placing signs directing people to bike paths."

When Secretary Sebelius testified before my subcommittee, I asked her whether she needed further congressional approval to spend the money from the section 4002 fund, and she answered no.

I then asked her if she could fund activities above and beyond the level Congress appropriated, and she stated yes.

This should concern every Member that we have created a slush fund from which the Secretary can spend without any congressional oversight or approval. No one here can tell us how this funding will be used next year or 5 or 10 or 20 or 50 years from now. We can't predict how the money will be spent—and worse, we can't even influence it.

I would suggest to my colleagues that, if you wanted more funding to go towards smoking cessation or to any other program, the health care law should have contained an explicit authorization, because you are not guaranteed that a dime of the money in this fund will go to your particular activity.

By eliminating this fund, we are not cutting any specific program or activity. I am not against prevention and wellness. This is not what this is about. This is about reclaiming our oversight role of how Federal tax dollars should be used.

I urge support for my bill, H.R. 1217. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the Republicans' newest line of attack to disrupt, dismantle, and to ultimately destroy the Affordable Care Act. Today, they are doing so by sacrificing longstanding bipartisan policies to push a narrow partisan ideology.

For many years, Republicans have joined with Democrats in supporting programs to prevent disease, to promote health and, in turn, to cut health care costs. But today, the House will vote to end funding for the first and only Federal program with dedicated, ongoing resources designed to make us a healthier Nation.

Every State in the Union is already benefiting from the resources made

available from the fund to fight chronic and costly conditions, such as obesity, heart disease and diabetes. Repealing the prevention fund is a blow against seniors. In States like California, Michigan, Iowa, Maine, North Carolina, and Massachusetts, they are using these funds to train personal home care aides who assist the elderly with Alzheimer's disease and other disabling conditions.

Terminating the prevention fund is not only extremely shortsighted; it will also prove to be fiscally irresponsible. The return on this kind of upfront investment—targeted resources to help keep people healthy for as long as possible—will over time save precious health care dollars.

We need to preserve the prevention fund because it can serve as a cornerstone for a health care system that finally recognizes that preventing illnesses is as important as treating them. Until now, prevention has too often been just a mere afterthought.

American families support prevention. They want programs to educate seniors to use preventive health services, such as mammograms and colonoscopies, which can help extend their lives; and they want programs that focus on preventing childhood obesity and diabetes, which will help their children to grow up healthy and strong. The American people want us to start working together to solve the real problems facing our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this partisan and divisive legislation.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished vice chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of H.R. 1217. The bill, as we have already heard, repeals the public health slush fund that was included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which was passed just a little over a year ago.

This fund, called the Prevention and Public Health Fund, is almost \$18 billion, which accounts for the next 8 fiscal years, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services gets to spend this money on any program that he or she deems worthy. What the money will be used for and how it will be used are, essentially, unknowns. Neither this Congress nor subsequent Congresses have any earthly idea.

It is yet, once again, an abdication of our authority here in the United States Congress. It is an abdication of power in deference to the executive branch. If that's what people think we were sent here to do, to simply carve off greater and greater pieces of our authority and hand it over to the White House, then I hope I'm wrong in that; but over and over again, with the health care bill, with the financial reg bill, it seems like that is the mantra here. It does put way too much discretion in the hands of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

□ 1530

We've got a predicted shortfall in the Nation's health care provider workforce. Some of this money is going to go for scholarships, but it sets up a big problem. Under the Public Health Fund, some of those same students could receive a scholarship for 1 year, only to find that the Secretary has bigger and better things to spend it on next year. Maybe there's a new bike path that needs a sign, and that student would find their education unfunded because all of the discretion rests with the Secretary.

Now, just a moment ago, the ranking member of the full committee stood up and said that it seems like all the Republicans want to do is defund and remove the Affordable Care Act. Well, I appreciate his noticing, because, Mr. Chairman, that is what the election of November 2, 2010, was all about. We were elected to come here and do that work for the American people.

And the duplication contained within the slush fund, the ranking member talked about smoking cessation. That's a good idea. I believe in that. I lost two parents due to tobacco-related illness. But wait a minute. What about the duplication? When the ranking member was chairman last year, last Congress, he created the Center for Tobacco Products at the Food and Drug Administration. We funded that lavishly with a brand-new tax, and now we're going to come back and fund it yet again with this public health slush fund?

The ranking member asked about what programs we wanted to cut. Really, it's a question of do we want to be accountable to the American people who elected us here to do this job. They sent us here to ensure their money was spent responsibly and that every penny would be accounted for and justified before being spent. With the current state of the economy, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure how the American people feel about the Secretary choosing to spend money on signs to direct people to bike paths. I know how they would feel about it in my district.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. BURGESS. In this law that was signed in the East Room of the White House just a little over a year ago, section 4002 takes from Congress the oversight of spending, and it becomes a blank check for the Secretary to do with as she wishes without any other input from Congress. By doing that, it takes that authority away from the American people, because we are the closest contact the American people have with their Federal Government. And by taking us out of the equation, guess what, Madam Secretary? You've got a blank check. It's all yours.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank the ranking member of my subcommittee for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1217, a bill that would defund a key strategic investment in our Nation's long-term fiscal and physical health, the Prevention and Public Health Fund. Simply put, this fund is a critical effort to make our Nation healthier and, in turn, to bring down health care costs.

This misguided bill would return our Nation to a system of "sick care," a system that hasn't worked, rather than one focused on health and wellness. That's something we can't afford to do. We all know that health care costs are rising at an unsustainable rate. In fact, the Republican majority has cited these costs as a reason to propose ending Medicare as we know it, by turning it into a voucher program and by whacking away at poor people's health care by block-granting Medicaid.

But one of the key drivers in entitlement spending growth is chronic disease, the exact problem addressed by this prevention fund. Yet this bill shortsightedly cuts back our efforts to reduce chronic illness and promote wellness programs.

In California, we are putting these funds to work to slow the alarming rise in obesity rates, to train our next generation of public health professionals, to curb our tobacco use and improve our capacity to respond to disease outbreaks.

At a time when counties have laid off thousands and struggled to maintain essential public health services, the need for this fund becomes even more critical. That's why numerous local governments and national organizations, including the National Association of Counties and the American Public Health Association oppose this shortsighted bill.

Furthermore, the fund is a sound investment. Trust for America's Health Research has shown that investments in proven, community-based programs to increase physical activity, to improve nutrition, and to prevent tobacco use could save the country more than \$16 billion annually within 5 years. This is a return of over \$5 for every dollar invested.

Not only do these programs add to our constituents' quality of life, but it can also increase their economic output by keeping them healthy and in the workforce.

These are some of the reasons I stand with these folks and urge a "no" vote.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), who is on the Health Subcommittee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of H.R. 1217. I think this is an important bill for us to bring forward. And I want to thank the chairman for bringing it forward and for helping to lead this Congress in the repeal of ObamaCare. It is a message that the American people sent loud and clear last November. They do not want to see government coming in and con-

trolling their health care choices. That is something that should be made by individuals, their family members, and their physicians and not by the Federal Government.

I have found it so interesting, as we have been through the hearings on this and through the markups, that we continue to hear, well, this \$17¼ billion, well, it's just not that much money. Isn't that amazing that in the middle of a CR crisis and a debt crisis that we are hearing such rhetoric?

I think it is amazing that we are being told, and through what we know—yes, and some of us did read the bill and so we do know what was in that bill—that the Secretary can spend this however she wants to. She does not have to come back to Congress another time to get permission for spending this slush fund. And isn't it amazing that some of our colleagues think that a fund will make people healthier? Money doesn't make people healthier. We all know that.

And isn't it amazing that in the middle of all of this, we are out of money at the Federal level? We all know that the cost of health care is rising, and we know that one of the reasons that the cost of health care has risen so much in the last few years is government intervention. Those are some of the known components that we have.

I think it's important to realize too, Mr. Chairman, eliminating the slush fund does not cut any specific program. And proponents of this fund want to claim that we're cutting, we're cutting, we're cutting. What we're doing is saying, no, you can't allow the Secretary to have control and just give it out. This needs to go through the normal, regular funding processes. That is very important. And it's time that we realize we have to do that.

Yes, let's move forward. Yes, let's repeal ObamaCare. Yes, let's get it off the books. Let's do everything we can to get the Federal Government out of your pocket, out of the middle of your health care decisions. Let's make certain that those choices go to individuals and to their physicians and that they are not going to be dictated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who has a slush fund of \$17.75 billion to spend as she or he sees fit over the next 10 years.

We need to be changing the way health care is going to work, and we need to do it with putting individuals in charge.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Here they go again. The Republicans failed in their efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and now they are reversing course and trying to cripple implementation by attacking individual provisions of the law.

The United States has a health care system designed to treat the sick, not to prevent disease from occurring in the first place. The Prevention and

Public Health Fund is a crucial component of the health reform law's effort to remedy that weakness and transform today's sick care system into a prevention-focused health system.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund will avert future illness, save lives and restrain the rate of growth of health care costs. It's a dedicated investment in community prevention and is a much-needed down payment on the health and economic well-being of all Americans.

Federal investments from the Prevention and Public Health Fund have already begun to address improvements in the Nation's health status by supporting essential and proven prevention activities, such as immunization—immunization and tobacco cessation.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund holds great promise to improve the capacities of State and local health departments to protect communities from health threats through the use of technology. It will increase numbers of highly skilled scientists and other public health professionals.

I want to be very clear, and you've heard it yourselves. This is simply another attempt by Republicans to defund the Affordable Care Act and stop its implementation. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

□ 1540

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady kept saying it will, it will, it will. The simple fact is we don't know where the money is going to go.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, at least some Members of this body can remember ads back years ago touting the miraculous benefits of Sal Hepatica and Carter's Little Liver Pills. Probably all of the Members can remember, because it was just a year ago, Andy Griffith touting the new health care reform bill. And those of us who are on Medicare remember getting those glossy mail outs, very expensive, slick-looking ads touting the benefits that ObamaCare has brought to Medicare, even though the new bill, the new entitlement creation took something like \$550 billion out of Medicare, and yet they had the audacity to send these ads out, these fliers saying that it improved Medicare. ObamaCare improves Medicare; go figure. Well, that is a concern here. That is why I am standing in strong support of Chairman PITTS' bill, H.R. 1217.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, for prevention, wellness, and public health activities authorized in the Public Health Service Act and administered by Secretary Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human

Services. But she can use those funds in any way she deems appropriate as long as she says it is for public health.

Can it pay for political TV advertising for President Obama ahead of the 2012 elections? Absolutely she could. Nothing could stop her; the Congress couldn't as long as she deems it is necessary for public health. Pay for thousands of signs in communities all across the country declaring that PPACA is a success, nothing could stop this Secretary, or any Secretary from doing so, as long as they call it for public health. No, not even Congress.

And as the chairman said, Mr. Chairman, the amount of \$17 billion, almost \$18 billion, is just a down payment, if you will, because in perpetuity \$2 billion a year continues to be appropriated. And you do that with a bill that quite honestly this Member thinks will be declared within a year and a half, hopefully sooner, unconstitutional. So we are spending money that is absolutely unnecessary at a time when we are sitting here with \$14 trillion worth of debt and listening to the Secretary of the Treasury say within 6 weeks we are going to have to raise the debt ceiling so we can borrow more money. And here we are spending \$17 billion, with a "B," and that is not just chump change by any stretch of the imagination.

Last year in 2010, the CDC actually spent some of \$500 million to promote an increase in the excise tax on tobacco to the States; basically saying to the States, you need to make sure you raise taxes on tobacco.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding me this additional time.

Let me just conclude that clearly this is a necessary bill to let Congress once again have the opportunity to control spending. That is our responsibility. That is our constitutional right. That's what the American people want. I think the chairman is absolutely right with this bill, and I fully support it. I urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking Democrat on the Labor, Health Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. It will cost money and endanger the health of the American people.

We included the Prevention and Public Health Fund in the Affordable Care Act because we know preventive health care reduces health care costs. It dramatically increases Americans' quality of life. Preventable causes of death such as tobacco smoking, poor diet, physical inactivity, and the misuse of alcohol have been estimated to be responsible for 900,000 deaths annually, nearly 40 percent of total yearly mor-

tality in the United States. Further, 7 in 10 deaths in America are from chronic diseases. And by 2020, the U.S. may spend \$685 billion a year on these chronic diseases. This fund works to bring down these numbers and to help Americans live longer, healthier lives.

Preventive care is fiscally responsible. One example that would be impacted by this misguided legislation is vaccines. Estimates indicate that we save up to \$400 for every illness averted by vaccination. And that does not even take into account the costs of further transmission in the case of a serious public health epidemic.

By supporting our public health workforce and building health infrastructure, by promoting exercise, reducing tobacco use, the Prevention and Public Health Fund will go a long way towards reducing the surging costs of health care for Americans families and for our Nation. It is shortsighted folly to repeal this fund now, especially when you consider all the oil subsidies and breaks for corporate lobbyists that the majority has included in their budget. We should not be putting political ideology before public health. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1217. As members of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee, my colleagues and I have participated in a number of hearings that have explored the fiscal impact of the new health care law.

These hearings have revealed the existence of several programs and mandatory spending provisions contained in the law. Health and Human Services Secretary Sebelius said during testimony that she had the sole discretion over billions of dollars in direct, unlimited mandatory spending under the law. This means without any congressional hearings, without any language in appropriations bills, and without any oversight, the executive branch has been granted unprecedented spending authority.

Today's legislation, H.R. 1217, will repeal one of those little-known programs called the Prevention and Public Health Fund and subject it to the annual appropriations process. The aim may be worthy, Mr. Chairman, but this should be subjected to the annual appropriations process. This action, according to the Congressional Budget Office, will save American taxpayers \$16 billion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, the Federal Government is \$14 trillion in debt. Our deficit for this year will be at least \$1.5 trillion. We must get Federal spending under control. We can start by repealing programs that run afoul of congressional oversight. I urge Members to support H.R. 1217.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I am frankly stunned to have to come to the House floor today to talk about a bill that defunds the largest investment we have ever made in our population's health: the prevention and public health trust fund. The trust fund specifically says what it is going to be used for: reducing tobacco use, expanding opportunities for recreation and exercise, bringing healthier foods like fruit and vegetables to communities in need; and helping kids to eat healthier meals at school.

All of us who have been involved in health issues for many years know that the biggest public health epidemic that we have right now is obesity. If we don't do anything to reverse these trends, then for our children and our children's children, we are not going to have good outcomes. Seventy-five percent of all health care costs are spent on the treatment of chronic diseases, many of them preventable. Our Nation's youth are confronting unprecedented levels of obesity, placing them at ever-increasing risk for those very same chronic health conditions. I think it is pathetic that we have children in this country who only have access to playgrounds at McDonald's with their 8,000 playgrounds in this country. And so what this trust fund does is it supports research that examines evidence-based practices relating to prevention, including the translation of interventions from academic settings to real-world settings.

□ 1550

This is not, as the opponents of this trust fund say, a slush fund or something that is simply willy-nilly spending. Instead what it is, it's evidence-based and it's looking at ways that we can prevent childhood obesity and nutrition, reduce tobacco use, and expand opportunities for recreation and exercise.

This is something all of us can get behind. This is something we should all support. I am sorry that it has become caught up in this partisan web, because frankly we should all support this for our kids.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I have the copy of the law the gentlewoman referred to. She says the trust fund refers to spending for fresh food and vegetables and other things. There's none of that in the language. I would welcome her to point it out.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1217 is an attack on public health and disease prevention in this country. The prevention fund is our first national proactive, strategic commitment to changing the focus of our health care system from one of treatment to one of keeping Americans healthy.

This change in focus is essential, because keeping people healthy improves

the quality of their lives and that of their family, and it is our best means of controlling preventable chronic diseases, which account for seven out of 10 deaths and 75 percent of our Nation's annual health care costs, totaling \$1.7 trillion.

If H.R. 1217 passes, we lose a critical opportunity to control health care costs and we lose the opportunity to reduce unnecessary suffering and death from preventable chronic diseases. Adding to the assault of H.R. 1217 on public health and prevention is the FY 2011 continuing resolution which cuts CDC's budget by over \$700 million.

The result of these proposals is that millions of Americans will needlessly continue to suffer from preventable chronic diseases, costly treatments and costly hospitalizations. Prevention saves lives and prevention saves money. Defeat H.R. 1217 and continue to build a healthier America.

Mr. PITTS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I cannot believe that we are here debating a bill that would repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund. At a time when we should be championing legislation to strengthen the health and well-being of Americans and this Nation, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing the exact opposite with H.R. 1217.

Currently, we have tens of millions of hardworking Americans who suffer and some die from preventable diseases, and without prevention and public health efforts, the very services this fund was created to support, tens of millions more will be affected in the future.

With so much at stake—and we are talking about human lives—we should not be here fighting about the merit and value of keeping the Prevention and Public Health Fund in place. We would do better for our country in terms of health and savings if we were instead discussing increasing it.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not moved by the disastrous human impact, then perhaps they will be moved by the equally disastrous economic impact that it will have, because not having prevention and effective public health measures in place costs money, and a lot of it.

On the other hand, the Journal of Health Affairs reported that increasing the use of proven preventive services from their current levels to 90 percent would result in \$3.7 billion in savings in just 1 year. And we know from a Joint Center study that reducing health disparities, which this fund would help to do, could save as much as \$1.24 trillion in direct and indirect medical costs in just a 3-year period.

This bill to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund is not just misguided legislation, it is harmful and unjust. It is contrary to our values and

a disrespect of the value of human life. It will not save money. In fact, it will cost this Nation more, both in human health and wellness as well as in actual health care spending.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote to protect all Americans and the moral standing of this country by voting "no" on H.R. 1217.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania controls 15¼ minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey controls 17½ minutes.

Mr. PITTS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, it's been 100 days of the Republicans' no jobs agenda and they've chosen to devote time and energy to bills and resolutions that would defund the Affordable Care Act, eliminate mandatory support for preventive care, and abolish any and all Federal support for Planned Parenthood. House Republicans know that these measures won't be approved by the Senate and would never be signed by the President. It's just another political gesture at a time when we should be working to create jobs and promote economic recovery.

The bill on the floor this week, H.R. 1217, would abolish the affordable care law's Prevention and Public Health Fund. This is a fund that prevents disease, that detects it early, and that helps manage conditions before they become severe. All empirical data, all experience and plain old common sense informs us that prevention and early treatment not only save lives, they also save money. In fact, the Prevention and Public Health Fund addresses one of the major deficiencies in our approach to health in America, and that's preventing illness before people get sick.

The Republican assertion that mandatory funding, which I've heard over and over again today and also in the Health Subcommittee, that this is somehow mandatory funding and it's unprecedented, that's completely not true. Medicaid and Medicare are funded with mandatory support, and there are a lot of other programs within our committee's jurisdiction and in Congress in general that are funded through mandatory funding.

I don't know how many times I'm going to come to the floor and hear about repealing the health care reform. I understand tomorrow there's going to be an enrolled bill that goes along with the CR that's going to defund the whole Affordable Care Act. Here today we're going to defund one piece, the prevention fund. Tomorrow we've got another enrollment resolution that defunds the whole bill. Again, another resolution tomorrow to defund Planned Parenthood.

How many times are we going to keep voting on the same thing over and over and over again? Meanwhile, I

don't see a single piece of legislation coming to this floor that addresses jobs or the economy. When I go home, people want to know what we're doing about the economy. They know that their health care reform has passed, that they're benefiting from it, that it's gradually unfolding before them. They don't want us to continue to debate the same thing over and over again. Repeal, defund, and no suggestion about what you would do to replace it either, by the way.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey and let me thank the chairman of the committee as well.

Madam Chairwoman, we just have a disagreement. I would venture to say that the bulk of sick people in America and others who every day struggle to maintain their health so they can provide for their families would vigorously disagree as well.

I think there are two points that I would like to make, and that is that what we lose when we repeal this Affordable Care Act and the funding of it is more than the glory that we get from going home and bragging that we have undermined America's health care system, or some would say that we have taken away ObamaCare. Preventative care is an unbelievable plus that this bill has generated.

I went to one of my emergency centers, a new one, that is crafted under the public health system. It is to take the load off the emergency centers, the emergency centers that ambulances go to. What an amazing sight, of people coming with broken toes and fingers and feet and bruises, maybe the beginning of heart disease and other problems. But it was a lower level emergency room, not particularly preventative care but the kind of intervention that can save millions of dollars.

□ 1600

I want to go even lower than that—and I don't use that terminology—but I want people to be able to go and check on their cholesterol, check on their high blood pressure, understand whether they have sickle cell, understand what stage of diabetes they are in or understand what stage of heart disease they are in in a preventative care cycle. And everyone knows that economists document how many billions of dollar that will save. How can we vote against that?

And then secondarily, there are two elements that the Affordable Care Act provides that is being repealed; research and training for health professionals that we absolutely need—whether you're in the private care system or not—and then of course protecting our most precious resource, and that is our children. If you can raise a

child in a healthy manner in terms of nutrition, in terms of immunization, in terms of regular doctor visits, then you are able to save billions of dollars.

This is wrong, headed in a wrong direction. Many of us are fasting. I said on this floor, we must pray because this is the wrong direction to go.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, we are simply never going to bend the cost curve on health care or improve America's quality of life until we focus much more on disease prevention, and that's what this prevention fund is for.

I always thought that both Democrats and Republicans wanted to keep people out of the hospital, off of disability, leading productive lives, and trying to prevent diseases before they occur. I never thought this was a partisan issue. Because we need to have a system of well care, not sick care, if we're really going to have success in saving money and bending the cost curve.

So I don't understand why my Republican colleagues so many times in the committee would talk about prevention, but all of a sudden now they want to abolish the prevention fund. It just doesn't make any sense.

Before the Affordable Care Act, prevention activities were chronically underfunded, accounting for only 2 to 4 percent of the national health care expenditure by some estimates. Considering that chronic diseases eat up an estimated 75 percent of our \$2 trillion in annual health care spending, to spend an additional \$2 billion for wellness and prevention is a wise investment.

Since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, every State has benefited from the prevention and wellness fund. This year, over \$750 million in grants were dispersed—building on a \$500 million investment last year—and repealing this program would mean putting the brakes on investments that are already beginning to make a difference.

In my home State of New Jersey, many of my constituents have benefited from over \$15 million in prevention and public health grants, funding for such things as HIV prevention, tobacco cessation, mental health care, critical public health infrastructure improvements, as well as support for primary care training and workforce development.

I could do the same, I have a sheet here—I'm not going to read it, but I have a similar sheet for Mr. PRTTS and Dr. BURGESS and others on the Republican side who specified these are the types of grants that are being made available in their States.

I simply don't understand. There are 600 national, State, and local organizations supporting the fund as a primary vehicle for making public health investments that would create jobs and help lower long-term health care costs. The Energy and Commerce Committee and the Health Subcommittee have

heard me many times say that we can never calculate the huge savings that come from prevention.

We had the CBO in the other day and I said to the CBO, why don't you calculate prevention, because we would save trillions of dollars? Well, they don't do it. But the bottom line is we all know that prevention saves money. If you concentrate just on chronic diseases, this law helps move the Nation from a focus on sickness and disease to one based on wellness and prevention. And if you take away this critical new investment in prevention, it's going to be harmful to the health of Americans now and also in the future.

Madam Chairwoman—and I will address this directly to my Republican colleagues—in the last few weeks, when we had hearings in the Health Subcommittee on the various measures that the Republicans wanted to defund—and I know they want to repeal the whole bill and I know they want to defund everything, and that's what they're going to try to do again tomorrow. I understand all that. I totally disagree with it, but I understand that they're against the Affordable Care Act. They want to defund it, they want to do whatever they can to get rid of it.

But it just seems to me that to pick the one fund that deals with prevention is really the worst thing you could have done today because what we're trying to do with the Affordable Care Act—and what I've sought to do in everything that we've done in the subcommittee since I've been on it—is to really stress prevention because we can avoid people going to hospitals, we can avoid people going to nursing homes. They can lead a better quality of life and we save money.

So I just think it is really unfortunate today that after so many years of a bipartisan effort to deal with prevention, to fund prevention issues, that this is the one fund that's actually picked on today to come to the floor. I think it's really a horrible thing that that is the case.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution because if you really believe in prevention, if you really believe that we can make a difference in making people well and preventing them from getting sick, then you should vote against this bill.

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, it's time for a fiscal reality check. The Federal Government is now borrowing 42 cents of every dollar it spends. Washington is spending more than \$1 of every \$4 this country produces and we are facing a third straight year with a \$1 trillion deficit. Yet, when the subcommittee voted on this straightforward bill to strip billions in unaccountable spending from the health care law based on the simple premise that Congress should fund prevention and wellness activities by prioritizing them in the regular annual spending process, the

response from the other side of the aisle was to say, we're not broke. Madam Chair, I beg to differ.

Our debate today is not about the virtue of preventive health care and wellness programs. I support prevention. The real question is whether our Nation can afford to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to spend nearly \$18 billion over and above what Congress appropriates over the next decade on programs of the administration's choosing.

H.R. 1217 does not cut a single program because this fund does not guarantee funding for any particular program. Every Member who supports this fund on the assumption that it provides additional money for a project they deem worthy should understand that no one knows where this money will be spent. Perhaps it could be used to combat obesity, or for cancer screenings, or perhaps it will be used to post signs about the location of bike paths. The point is, Congress abdicates our authority and responsibility for investing in prevention by handing a perpetual blank check to the Secretary.

Governing and solving our fiscal problems is difficult; it requires hard choices. It is easy to spend. The easy choice was to assign mandatory advanced appropriations to these initiatives rather than making them a budget priority. But it's only easy until the bill is due and the credit card is maxed out. Well, the bill is due and the credit card limit is approaching fast. Congress needs to reassert its role and set spending priorities rather than give the executive branch unfettered power to spend as it wishes.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, I rise to express my strong support for the Prevention and Public Health Fund and to ask my colleagues to reconsider the elimination of a program whose sole purpose is not only to improve the overall health of Americans, but to help "restrain the rate of growth in private and public sector health care costs."

If my colleagues across the aisle want to effectively cut spending and fix our long-term deficit, then I would remind them that health care costs are one of the biggest drivers of federal spending; and chronic diseases, such as heart disease, cancer, stroke and diabetes, account for 75 percent of the cost of care. If we invest in preventing these chronic diseases now, we could save our health care system hundreds of billions of dollars, reducing the costs to Medicare and Medicaid and saving countless lives.

Instead, we are taking a penny-wise and pound-foolish approach by considering H.R. 1217, which repeals investments in prevention and primary care services to combat mental illness, obesity, cancer, as well as HIV and other acquired infections. Rhode Island has already received over \$800,000 to support primary care, mental health services and health information technology that will improve the health of Rhode Island families before they are forced to seek treatment in the Emergency Department.

Our nation cannot afford to cut now and worry about the consequences later. That approach has only earned our country the unfortunate distinction of being the nation with the highest adult obesity rate in the developed world with the highest mortality rates for various preventable chronic diseases. It has also done nothing to reign in our long-term deficits.

Further, we are almost 100 days into the 112th Congress and Speaker BOEHNER has not put forward a single bill to create jobs. If my colleagues in Congress are serious about balancing the budget and creating a better health care system, then I hope we will move on from trying to dismantle the health reform law and focus on job creation. I ask my colleagues to oppose this measure and bring up a bill that will put Americans back to work.

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Chair, today we rise to debate irresponsible legislation cloaked in fiscal responsibility, legislation that will assuredly put the nation's public health at risk.

Today's debate is not one over concerns of mandatory funding for our nation's public health investments, it is another shot at the Affordable Care Act.

Our health system is inherently designed to provide treatment for the sick and ill, but does not currently contain the incentives necessary to keep consumers from becoming sick in the first place.

Just two years ago total health expenditures in the U.S. was \$2.5 trillion, and only 3 percent of that funding was spent on preventative health care services and health promotion.

If we want to cut down on the costs of hospitalizations and inappropriate emergency room visits, we have to help American families better manage their chronic diseases like diabetes or asthma and help them stay well through vaccines and screenings.

This was the purpose behind the Prevention and Public Health Fund—to make a strong investment into prevention and wellness programs and promote innovative prevention that will help to save our health system costs in the long run.

And now we are seeing the good work that the Prevention and Public Health Fund is doing in our states.

Michigan has received over \$2 million for public health activities—building capacity in our health departments, hiring and training epidemiologists and scientists to study infectious diseases, improving access and quality of health services in medically underserved communities, and helping to promote better primary care for those in need.

Thus, the Prevention and Public Health Fund is not only creating much-needed jobs in my home state, but also undertaking meaningful projects that will help to improve the health of our country.

Let us be clear that this legislation will not become law, and rather than use the time of this body for valuable legislation such as creating jobs and improving our economy and the health of our nation, my colleagues choose to focus their efforts on another vehicle to defend the Affordable Care Act.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1217. This irresponsible and short-sighted legislation would repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund which is a fundamental component to the Affordable Care Act.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is a critical investment in public health and demonstrates a historic commitment to changing our health system from one that focuses on treating the sick to one that focuses on keeping people healthy in the first place. We all agree that prevention is one of the most effective ways we can reduce health costs in the long run, rather than by simply cutting spending.

My friends on the other side of the aisle claim that eliminating the fund does not cut any specific prevention programs and that the reason they want to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund is to recoup the funding appropriated for it.

I would like to know from the Majority, are the short term cost savings from this bill worth the long term costs to our financial future and health? How do they plan to solve the public health problems of the future if they intend to gut programs like this one?

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is one of a number of Affordable Care Act initiatives that is already in place and producing positive results. Currently, all 50 states and the District of Columbia are receiving Fund support. These valuable dollars are being used to support community-based initiatives to reduce tobacco use and obesity, prevent HIV infection, build epidemiology and laboratory capacity to track and respond to disease outbreaks, and train the public health workforce.

Madam Chair, I know that we face difficult economic decisions, and I would be happy to have a discussion with my friends on the other side of the aisle on how we can reduce the deficit, but I feel that H.R. 1217 is the wrong approach.

Seventy-five percent of the two trillion dollars we spend in health care costs are spent on treatment of chronic diseases. Many of which can be prevented. Obesity alone costs us 147 billion dollars a year and chronic illness can cost us an additional 1 trillion dollars each year in lost productivity. In addition, studies have shown that proven community-based diabetes prevention programs can save as much as 191 billion dollars over 10 years. So the fact is prevention saves money.

Now, those are just the dollars and cents of the value that the Prevention and Public Health Fund bring. We know that prevention saves money, but what about the improvements to the health of our nation's citizens. Prevention saves lives, improves quality of life and is the most cost-effective way to spend our health care dollars. No matter what arguments the Majority may make, we cannot put price-tag on that.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1217.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, today we are considering a piece of legislation that will roll back important gains for public health and prevention. Specifically, today's bill proposes to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund under the Affordable Care Act.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, more than 75 percent of health care spending in the United States is due to chronic conditions, such as stroke, diabetes, and cancer. One of the ways to control health care spending is to invest ways to prevent disease and improving the public health of our nation. By investing in preventative health care services, we can reduce the number of people with chronic diseases while saving lives and money.

Currently, funding from this program is being used by states and communities to prevent smoking, obesity, heart disease, and to increase physical activity and train the public health workforce. The Prevention and Public Health Fund presents a significant opportunity to rein in our health care spending and to promote healthy lifestyles and communities. In my judgment, repealing it will only increase preventable health care costs over time.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided bill so that we can continue to protect the health of all Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1217, which would repeal the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ("Affordable Care Act") that established the Prevention and Public Health Fund, a fund which serves as a great stride toward turning our "sick-care" system, where we focus on treating the injured and ill, into a true "healthcare" system that puts focus on keeping the population well.

It is because of all that the Prevention and Public Health Fund accomplished in its first year, the overwhelming support the Fund has received from hundreds of organizations, and how essential prevention is to reducing the overall cost of healthcare for the American people, that I oppose the repeal of this Fund.

Despite my general opposition to this bill, yesterday in the Rules Committee meeting, I offered amendments to H.R. 1217, in order to remind this chamber and emphasize to the American people the importance and benefits of preventative care for the American public.

My amendments reaffirm to the American people that we as lawmakers understand the importance of preventative care by stating that it is the sense of Congress that prevention of disease and injury is overwhelmingly effective in improving our healthcare system and keeping that system affordable. Furthermore, preventative health care is an effective means for detecting and treating illnesses before they become serious and life threatening.

My amendments also make us as lawmakers accountable to the American people who have been and would be benefitting from the services and support provided through this fund. It gives notice to the public, through the Department of Health and Human Services' website, of the rescission of funds and the amount rescinded, increasing government's accountability.

I think most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree with me, as evidenced by the intense debate at the end of last week, when I say that we must address our nation's spending and growing deficit. However, it is of great concern to me that my friends on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do so by cutting cost-saving programs that are also essential to the health and wellbeing of Americans. This attempt, through H.R. 1217, to defund this essential program which was created under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is of particular concern.

Today's youth may be the first generation to live shorter and less healthy lives than that of their parents, and this is largely due to increased rates of diseases and conditions which are preventable with proper and consistent healthcare. 75% of our country's healthcare costs are attributed to treatment of chronic diseases, most of which are preventable. However, less than 5% of our healthcare

spending goes towards preventing these diseases. Loss of productivity in the workforce attributed to chronic disease is estimated to cost the United States over \$1 trillion each year.

With that being said, the 111th Congress, with the intent of seeing these grim statistics changes, appropriated \$16.5 billion to be used, over the next ten years to support preventative care and research. Since its establishment the Fund has already begun to strengthen the infrastructure of our healthcare system on the state and national level.

The Prevention and Public Health fund, though it has only been in existence for one year, has already been used for:

Programs to promote tobacco control and implement tobacco cessation services and campaigns;

Obesity prevention which directly decreases risk for Diabetes;

Improving nutrition and access to fresh fruits and vegetables;

Increasing opportunities for recreational and physical activity;

HIV prevention;

Support of clinical and community-based disease prevention; and

Bolstering the health workforce by increasing health care personnel.

Money towards finding health solutions, rather than treating health problems, comes back to society in terms of increasing productivity, creating jobs, and reducing Medicare, Medicaid, and overall healthcare costs. With just a \$10 per person investment towards improving community based activity, nutrition, and other preventative measures would create a return of \$56 per person within only 5 years. That translates to a savings of \$5.60 for every \$1 invested in preventative health care. Most importantly, cost benefits extend beyond government to both American businesses and families; providing savings and an improved quality of life.

As a result of the Prevention and Public Health Fund, Texas received \$6 million last year that went towards creating committees, testing facilities, laboratories, and training centers which brought over \$2 million to the health prevention capacity of Houston alone.

Congress must maintain that the prevention of illness, the saving of lives, and the securing of a healthy public are top priorities, and that prevention is an undeniably effective means to achieve these ends. My amendments will do just that.

The total loss of \$16 billion of funding for prevention efforts, an effective total eradication of our country's prevention program, will be unfortunate, and thus I urge my colleagues not to lose sight of importance of the Prevention and Public Health Fund's accomplishments and goals. Including:

The improvement of state and local health departments, giving them the capacity to respond to infections, natural disasters, and terrorist threats;

Creating a strong and healthy workforce that will be competitive in the global market; and

Saving families, businesses, and the government money, opposed to simply cutting costs.

While I do not support what H.R. 1217 purports to do, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of these essential changes to H.R. 1217 to acknowledge the need for preventative care and hold ourselves accountable for what would most certainly be a great loss to the public.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. EMERSON). All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1217

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

SECTION 1. REPEALING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11) is repealed.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds made available by such section 4002, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 112-61. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1610

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-61.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 1, add at the end the following:
(c) NOTICE OF RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services a notice of—

- (1) the rescission, pursuant to subsection (b), of the unobligated balance of funds made available by such section 4002; and
- (2) the amount of such funds so rescinded.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Chair, I know sometimes in the rush of legislating, many Members are faced with any number of challenges in understanding legislation, but I do know that the majority has come with their own roadmap. And I do want to respect the different viewpoints, and I don't say this in any way to malign.

First of all, I'm grateful that this amendment was made in order, but I wish it wasn't because I understand that all legislation that passes needs to have in fact—or often has those who agree with it and those who do not. And that's fair enough.

And the process that we usually use to handle that is to amend, not repeal. There are some sections here that I have looked at and have concern with. And many have heard me on the floor of the House discussing a number of issues regarding my local hospitals. But I will say to you that the repeal of this bill is putting us on the road to ruin.

And my amendment is simple. It asks the HHS to place on its Web site the moneys rescinded so that the American people can see. For some it may be to see the great success of taking away money. For others, it may be to see what has happened to the resources that they need to take care of themselves.

Very quickly, this amendment requires for fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 to list the amount of money that is being taken away from good health care. But, Madam Chair, it will also hopefully point people to what they're losing.

For example, look at this beautiful baby here. We will not have, under the repeal of this Affordable Care Act, the bounty of preventative care. For those with chronic diseases, Americans who are subject to chronic disease such as heart disease, cancer, stroke and diabetes, their only care will be the emergency room, high-priced emergency room when they're in a diabetic coma or they're in a stroke or they have a heart attack, rather than be able to go to their doctors.

But we start early on with this little baby being able to go to wellness clinics or to their community health clinics. That's what the money that is being rescinded is going to do to you.

In addition, you will find that chronic diseases resulted in \$75.3 billion loss in productivity in the State of Texas alone. This is going to be across America.

The rescissions will also impact all of the States. I have a list of almost 50 States that have begun to receive dollars from the Affordable Care Act—from Alabama, to Alaska, to Pennsylvania, to Massachusetts, to Michigan, to Rhode Island, and South Carolina, and Tennessee, and Texas. All of the States that my good friends come from, they are receiving money right now.

In addition to this issue of taking away money, Prevention for Healthy America concluded that investing \$10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increased physical activity, for example, improved nutrition, and prevents smoking and other tobacco could save the country more than \$16 billion annually within 5 years.

When you see how much money was taken away, just realize that you multiply that. If it's a total of \$16 billion, you're going to lose \$16 billion a year because there will not be any wellness program. Community and clinical prevention, which is about \$2 million. And so you will take away money from HIV

prevention, and that is a very costly proposal.

You'll take away from public health infrastructure; you'll take away from primary care residential expansion programs training residents and doctors. You'll take away from other medical assistance programs, expansion of physician assistant training. You'll take away from public health departments where they link people to needed health care. You'll take away childhood and adult immunizations and protecting the water we drink and the food we eat.

Let me just say to you that my amendment is to shine the light on what will be happening to the health care of Americans. I want my colleagues to tell their constituents, not those that are already focused on negative aspects of what we're trying to do here, but those who are just simply hardworking mothers and fathers who are trying to make a living and who need this health care.

Madam Chair, I would first like to state my clear position that I am adamantly opposed to H.R. 1217 and its repeal of the important Prevention and Public Health Fund created under the Affordable Care Act. The Fund saves lives and saves money.

If H.R. 1217 to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund provided under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is enacted into law:

What my amendment does is: Requires the Department of Health and Human Services to post public notice on its official website of the Unobligated Funds from section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act including the amount of the funds that will be rescinded.

This amendment will provide the public with important information about Preventive Health Care funding that will no longer be available for them to receive necessary preventive health care services.

This amendment also assists my Republican colleagues by permitting them to easily show the American public that they are cutting government spending, by how much they are cutting spending, and where they are cutting government spending. So I expect that my Republican colleagues will fully support this amendment.

PURPOSE OF THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND (SECTION 4002 OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT)

When Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010 and the President signed it into law, the Department of Health of Human Services was given the power to administer the program to provide for expanded and sustained national health investment in prevention and public health programs to improve public health programs and help restrain the growth in private and public health costs. This was already a cost cutting measure.

Nearly 11.7 million cases of seven common chronic diseases—cancers, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders, and pulmonary conditions—were reported in Texas in 2003.

The cost of treating those with chronic disease in Texas totaled about \$17.2 billion.

Chronic diseases resulted in \$75.3 billion in lost productivity and economic costs to Texas.

A new focus on prevention will offer Texas and the rest of our nation the opportunity to

not only improve the health of Americans, but also control health care spending. A report from Trust for America's Health entitled Prevention for a Healthier America concluded that investing \$10 per person per year in proven community-based programs that increase physical activity, improve nutrition, and prevent smoking and other tobacco use could save the country more than \$16 billion annually within 5 years. This is a return of \$5.60 for every \$1 spent on preventive health care.

HOW THE FUND IMPROVES WELLNESS AND PREVENTION FOR TEXANS

Since enactment of the Affordable Care Act on March 23, 2010, the Department of Health and Human Services has awarded approximately \$17.63 million in grants to organizations in Texas through the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help improve wellness and prevention efforts, including:

Community and Clinical Prevention (\$2,956,000): This funding supports prevention activities that have been shown to be effective in reducing health care costs and promoting health and wellness.

Primary and Behavioral Health Integration (\$495,000). Assists communities with the integration of primary care services into community-based mental & behavioral health settings.

HIV Prevention (\$2,359,000). Focuses on HIV prevention in high risk populations and communities by increasing HIV testing opportunities, linking HIV-infected persons with appropriate services, and filling critical gaps in data and understanding of the HIV epidemic.

Tobacco Cessation (\$102,000). Strengthens Texas's ability to move towards implementing a plan to reduce tobacco use. It also enhances and expands the national network of tobacco cessation quitlines to significantly increase the number of tobacco users who quit each year.

Public Health Infrastructure (\$2,084,000): These grants strengthen state and local capacity to prepare health departments to meet 21st century public health challenges and support the training of existing and next generation public health professionals.

Public Health Infrastructure (\$800,000). Supports state, local, and tribal public health infrastructure to improve information technology, workforce training, and policy development.

Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity (\$634,000). Builds state and local capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to infectious disease outbreaks.

Public Health Training Centers (\$650,000). Improve the public health system by enhancing skills of the current and future public health workforce.

Primary Care Training (\$12,586,000): These funds support the expansion of the primary care workforce.

Primary Care Residency Expansion Program (\$7,680,000). Increases the number of residents trained in family medicine, general internal medicine, and general pediatrics.

Advanced Nursing Education Expansion Program (\$1,426,000). Increases the number of primary care nurse practitioners and nurse midwives who graduate by expanding class sizes and accelerating graduation rates for part-time students.

Expansion of Physician Assistant Training (\$1,980,000). Improves access to primary care by funding the training of primary care physician assistants and expanding the primary care workforce.

Nurse-Managed Health Clinics (\$1,500,000). Provide primary care and wellness services to underserved and vulnerable populations through clinics that are managed by advanced practice nurses and provide valuable clinical training sites for primary care nurse practitioners.

If the Prevention and Public Health Fund is cut and its Unobligated Funds Rescinded our health care costs will soar and the results will be catastrophic. The Fund saves lives and saves money.

IF THE FUNDS ARE RESCINDED

America's local health departments need the Prevention and Public Health Fund to help prevent diseases and protect health in ways that health insurance companies or medical care providers cannot.

Local health departments:

Link people who need healthcare with ways to get it.

Detect and stop outbreaks of disease.

Help people make healthier choices in diet, exercise, and tobacco use to prevent and reduce chronic disease.

Provide childhood and adult immunizations.

Protect the water we drink and the food we eat.

Help new parents give babies a healthy start at home.

Inspect schools and day care centers for health and safety.

Conduct screenings for cancer, heart disease, diabetes, childhood lead poisoning, tuberculosis, and other infectious diseases.

The Prevention and Public Health Fund is critically needed to stabilize the ability of local health departments to protect their communities from health threats and help individuals and families lead productive and healthy lives. Please oppose this attempt by H.R. 1217 to eliminate funding for the Prevention and Public Health Fund. A healthy future depends on it.

If H.R. 1217 passes this Chamber and is enacted into law, it is important for the American People to have notice of the rescission of funds for the Prevention and Public Health Fund program. Since the Department of Health and Human Services administers the Fund, it is only appropriate that public notice be given on the official HHS website and include the amount of funds rescinded. In this way, the American public will know that the public funding they rely upon has been cancelled for preventive health care and the Transparency of Spending Cuts will be further promoted in a manner that my Republican Colleagues will also appreciate.

I would urge all Members of Congress to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, at this point I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PITTS. I will just mention to the gentlelady all of the wonderful programs that she mentioned are not mentioned in this section of the law. There is no guarantee that this money will be spent for any of that.

H.R. 1217 repeals the Prevention and Public Health Fund and rescinds unobligated balances. The Jackson Lee amendment would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services

to post on the HHS public Web site a notice of the rescission of unobligated balances of the Prevention and Public Health Fund and the amount of the rescission.

I support transparency in government. I actually wish there was more transparency in how HHS has already spent the money from this fund. The lack of transparency and accountability regarding this fund is a primary reason I support H.R. 1217. And if the author feels this would increase transparency, then I support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112–61.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. GAO STUDY ON THE IMPACTS THAT FUNDING THROUGH THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND WOULD HAVE ON PREVENTING CHRONIC DISEASES AND PROMOTING HEALTH.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the impacts that providing prevention, wellness, and public health activities under the Prevention and Public Health Fund, using the funding made available under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11), would have on preventing chronic diseases and promoting health in the United States, if such funding were not repealed and rescinded under section 1. Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the day of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth the results and conclusions of the study under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, my amendment requires a government accountability study within 90 days of enactment of the law to study the impact the Prevention and Public Health initiative has on preventing chronic diseases and promoting public health.

Madam Chair, prevention works. It's smart. It saves the taxpayers money. It saves families money. And it saves lives. The Prevention and Public Health initiative empowers communities all across this great Nation to focus on prevention and wellness and what works for them when it comes to reducing cancer cases, reducing heart disease, reducing strokes back in our own hometowns.

In Florida alone, there are over 10 million cases of the seven most common chronic diseases—cancer, diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, stroke, mental disorders and pulmonary conditions. We all know our neighbors, friends, families, folks we go to church with, folks we see in the grocery store that suffer from these diseases. In a lot of these cases, if they had gotten early detection or if we had worked harder on prevention, they wouldn't have fallen into that trap of the disease and all that it brings for families and communities.

See, we have a better approach now. We are smarter in America. No longer should our health care system be focused only on taking care of folks in the hospital when they're sick or at the end stages. We're smarter. We can prevent a lot of this through education and being proactive and encouraging a healthier lifestyle.

And that's what the Prevention and Public Health Initiative does. State and local communities are able to decide what works best for them. This isn't Washington dictating what you should do. This is saying to our local hometowns and communities, What do you think works best for you?

□ 1620

So I would encourage all of my colleagues to take a look at the grants that are being made. How are your local communities making these investments work in your own districts to invest in the long term health of our neighbors and the economic prosperity of our communities?

For example, in my hometown in my district, the Pinellas County Health Department has brought together neighborhoods and all the nonprofits to determine—you know what's going to work best in Pinellas County is encouraging healthier lifestyles, because we have an obesity epidemic. So they want to build sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, better lighting to encourage people to exercise. They are going to make improvements to parks so children have the opportunity to get out and play after school instead of sitting in front of the television.

I also have a great public university, the University of South Florida, in my district. They are training the modern health care workforce in Florida. These are professionals fighting on the front lines of our communities, and yes, creating jobs. This is creating jobs to encourage the healthier lifestyles that work. USF is able to identify where the gaps in training might be, develop updated curricula to ensure the public health care workforce receives the most up-to-date research, and then they can spread the word throughout the churches, the grocery stores, and our neighborhoods.

The Florida Department of Health is also using these grants in checking on all of our strategies Statewide to determine what works. See, this is one of the important goals of the Affordable

Care Act, to promote wellness and prevention, to ensure healthier outcomes for our families and neighbors. And the examples I have just shared with you are only a few of what's happening all across the country.

We are smarter, Madam Chair. Prevention works. It saves taxpayers money. It saves families money. It saves lives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the Castor amendment.

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, the amendment before us directs the GAO to pontificate on the effectiveness of unspecified prevention, wellness, and public health activities financed by funds under section 4002 of PPACA.

As we have pointed out, section 4002 gives the Secretary of HHS complete discretion to spend the slush fund with little limitation. Any program within the Public Health Service Act, regardless of its merit or effectiveness, is eligible for funding under section 4002. How can we ask the GAO to determine the effectiveness of spending dollars when we simply don't know how those dollars will be spent? Is GAO supposed to assume that funds will be used to train doctors or build jungle gyms? Will their report make the assumption that the money will be used to advocate for soda tax increases in States or build signs that direct people to bike paths? All of these activities can be funded through this slush fund.

According to the Energy and Commerce minority views, Pitt County, North Carolina, received a grant from the fund that will be in part used to "place signage within communities to point out public parks, other recreational opportunities, and the availability of bike lanes."

This amendment underscores the major problem with section 4002. Rather than letting Congress weigh the relative value of programs through the annual appropriations process, my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to throw dollars to a political appointee at HHS to spend billions of dollars on any program with no oversight. The amendment also places an unrealistic timetable on the GAO to issue a report within 90 days of enactment. It is simply a waste of money to ask GAO to conduct a study with little time to complete what is clearly an impossible task.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, how much more time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, what a waste of money it would be if we do not act on education and knowledge, because we know that prevention works in America. When you educate someone on healthier lifestyles, the likelihood is that they are going to live a healthier life. They can prevent disease. Maybe they get early detection of their cancer. And that would save them a lot of money. You know, it also would save the government a lot of money. So let's be smart about this. Prevention works.

It reminds me now of my friends across the aisle, their proposal to end Medicare as we know it, because that is not smart. Again, like prevention, Medicare works. It saves families money. And the plan to privatize Medicare and turn it into a voucher program is not going to save any money. Indeed, it will shift the costs to families. They will have to pay more. So let's do what's smart. Prevention works.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, the simple fact is everything the gentlelady just mentioned she doesn't know will be funded. There is no guarantee to fund any of those things.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-61.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 2. GAO STUDY ON THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS THAT FUNDING THROUGH THE PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND WOULD HAVE ON STATES AND COMMUNITIES.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine the economic impacts that providing prevention, wellness, and public health activities under the Prevention and Public Health Fund, using the funding made available under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11), would have on States and communities in the United States, if such funding were not repealed and rescinded under section 1. Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the day of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall sub-

mit to the Congress a report setting forth the results and conclusions of the study under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 219, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, my amendment requires a Government Accountability Office study within 90 days of enactment of this bill to examine the economic impact Prevention and Public Health grants have on States and local communities.

Now, I can tell you we don't really need a study to understand how important prevention is and how important it is to empower our hometowns, local governments, nonprofits, whoever can come together on a local level and make these decisions about encouraging healthier lifestyles.

The beauty of the Public Health and Prevention initiative is it's not Washington dictating all across the country a cookie-cutter approach, one size fits all. Instead, we empower our neighbors to make these decisions on what works best for them. I would say that what works best in my hometown back in Tampa probably would not work quite as well in Fargo or in Missouri.

Prevention of disease is smart. It saves families money, and it saves taxpayers money as well. Now, over time we have all gotten smarter about preventing chronic diseases. Much of this cost-saving and life-saving focus was brought to bear in the landmark Affordable Care Act and this Prevention and Public Health initiative, which is the most historic investment in public health of our communities in the history of our country.

Now, far from the extreme arguments against prevention from my colleagues across the aisle, the Prevention and Public Health initiative empowers States, hometowns, and local communities to determine what works best for them. The annual treatment cost of chronic diseases costs the United States over \$270 billion. And our economy has lost over \$1 trillion in lost productivity. In Florida alone, we have lost over \$68 billion in lost productivity and economic costs due to chronic diseases like heart disease, diabetes, and cancer.

So not only does prevention help us reduce costs, it can be an economic boost to our communities. I can tell you back in Florida we need as many economic boosts as we can get. We still have a high unemployment rate. We have a large number of uninsured. So what could be smarter than targeting some of our communities and encouraging them on healthier lifestyles so they can get back to work?

We are creating jobs through doing this. For example, at the University of South Florida College of Public Health, they've received one of the Prevention and Public Health grants where they're

hiring and training the modern public health workforce. These are the folks with the most updated knowledge that are able to go out through communities and encourage them and educate them on what it would mean if they didn't smoke, if they didn't drink. Oftentimes, these initiatives have a great impact. They can save us money, and they can save us lives.

□ 1630

In Pinellas County they are combating childhood obesity, and they are already making a big economic impact in the community. Richard Curtin is the program manager for the Communities Putting Prevention to Work—Pinellas. He informed me they have created already 18 jobs as a direct result of this lifesaving work.

So I would encourage all of you to ask your folks back home what works best for them. Apply for these grants. We can make a difference all across America, save taxpayers money, save our families money, and save lives while we are at it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, the Castor amendment directs the Government Accountability Office to make assumptions on the economic impacts of providing prevention, wellness, and public health activities under section 4002 of the PPACA. However, section 4002 gives the Secretary of HHS complete discretion to spend this slush fund with little limitation. The amendment asks the GAO to determine the economic impact of spending when no one except the Secretary knows how those dollars will be spent.

What will GAO base their assumptions on? Does placing signage for bike paths produce economic activity or does advocating higher soda taxes benefit the economy? These activities have been financed by programs eligible for funding under section 4002.

Members and the GAO cannot determine the economic impact of the fund because the Secretary controls how it is to be spent. Will GAO be charged with determining whether borrowing 42 cents of every dollar this fund spends has a positive economic impact?

This amendment underscores the major problems with section 4002. Rather than letting Congress weigh the relative value of programs through the annual appropriations process, my friends on the other side of the aisle have decided to throw dollars to a political appointee at HHS to spend billions on any program with no oversight.

The amendment also places an unrealistic timetable on the GAO to issue a report within 90 days of enactment. Like the previous amendment, we are not spending our resources wisely when we ask the GAO to conduct a study

with little time to complete what is clearly an impossible task.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, we are spending our dollars wisely when we are investing in prevention and wellness because prevention works. Prevention saves money, it saves the taxpayers money, it saves families money and it saves lives.

Now, there has been a great debate all across America about health care over the past few years. I think we can all agree on that. Part of the importance of the health care debate was that our health care system for too long has focused and spent money at the end game on sickness, when people have cancer, and that's fine, but we can be smarter about it. We have a lot more knowledge and a lot of experts that have advised us all that if you invest in prevention to encourage folks not to smoke, not to drink, those easy things, very easy in lifestyle, but oftentimes they need a little extra help. Parents should turn off the TV and the kids should go out and play. They should exercise.

But sometimes it's that little extra push. And if we can make a dent in childhood obesity, diabetes, cancer, a stroke, because we have encouraged healthier lifestyles with this very modest investment, that will be a great accomplishment. And that's part of what the health care debate was about, taking this modest investment in public health and empowering our communities to make those decisions on what works for them. Prevention works. It's smart.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, once again the gentlewoman made my point. She has no guarantee that in the year 2015 the Secretary will fund programs like cessation of smoking or obesity. She has not a clue. What if the Secretary decided to use the whole \$2 billion for abstinence education in 2015? She has no clue what it will be used for.

I urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-61 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—187

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

Waxman	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
Weiner	Woolsey	
Welch	Wu	

NOES—237

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

NOT VOTING—8

Bass (CA)	Maloney	Richardson
Culberson	Meeks	Rogers (MI)
Giffords	Reichert	

□ 1701

Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. HANNA changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, MCINTYRE, DINGELL, SMITH of Washington, ISRAEL, HINOJOSA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms.

PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained earlier today and therefore was not present to be recorded on rollcall vote No. 261. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 261, I would have voted "aye" (April 13) (Castor (FL) Amendment, Requiring the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of the impact funds awarded through the Prevention and Public Health Fund would have on preventing chronic diseases and promoting health).

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 238, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—188

- Ackerman Cummings Jackson Lee
Andrews Davis (CA) (TX)
Baca Davis (IL) Johnson (GA)
Baldwin DeGette Johnson, E. B.
Barrow DeLauro Kaptur
Bass (CA) Deutch Keating
Becerra Dicks Kildee
Berkley Dingell Kind
Berman Doggett Kissell
Bishop (GA) Kucinich
Bishop (NY) Donnelly (IN) Langevin
Blumenauer Doyle Larsen (WA)
Boren Edwards Larson (CT)
Boswell Ellison Lee (CA)
Brady (PA) Engel Levin
Braley (IA) Eshoo Lewis (GA)
Brown (FL) Farr Lipinski
Butterfield Fattah Loeb sack
Capps Filner Lofgren, Zoe
Capuano Frank (MA) Lowey
Cardoza Garamendi Lujan
Carnahan Gonzalez Lynch
Carney Green, Al Maloney
Carson (IN) Green, Gene Markey
Castor (FL) Grijalva Matheson
Chandler Gutierrez Matsui
Chu Hanabusa McCarthy (NY)
Cicilline Harris McCollum
Clarke (MI) Hastings (FL) McDermott
Clarke (NY) Heinrich McGovern
Clay Higgins McInyre
Cleaver Himes McNeerney
Clyburn Hinchey Michaud
Cohen Hinojosa Miller (NC)
Connolly (VA) Moore Miller, George
Conyers Hirono Moore
Cooper Holden Moran
Costa Holt Murphy (CT)
Costello Honda Nadler
Courtney Hoyer Napolitano
Critz Inslee Neal
Crowley Israel Olver
Cuellar Jackson (IL) Owens

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

NOES—238

- Adams Gerlach Miller (FL)
Aderholt Gibbs Miller (MI)
Akin Gibson Miller, Gary
Alexander Greigrey (GA)
Altmire Gohmert
Amash Goodlatte
Austria Gosar
Bachmann Gowdy
Bachus Granger
Barletta Graves (GA)
Bartlett Graves (MO)
Barton (TX) Griffin (AR)
Bass (NH) Griffith (VA)
Benishek Grimm
Berg Guinta
Biggart Guthrie
Bilbray Hall
Bilirakis Hanna
Bishop (UT) Harper
Black Hartzler
Bonner Hastings (WA)
Bono Mack Hayworth
Boustany Heck
Brady (TX) Heller
Brooks Hensarling
Broun (GA) Herger
Buchanan Herrera Beutler
Bucshon Huelskamp
Buerkle Huizenga (MI)
Burgess Hultgren
Burton (IN) Hunter
Calvert Hurt
Camp Issa
Campbell Jenkins
Canseco Johnson (IL)
Cantor Johnson (OH)
Capito Johnson, Sam
Carter Jones
Cassidy Jordan
Chabot Kelly
Chaffetz King (IA)
Coble King (NY)
Coffman (CO) Kingston
Cole Kinzinger (IL)
Conaway Kline
Cravaack Labrador
Crawford Lamborn
Crenshaw Lance
Davis (KY) Landry
DeFazio Lankford
Denham Latham
Dent LaTourette
DesJarlais Latta
Diaz-Balart Lewis (CA)
Dold LoBiondo
Dreier Long
Duffy Lucas
Duncan (SC) Luetkemeyer
Duncan (TN) Lummis
Eilmers Lungren, Daniel
Emerson E.
Farenthold Mack
Fincher Manullo
Fincher Fitzpatrick Marchant
Flake Marino
Fleischmann McCarthy (CA)
Fleming McCaul
Flores McClintock
Forbes McCotter
Fortenberry McHenry
Foxy McKeon
Franks (AZ) McKinley
Frelinghuysen McMorris
Gallegly Rodgers
Gardner Meehan
Garrett Mica

- Webster Wilson (SC) Yoder
West Wittman Young (AK)
Westmoreland Wolf Young (FL)
Whitfield Womack Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

- Blackburn Giffords Reichert
Culberson Meeks Woodall

□ 1709

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1217) to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund, and pursuant to House Resolution 219, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Loeb sack moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1217 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PRESERVING PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND FOR ACTIVITIES FOR SENIORS, SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "It is the purpose" and inserting "Subject to subsection (c), it is the purpose";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "and appropriated"; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "shall" and inserting "may, to the extent and in the amounts made available for use by an appropriations Act.,"; and

(B) by striking "for prevention, wellness, and public health activities including" and all that follows through the period at the

end and inserting “for prevention, wellness, and public health activities for individuals 65 years of age or older.”.

(b) RESCISSION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated by such section 4002 before the date of the enactment of this Act, the unobligated balance is rescinded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, while I oppose the underlying bill, I am offering this final amendment on a topic that I know is important to all of us—our Nation’s seniors. Our seniors have worked hard all their lives. Many of them have lived through some of the most trying times in American history, including the Great Depression and two world wars. They have also been a part of some of our country’s proudest achievements and moments, like putting the first man on the Moon.

Along the way, our seniors have made incredible sacrifices for their families and for their country. My own grandmother helped take care of me while I was young, making sure that my siblings and I had a safe place to live and food on the table. That is why our seniors deserve the best care and treatment available as they age.

I have visited seniors all across my district in Iowa, delivering Meals on Wheels in Cedar Rapids and Muscatine, serving lunch at senior dining in Marion, and hosting events at senior centers and retirement communities like Westgate Towers in Ottumwa and Cedar County Senior Center in Tipton where this photo was taken.

One of my proudest moments in Congress in fact was when I met with a group of World War II veterans who were here from Iowa on an honor flight tour. I was privileged to thank them for their service.

When I talk to seniors in my district, I hear far too often that many of them are struggling. This is unacceptable. No senior should retire into poverty or have difficulty paying their medical bills. While we may disagree on the Republican budget, which would end Medicare as we know it, I think we can all agree that we owe seniors access to the preventive health care and public health efforts that the underlying bill would repeal. I am determined to fight for our seniors and to make sure that we keep our promises to them. That is why this final amendment will ensure that the repeal of the Prevention and Public Health Fund will not apply to prevention, wellness, and public health activities for individuals 65 years of age or older.

This funding can be used for programs that promote wellness, that empower seniors to take personal responsibility for staying healthy as they age. It can also be used for prevention, including screenings for cancer, heart disease, and Alzheimer’s disease. The fund can also be used for public health activities to ensure that seniors have the information they need to make the best possible decisions about their health. These funds can also be used for

research, so we can find ways to prevent health problems associated with aging. What’s more, by focusing on public health and prevention, this fund can reduce costs in the long run.

We all know that early detection improves patient outcomes and saves money, and successful public health campaigns have demonstrated that we can decrease unhealthy behaviors by equipping people with good information. That is why I believe the underlying bill, itself, is penny wise but pound foolish. In the long run, the underlying bill only serves to hurt the Nation’s seniors. It is unfortunate that some are choosing to make this short-sighted decision when the health of our seniors is at stake.

Madam Speaker, the American people, we should keep in mind, sent us here not to fight with each other over critical issues such as the one before us today but to fight together for them. I urge all Members to join me in ensuring that our Nation’s seniors have access to the preventive health care that will keep them healthy, allowing them to enjoy their friends and families and remain active in their communities. We owe the seniors in our districts at least that much.

The passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If the amendment is adopted, it will be incorporated into the bill and the bill will be immediately voted upon. I believe, Madam Speaker, that now is the time to show the American people that we as a body can indeed work effectively for them, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this commonsense final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation and rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The reservation is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Yesterday, we heard the House minority leader say that “elections shouldn’t matter as much as they do.”

I strongly disagree. Members were brought here to get runaway spending under control; but rather than help us avoid a fiscal crisis, House Democrats have brought forward an MTR that guts the underlying bill and continues the runaway spending that the American people have rejected.

As we have pointed out, section 4002 gives the Secretary of HHS complete discretion to spend the slush fund with little limitation. Any program within the Public Health Service Act, regardless of its merit or effectiveness, is eligible for funding under section 4002.

Will section 4002 help train doctors, or will the money be used to build jungle gyms? Will the Prevention and Public Health Fund be used to advocate for soda tax increases in States or build signs that direct people to bike paths? All of these activities can be funded through this slush fund.

This MTR underscores the major problem with section 4002. Rampant spending on the Federal credit card cannot continue. The Federal Government will be borrowing 42 cents of every Federal dollar spent from this fund. We are facing a \$1.6 trillion deficit. The President’s irresponsible budget will double the national debt from \$14 trillion to \$26 trillion. This endless spending is fiscally irresponsible and morally bankrupt. Spending today is debt that our children and grandchildren will pay tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the MTR and “yes” on the underlying bill so we can help get our fiscal house back in order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 234, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—189

Ackerman	Cummings	Johnson (GA)
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Kaptur
Baca	DeFazio	Keating
Baldwin	DeGette	Kildee
Barrow	DeLauro	Kind
Bass (CA)	Deutch	Kissell
Becerra	Dicks	Kucinich
Berkley	Dingell	Langevin
Berman	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	Larsen (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Lee (CA)
Blumenauer	Edwards	Levin
Boren	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Boswell	Engel	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Loebsack
Braley (IA)	Farr	Loftgren, Zoe
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Lowe
Butterfield	Filner	Lujan
Capps	Frank (MA)	Lynch
Capuano	Fudge	Maloney
Cardoza	Garamendi	Markey
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Matheson
Carney	Green, Al	Matsui
Carson (IN)	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McCormack
Chandler	Gutierrez	McDermott
Chu	Hanabusa	McGovern
Ciциlline	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Clarke (MI)	Heinrich	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Michaud
Clay	Himes	Miller (NC)
Cleaver	Hinchev	Miller, George
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Moore
Cohen	Hirono	Moran
Connolly (VA)	Holden	Murphy (CT)
Conyers	Holt	Nadler
Cooper	Honda	Napolitano
Costa	Hoyer	Neal
Costello	Inslie	Olver
Courtney	Israel	Owens
Critz	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Crowley	Jackson Lee	Pascarell
Cuellar	(TX)	Pastor (AZ)

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)

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

NOES—234

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

Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Culberson
Giffords
Herrera Beutler

Meeks
Reichert
Rogers (KY)

Royce
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

□ 1736

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—236

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

Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs

Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford

Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton

Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—183

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Bertram
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)

Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinches
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens

Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—13

Barton (TX)
Culberson
Fleming
Giffords
Honda

McMorris
Rodgers
Meeks
Napolitano
Noem

Reichert
Sessions
Sewell
Sullivan

□ 1743

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL GOLF DAY

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about National Golf Day. Earlier today, I attended an event and heard the story of one of our Wounded Warriors and how the sport of golf has helped him to overcome his traumatic brain injury, and learn the sport of golf even with prostheses, and how much that's helped him.

The first small business I owned happened to be a miniature golf course. I also went to high school with the late great Payne Stewart. And no, none of his golf abilities rubbed off on me, unfortunately.

Golf is a \$76 billion industry, which provides 2 million jobs in the United States. Golf courses are generally small business owner-owned golf courses. And I know the challenges small businesses face today. The estimated economic impact of the golf industry is over \$200 billion. Golf course superintendents are excellent environmental stewards of the land, and among the best in the world at knowing how to care for the Earth.

Being outdoors always improves one's quality of life. Walking just a nine-hole course can give you a 2.5-mile workout, or in my case 7 miles. It is a sport that can be played by all ages, and we should take time today to recognize National Golf Day.

ROE & ROEPER 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what started out as a small pirated radio show of two men running from the law under a bridge and turned into a successful empire today, the Roe & Roeper Show has entertained many people for a long time. Today it's reached its whole 1-year anniversary.

While many radio shows struggle to increase listenership, the majority of drive time listening Illinoisans tune in to Roe & Roeper from 2 to 6 every weekday. In addition to providing cutting-edge news, listeners tune in to hear entertaining and informative exchanges between Roe & Roeper and their callers.

But both come with a very unique and admirable trait that makes the show a success. Roe Conn has a strong level of dedication to his community, and was recently honored as the 2010 Chicago-area recipient of the FBI Director's Community Leadership Award for unwavering support of law enforcement in general. Richard Roeper is a fellow Redbird alumni of Illinois State University, and has led an outstanding career as a columnist, critic, and show host, covering topics ranging from politics to media and to entertainment.

On WLS's Roe & Roeper's 1-year anniversary, I'm honored to take this time to recognize two successful individuals who provide an outstanding show on a daily basis, but also two men whom I'm proud to call friends. Congrats, gentlemen. Here's to another year.

RECOGNIZING DR. DONALD JEANES

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a great leader, minister, and educator, Dr. Donald Jeanes, who is retiring this year as president of Milligan College in my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee.

President Jeanes is a 1968 magna cum laude graduate of Milligan College and has lived in Johnson City most of his life, first as a minister, and then as part of Milligan College. President Jeanes was inaugurated as the 14th president of Milligan College in October of 1997. Under Dr. Jeanes' leadership, Milligan College has consistently been named one of America's Best Colleges, and has experienced phenomenal growth both in terms of the physical campus as well as the courses offered.

I would like to personally thank and acknowledge Dr. Jeanes for his commitment to faith, education, and community development. I wish he and his wife, Clarinda, the very best as he prepares for his retirement from the presidency of Milligan College. I would like to say to my friend, a job well done.

LIBYA AND THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it's been 25 days since the President began kinetic military action in Libya without congressional authorization. He made this decision despite the fact that the conflict in Libya did not represent an imminent threat to the United States. Instead, the President sought the approval of the United Nations and the Arab League before taking military action, and not Congress. This sets a terrible precedent.

By seeking only U.N. approval, the President is transferring authority that should rest with the American people through their Congress, not with an international community. The U.N. resolution is nice, but it is not a substitute for congressional authorization.

Under the War Powers Resolution, the President needs to seek congressional approval within 60 days. I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that President Obama must adhere to the War Powers Resolution. Whether you call it a kinetic military action or war, this Con-

gress must authorize it. If we don't, we will be setting the precedent that we are irrelevant, and the President need only seek approval from international bodies outside of the jurisdiction of the American people.

□ 1750

HONORING KGC

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise because I had the opportunity to attend the KGC this last weekend, an event raising resources to battle depression. Depression affects over 20 million adults in our Nation. This is something that we all need to be paying more attention to.

I want to thank Chairman Bennett for his leadership. I also want to thank Kevin Haggard, Andrew Boyle, Phil Furse and Tom Joyce for their generous contributions to the event. I also want to extend my heartfelt thanks to Andrew Boyle for his leadership for next year's event.

THE BUDGET AND THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today we have seen a remarkable event here on floor of the House. During this discussion that's so critically important to this Nation about the deficit and how we are going to deal with our budget, this House passed a bill that will actually increase the deficit, a bill passed today with the support of the Republicans to repeal a provision in the Affordable Health Care Act that will keep Americans healthy.

Healthy Americans don't need medical care, and I suppose the idea of the Republicans here is that they ought to get sick. You take a look at the wellness issue, part of the Affordable Care Act, it provided for numerous activities specifically designed to keep Americans healthy: blood pressure screening for adults, programs for children to avoid obesity, public health programs for vaccination so that our children and, indeed, our adults don't get sick. All of these programs in the wellness portion of the Affordable Care Act would be repealed by the action that the Republicans just voted on not more than a half-hour ago.

What in the world is going on here? What's this all about? Is it some sort of ideological spiritual thing to do what is not very smart?

The Affordable Health Care Act, which they like to call ObamaCare, has many, many provisions in it specifically designed to reduce the cost of

medical care in America. If you are going to deal with the deficit, and we all talk about it here, you have got to deal with the cost of Medicare.

How do you deal with the cost of Medicare? Well, you deal with it by reducing the likelihood that seniors will get sick. You deal with it by reducing high blood pressure in seniors so they don't have strokes. One of the most expensive things that the senior population will endure is a stroke. It's not just the immediate medical care; it's the long-term effect of a stroke. So when we go out and we try to have seniors and those soon to be seniors have blood pressure checks, we reduce the cost of medical care in America. But I guess the Republicans don't see it that way.

They also see it in another way, and that is somehow they believe that we can reduce the cost of medical care in the Federal budget by terminating Medicare. It is unbelievable that the Republican budget would terminate medical care for seniors by terminating Medicare, a program that was started in 1964 to deal with the specific problem that seniors had at that period, and that was the inability to afford medical services. They would literally be into bankruptcy and poverty because they couldn't pay for their medical care.

So, in 1964, Lyndon Baines Johnson and the Democrats in this House and the Senate passed Medicare, one of the foundations of support for the senior population in this Nation. And yet in the Republican budget that will be on this floor later this week is the repeal of Medicare, the termination of it.

So I suppose this is the new way we ought to look at this issue. It's a tombstone. And what it is, it said, Medicare, 1965 to 2011, created by LBJ, destroyed by the GOP. Unbelievable.

Fortunately, today, when President Obama spoke to the Nation, he addressed this issue, and I will paraphrase what he said. He says it more as a professor. I guess I will just say it as a street fighter from California: No way, no how will, in his Presidency, Medicare be terminated.

Are you listening my friends on the Republican side? The President said "no." We are not going down the path of terminating Medicare.

And I know that my caucus, the Democratic Caucus, will stand there with the President. We will fight any attempt any time, anyplace, anywhere that you or anybody else will put before this House a proposal to terminate Medicare. We will not allow it, and thankfully the President has the veto pen. He ought to go back and pull out the pen that LBJ used to sign the Medicare law in 1965 and put it to paper should, somehow, the Republican budget arrive on his desk with the termination of Medicare in it. It should not happen. It cannot happen. We cannot subject our seniors to the kind of poverty that existed prior to the implementation of Medicare in the 1960s.

This is something that we will stand and fight on.

The President had also said today, as he laid out his solution for a \$4 trillion reduction in the deficit, do not terminate Medicare and don't privatize Social Security. Laying it down. Not a line in the sand, but clearly a mark on the concrete. Social Security will not be privatized during his watch.

Thank you, Mr. President. And you know this, that the Democratic Caucus in this House will stand firmly with you, and we will fight every, every bill, every proposal to privatize Social Security.

Now, we know there is a budget problem. We know that there is a deficit problem here in the United States, and we know that it has to be addressed. The President has laid out two chapters in the Democratic proposal to deal with the deficit.

In his State of the Union speech, he made it clear that Federal expenditures needed to be frozen over the next 5 years, and today he took another step recommending specific reductions in various Federal programs, all to the good, and we will stand there with him and we will work on reducing those Federal expenditures.

For me, I have got one in mind, about \$120 billion a year that we could save, \$120 billion a year. Now, that's four times, three and a half times what is in the Republican continuing resolution that will be on floor this week.

How do you find \$120 billion a year? End the war in Afghanistan. End the war in Afghanistan. Bring the troops home. Bring the money home. Balance our budget. Use that to solve the deficit, or spend that money on building those roads, those facilities here in the United States.

□ 1800

Let's talk about the deficit for a moment. Oh, yes. If you're going to talk about the deficit, you really ought to understand where the deficit came from. It didn't just come out of the blue this year. It didn't just appear during the Obama administration. The deficit is something that has built up over a long period of time here in the United States. When they say the deficit is \$14 trillion and is going to increase, well, it's not if the President and the Democrats get their way. It will actually be reduced by \$4 trillion.

However, as to the current deficit, where did it come from? From where did it magically appear? Who left us with huge deficits?

Let's take a look. Here are the facts. This fellow over here, you may recognize him. He is Ronald Reagan. At the end of every year, the Congressional Budget Office makes an estimate of what is going to happen over the next 10 years. At the end of the Ronald Reagan period, his last year in office, the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, made an estimate of the Federal budget situation. Where's the deficit?

They estimated that, in the next 10 years, Ronald Reagan's budget and the programs that were put into effect during his period would create a \$1.4 trillion deficit.

Now, those of you who are familiar with the history of the United States would know that George H. W. Bush—the senior—followed Ronald Reagan. At the end of his 4 years in office, again, the Congressional Budget Office made an estimate. It estimated, should the Bush-Reagan policies go forward, the deficit would be \$3.3 trillion in the out years.

Then along came Bill Clinton. In the first 4 years of his administration, Bill Clinton put in place, if extended forward, policies that would deal with the deficit, such things as PAYGO—a word that's common in Washington, but I'm sure, out there in the great American public, people have no idea what "PAYGO" is. "PAYGO" was the law during the Clinton administration. It required that any bill passed by Congress had to be paid for with either higher taxes or cuts in some other program. In other words, it could not create a deficit. It could not add to the deficit.

There were other programs put in place, part of which I was responsible for implementing, and that was the re-inventing of government. I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior during those years, and we were told by the Clinton administration's Office of Management and Budget that you will reduce the expenditures of the Department of the Interior, and you will continue to do the same things. Only, you will do them better. Effective and efficient government. We reduced the number of employees in the Department of the Interior during those first 4½ to 5 years by some 15,000 people—from 90,000 to 75,000 people. We performed all of the previous services as well and, in many cases, better. So it is possible to be efficient and effective in this process.

Anyway, Bill Clinton is now President, and he puts all of these policies in place. At the end of his Presidency, the Congressional Budget Office did what it always does, which is to produce an estimate of what would happen in the next 10 years if the same policies were to continue. Guess what would happen. What would happen is a \$5.6 trillion surplus, enough to wipe out all of the American debt—no debt, no interest payments, everything paid off.

However, Bill Clinton was followed by George W. Bush, and immediately, in the very first year of the Bush administration, the Clinton-period policies, some of which were voted on by Republicans as well as Democrats, were terminated. Massive tax cuts were put in place not only in year one but in year two. Two wars were started—the Afghanistan war and the Iraq war—neither of which were paid for. It was the first time in American history that wars were not paid for but were, rather, borrowed. Who did we borrow the

money from? China. From other foreign countries? Yes.

Anyway, you now had two massive tax cuts, two wars, and then the Medicare drug program, which was about \$700 billion a year—not paid for but, rather, borrowed, not for 1 year but for every year on into the future.

Thirdly, there was a whole set of policies where the government simply stepped back and let Wall Street do whatever it wanted to do. What it wanted to do was to engage in reckless profiteering, resulting in 2007 and 2008 with the crash of the American economy, with the Wall Street crash of 2008, bringing the American economy to its knees, to the greatest recession since the Great Depression. Those policies added up to this rather massive red zone here of \$11.5 trillion of deficit, estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which projected in the next 10 years, if the same policies continued, an \$11.5 trillion deficit.

President Obama came into office in January of 2009. The day he arrived in office, the budget had a \$1.3 trillion hole in it. He didn't create it, but he had to deal with it—a \$1.3 trillion deficit handed to him by George W. Bush and his policies.

That's the history. Now we're trying to dig ourselves out of that hole. Properly said, when you're in a hole, stop digging. A wise policy. The President couldn't do that, and this Congress couldn't do that in the face of the most serious financial and economic crisis this Nation had faced since the Great Depression. So the stimulus bill was enacted, some \$750 billion, and it worked. Despite all the rhetoric, the economists looking at that today, in the cool memory of the stimulus bill, said it worked; it saved this economy; it saved this Nation.

Every other industrialized country in the world did the exact same thing—stimulated their economies. Together, the American and the international economies were stabilized, and we began to slowly grow out of that great recession. We're not out of it yet. We've got to put in place policies that end the deficit, and that's precisely what the President talked about today.

The Republicans have put a proposal before us, and we'll vote on it this week, but it is not a proposal that will help America retain its eminence as the most dynamic, the most creative, the most innovative, and the most successful economy in the world, because of the policies that are in it. It will terminate Medicare, and it will significantly reduce those programs that create future economic growth.

I would like to just take a deep breath now and turn it over to my colleague from the great northeastern part of the United States.

PETER, would you join us and carry on this discussion.

Mr. WELCH. Yes, thank you. I appreciate your historical perspective on it.

There are really two things that I want to address. Number one: What are

the policies that were part of getting us to that \$11.5 trillion deficit? Number two: What do we need to do now in order to get to fiscal balance?

The two policies were, one, a war of choice where the Pentagon in its activities was not subject to the same scrutiny of actually having to pay as you go, so the cost of the war in Iraq was \$1 trillion. The war in Afghanistan, as you mentioned, started out as a mission to dislodge Osama bin Laden. It was transformed into nation-building.

□ 1810

And no matter how necessary or debatable either of those events were, those wars were, you do have to pay for it. It's not as though because it's in the name of national security it can be exempt from fiscal responsibility. In fact, what's unusual is that this is the first time in the history of our country where we have been at war where we actually haven't asked for shared sacrifice by the taxpayers, but we've made the entire burden be borne by our military. So we've got to pay; and we didn't do it, as you pointed out.

The second is the theory that's being advanced by many that if you cut taxes, it will create wealth and create jobs. In some places and some times and in some circumstances that will work. In fact, many standard economists say that in a recession, it's the time to cut taxes, not raise them. But the more that is focused on the middle class who are struggling—especially in a down economic time—to pay their bills, if they get a tax cut, they have discretionary income or they have income liberated, that money is going to go right back into the economy. But every tax cut does not generate jobs, and many tax cuts end up adding significantly to the deficit.

The President Bush tax cut in 2001 and the President Bush tax cut in 2003 added \$2.3 billion to the deficit. So you have a Pentagon that is not subject to pay-as-you-go and you have tax cuts that don't pay for themselves. Those are two major contributing factors to that \$11.5 trillion deficit on the heels of a \$5.6 trillion surplus. The debate we are having now in this House is enormously consequential to the future. Republicans won this last election, and a major argument they made is that we've got to get spending under control. They're right. I agree with that. We have to get to fiscal balance.

The challenge is if we're going to get there, do we need a plan that repeats those two policies of the Bush administration, namely, keeping the Pentagon off the table and increasing tax cuts, particularly to the high end, but keeping off the table Pentagon savings, keeping off the table eliminating tax loopholes and keeping off the table the question of revenues?

Democrats, in my view, have to be willing to come forward and say, look, the programs that we have been strong supporters of have to be re-examined, we have to reform them, we have to

make them more efficient; and if they are not working, we have to acknowledge that and move on. We have to do our share. The President's proposal that would freeze domestic spending for 5 years is pretty dramatic, but many Democrats would be willing to support tough medicine as long as the plan had on the table other things that are major contributors to the fiscal situation we're in. That's, of course, revenues; that's, of course, the Pentagon; and that's, of course, tax loopholes in the tax system.

We can get from where we are to where we need to be. We saw that in recent years when it happened under President Clinton. Again, as you pointed out, in those years, Tax Codes matter; but in the Clinton years when we had higher tax rates, we created 20 million jobs. In the Bush years when we had lower tax rates, we created 600,000 jobs. And also incomes were increasing.

So this has to be reviewed by this body, in my view, as a practical problem for us to solve, not an ideological argument that every tax cut is going to be beneficial anymore than every spending program is going to be beneficial. You have to apply judgment to the situation at hand. The big challenge for us is restoring the fiscal balance.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me thank my colleague from Vermont, PETER WELCH, for this presentation on the tax policy. I think we probably would want to stay with that a few moments. I know my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO) is here, and perhaps you would like to opine and to share with us your thoughts on these issues of the budget and how we can deal with the deficit.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI. And I compliment Representative WELCH for what I believe is a balanced approach to how to solve the deficit situation, the debt situation, and certainly how do we move forward with a sound budget that can invest in America at a time when other nations are investing in a clean-energy, innovation economy. We don't have the luxury to just hone in on deficit, or budget carving here that solely relies on impacts through domestic program cuts on our middle class families, our working families and the poor.

What we have seen here is trillions' worth of cuts to domestic programs, impacting the ability to pay utility bills, impacting the ability to perhaps send your adult child off to college, to dream the American Dream, to own a home and to have an affordable home budget. All of these items are at risk here. We're putting people most vulnerable at risk. We have seen almost a flat curve for the growth in household income across America, just a slight bump upward, while we've seen an exponential rise in corporate executive salaries, in millionaire and billionaire wealth. That's where the growth has been.

The recovery here has seen that happening with a downward spiral, a downward mobile quality to the comeback of our efforts here in this country. So it is important for us to make certain that there is a balance here, that we're calling upon all tools in the toolkit to make it all happen.

And this chart absolutely tells a story. Over the last 40 years, middle class wages have stagnated while millionaires and billionaires have trumped all by 256 percent.

Now, this tells a story. When people are talking about not wanting to visit a fairness in tax policy here, when we have seen the anger in America expressed via the many, many households that the great multitudes of people in this country are portrayed in the middle class, they are the population that have expressed anger, and rightfully so, that anger has got to be addressed through fairness in tax policy, through an across-the-board impact of solution here that will enable us to do what's fair and do what's correct.

I watch the savings that they talk about here with the Republican plan. The Republicans will talk about the huge amounts of savings that they produce all through cuts on the domestic programs, again impacting working families, the poor and the middle class. Well, those aren't savings because in order to be savings, they might be in a locked box or assumed to go after relieving the deficit. But instead, they take these trillions in like amounts and provide tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires and corporations and still continue to hand out mindlessly the subsidies to big oil companies. This is what is so most egregious about this budget.

Instead of working towards a balance that looks at revenues, that looks at the domestic programs that require investment, no, they are going pell-mell into an all-out attack on the middle class. That's wrong. And also in the outcome as they slide programs, assistance and investments to middle class America, as they slide it over to the millionaire, billionaire, corporate and big oil companies crowd, that community, what happens in the interim? With this Republican plan for a budget, we grow debt by \$8 trillion.

So where have we gained here? This sounds like a repeat of the pre-recession years where we were not acknowledging fairness in revenues, where we were allowing for a falling apart of the system. At the same time we took the watchdog out of the equation on the financial sector on Wall Street. We allowed for working families' portfolios of investments to go to ruination where we lost \$2.8 trillion in accumulated wealth on 401(k)s and various other investment materials. And this is what happened: we destroyed the economy, and now we're going to repeat history, history of the worst kind.

Let's pick up on the history of the best kind. Let's pick up on investing in jobs as we did in the FDR years where

we came out of tough economic times and people knew the dignity of work and we saw projects built across America, not the trickle-down theory that didn't work during the Reagan administration and the trickle-down theory that didn't work during the second Bush Presidency. It just didn't happen.

And my question is, I can't help but rhetorically ask, why would we revisit that kind of scenario again knowing that we're just crawling out of the recession and we're growing private sector jobs to the tune of \$2 million in just over a year? Why would we disrupt that progress? I ask, why would we disrupt that?

Representative GARAMENDI, I think it is great that we're bringing this information to the forefront here and allowing it to be exchanged with the people that we serve day in and day out who have expressed, rightfully, the anger about the onus, the burden and the unnecessary pain that has been placed upon households of modest annual income means.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The chart that you and I shared a moment ago is up here next to me; and it clearly shows that we have seen a middle class in America that has seen very, very little progress over the last two decades and, instead, an enormous shift of wealth and income to the top 1 or 2 percent of the Nation.

□ 1820

There has been a 256 percent increase in income to the very wealthy, and as I said, it trumps all of the income gains by the rest of the economy. Those at the bottom saw maybe a 10 to 11 percent increase. The rest, very, very little.

I look up and I see my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Thank you for joining us. We talked earlier today about the upcoming debt limit. Please join with us and share with us your thoughts on what we are doing here, what we shouldn't be doing, or should be doing.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your leadership and your focusing on the issues that face us.

Having spent hours in the Budget Committee so far this Congress, I must admit that I was shocked and surprised with the profoundly negative approach that is being taken by my good friend, PAUL RYAN, the chair of the Budget Committee and my Republican friends.

First of all, there is in essence a refusal to zero in on the three areas of greatest increase in the budget. We see repeated charts that talk about Medicare going through the roof over the next 50 years. And it is true. We need to get Medicare spending under control because the past path is not sustainable. But ironically what is ignored is that the approach that is being offered by the Republicans in their budget actually ignores the major provisions that have been placed in statute now that would actually reduce the rate of Medicare spending in the future.

We have taken every significant, independently verified promising initiative to bend that cost curve, and they have been stripped away. We watched Republicans attack Democrats because there were provisions to be able to make a difference with Medicare spending, claiming it would somehow slash Medicare for senior citizens by a half-trillion dollars. Well, Congressman GARAMENDI, you and I come from areas of the country that actually have been able to reduce health care costs, they are below the national average, and in both areas we actually have higher performance; better health care, less cost. If the rest of America practiced medicine the way it is practiced in our two communities, there would not be a Medicare crisis.

What we have done with the reform act was embed those notions to be able to provide incentives to reward value over volume, not just pay for procedures. To be able to have accountable care organizations, bundling of services, to actually have some financial disincentives for unnecessary hospital readmissions. All of these, the experts tell us, could save over \$1.2 trillion over the next 20 years. And, in fact, if we had the courage to actually improve and accelerate and enhance, there are greater savings because the doctors, the nurses, the hospitals in our two communities have proven that it is possible. But our Republican friends have simply decided to turn their back on that. They are going to take the Medicare savings and spend it for tax cuts for people who need it the least.

I can't help but turn back to you because you have an interesting chart there on the floor that may say it all.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, and let's just do a colloquy here back and forth. You've talked about ways in which we can bend the cost curve for health care for all Americans, not only those on Medicare. It was in the Affordable Care Act, the health care reform. Our Republican friends like to call it ObamaCare because it actually would reduce the cost of medical services for everybody, whether you are in Medicare or Kaiser or anywhere else. And you mentioned four very, very important ways it does it. One is hospital readmissions, otherwise known as hospital infections. Our former colleague a week ago likely died of a hospital infection. The Affordable Care Act places a heavy burden on hospitals that have a high infection rate, or readmissions. It is a very, very expensive, deadly situation. It is just one of several ways in which the Affordable Care Act reduced over time the cost of medical services.

You were here on the floor. I voted "no," you voted "no" on a bill that Republicans forced through this House that eliminates wellness. What in the world was that all about? Why would you ever eliminate wellness: obesity, blood pressure, proper eating, nutrition, public health, vaccinations—all of these things to keep people healthy. Healthy people don't cost money. They

don't run up the price of medical services. So they want to repeal that, and I'm going, that makes no sense at all. You are actually increasing the deficit by doing that. And then they take it to the ultimate step of terminating Medicare.

This has become my favorite. It's the tombstone for Medicare. In the Republican budget is a proposal that would terminate Medicare for all Americans who are less than 55 years of age today. If you are 65, maybe it would continue on. But if you look at the totality of their proposal, it is the termination of Medicare and this is what we have. "Medicare, 1965 to 2011, created by LBJ, destroyed by the GOP." Unbelievable. And along with it, a significant reduction in Medicaid, which in California we call Medi-Cal.

Your expertise, Mr. BLUMENAUER, on the health care issue and the experience in Oregon on how we can reduce the cost of medical care needs to be heard by every Member of this House. So if you would continue on and share with us this issue of medical services and how we can reduce the cost, save Medicare, and simultaneously addressing the deficit.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Your point is well taken in terms of what they would do terminating Medicare as we know it for everybody under 55 years of age. We are talking about over 230 million Americans. And as a result of this, it is clear, you can look at the Congressional Budget Office, other independent experts, it is not going to reduce the cost of health care. In fact, it is going to increase the cost of health care in America. But what it does is it is going to put an ever-increasing burden on elderly Americans. It is going to have a gap because ultimately they are not going to enable people to have Medicare until they are 67. They are going to have a small voucher that is given to the insurance company. Bear in mind the reason that LBJ and the Democratic Congress in 1965 enacted Medicare was because America's elderly could not get good insurance coverage that was comprehensive and affordable. Senior citizens, like it or not, are older. They are frailer. They are less healthy than younger Americans, and they are not working as much. They don't have the income. They need help. Now, our Republican friends would lead us to believe that all of a sudden there will be a private insurance market, which by the way sounds suspiciously like the exchanges that they said were bad in the health reform act, and they would force people into them, but they would have decreasing premium support.

□ 1830

I think it is also appropriate to just reflect for a moment about what happens to the 78 million geezer baby boomers who are 55 or older who will be under Medicare. That's going to continue for years. It's going to be increasingly inefficient. It appears as though

there are some extra costs that are embedded for existing and soon-to-be future Medicare recipients that are going to continue to distort, drive up costs, and, of course, nationally we're all going to pay more for the privilege.

I would suggest this tombstone is something that people should consider carefully, because it's going to mean, I sincerely believe, not just the death of Medicare but it is going to provide profound shifts and dislocations within our health care system, hurt the providers, and provide less effective health care for our elderly citizens.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let me add to that and carry on a little piece of it.

The Republican budget, which we will be voting on here on the floor of Congress in the next 2 days, has provisions that are equally harmful to seniors and to wannabe seniors, people who want to get to be 65 or 67 years of age, and these are the Medicaid reductions.

In the proposal that the Republicans will bring to this floor, the Road to Ruin proposal, is a block grant to the States for Medicaid services. In California, we call it Medi-Cal. This is a program that provides benefits to the poor and those who cannot afford medical services because they are severely disabled, mentally disabled, or seniors that cannot afford services in nursing homes. The block grant is less than what is now available to nearly every State, and it is scheduled to be reduced in the years ahead, the purpose of which is presumably to deal with the deficit, but what it does is it takes that whole population of seniors, current seniors, and others who are currently served by the Medicaid program and puts them at risk. The effect will be to throw seniors out of nursing homes, seniors that are on Medicaid or Medi-Cal in California. It is the most onerous and hardhearted proposal I have yet seen. These are people that are in desperate need of services, services for the mentally ill, services for the severely disabled, services for seniors who are in nursing homes and who cannot afford the cost of nursing homes. That's another part of this provision in the budget.

What is happening here is a shift, a shift of costs from the overall American economy in the Federal budget to the individuals, not to the wealthy, not to those who have income, but rather to those who have so little. And it's not the only shift that's occurring.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we could just follow up on this for a moment, because you are talking about something that ought to concern each and every citizen. Medicaid. In your State Medi-Cal. We've had the Oregon health plan. There are other States that have variations on that. It provides health care, as you say, for our most vulnerable populations: the elderly, disabled, extremely poor people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And the young.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is very cost effective. There are complaints that

the benefits under Medicaid are actually very low, and it's hard for physicians and hospitals, medical providers, to deal with this. But by moving to a block grant that, as you say, it is designed to go down over time. And unlike the current system, which is sort of countercyclical, where the Federal Government has given more money in times of distress, which it's done to your State and my State in the last 2 years. If we hadn't got the extra payments from the Federal Government to help with Medicaid, I can't imagine what shape people would have been in in Sacramento and Salem, Oregon. The legislature would have just melted down. What this proposal is, is to continue this ratcheting down, no benefits when times are tough, and put States in a situation where too often they are either unable, or in the case of some States, unwilling to react. It's going to have a cascading effect.

You mentioned the problem that's very likely to emerge with people being literally tossed out of nursing homes. This is something that Americans need to step back and look at what is being designed as part of this very pessimistic road map that is going to have very serious negative consequences.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you for that.

I am going to shift to another very, very important part of the Republican budget proposal, and that is their total unwillingness to deal with the reality of the revenues that the Federal Government needs in order to continue to provide all of the multitude of services that are part of a modern society: everything from defense to homeland security as well as the medical and social services that we have been talking about.

I'm going to put this up, it's a little cute, but I think it pretty much illustrates one of the profound problems in the Republican budget.

"What Do They All Have in Common?" We've got the unicorn over there, we have Bugs Bunny, and then we have this thing that says the corporate tax rate, 35 percent, large corporations like Exxon. It's a fallacy. Large corporations and small corporations in America don't pay 35 percent corporate income tax. In fact, if one were to take a look at Exxon, in 2008 they had the largest profit of any company in the world. In 2009, they had a profit of about \$19 billion and their effective tax rate, how much they actually paid in taxes, was zero. Not 35 percent. Not 30 percent. Not 25, not 20, not 15, not 10, but zero.

Now it happens that they're not the only corporation. The Republican proposal actually would make this situation worse. It would take this 35 percent and reduce it to 25 percent.

What are we talking about here? Why would we want to do that? Apparently they want to do that because they want to take their savings, Medicare, by terminating Medicare, Medicaid, by

reducing Medicaid and all of the other savings, the savings that they presume they're going to get from abolishing the wellness programs, high blood pressure screenings and so forth, and on and on and on, and give it to the corporations.

Let's understand that American corporations currently get a tax break for sending American jobs overseas. American corporations currently get a tax break for oil drilling. The oil industry in the United States is the most profitable industry in the world. We just talked about ExxonMobil. All of the other oil companies in the last 10 years have had a profit of \$947 billion, just under \$1 trillion. Yet they continue to receive tax breaks in the order of \$12 billion to \$15 billion a year, of our tax money, handed over to the oil companies at a time when they are now charging us over \$4 a gallon for gasoline.

And what is that all about? Well, it's all about the ability of the oil industry to maintain a subsidy, a tax break out of the American taxpayer's pocket, handed over to the oil company, and they've had that subsidy for nearly a century. I'm saying, enough of that. Bring that money back into the Treasury, use it for green energy, solar, wind, renewable energy, for research, use it for the things that we need to do, including reducing the deficit. But oh, no. Oh, no. They don't want to do that. Our Republican colleagues want to continue to give to the oil industry the kind of tax breaks that they have.

If that's not enough, our Republican colleagues want to make sure that this fellow, Donald Trump, he wants to be President, probably to maintain the extraordinary tax break that he presently has. The Republicans want to reduce the taxes for Donald Trump and for other billionaires, millionaires, from 35 percent to 25 percent.

□ 1840

You go, why should we do that at a time when we're taking money away from seniors, at a time when we're forcing the middle class to pay more, at a time when you're shifting the cost of all of these services to the middle class, at a time when you're going after the unions and trying to destroy the union movement in America? Why in the world would you give Donald Trump, why would you give billionaires, why would you give those people at the very tiptop of the American economy, those people that now control over 25 percent of all of the wealth in America, the top 1 percent of wage earners in America, why would you give them, not a 10 percent, it's about a 17 percent reduction in their taxes? It makes no sense at all.

We talk about shared sacrifice. The Republican budget proposal that will be on this floor later this week will not be shared sacrifice. It is, in fact, giving to the top of the American heap of all taxpayers, of all wealth, even more. I suppose it must be the trickle-down

theory, that if these folks, if Donald Trump and the other billionaires and millionaires have more money, somehow jobs will be created. The fact is it doesn't work. Don't believe me. Take a look at the American economy from 2001 to 2009, the George W. Bush period.

George W. Bush started the first very year of his Presidency with massive tax cuts that created a 2-plus trillion dollar deficit and very few jobs. During the Clinton period, we ended with a \$5.3 trillion surplus and the creation of over 22 million jobs, and the tax rate for Mr. Trump and for other millionaires and billionaires was 39 percent. It is, in fact, the history of America's economy that proves that you're not going to create more jobs by reducing the taxes for Mr. Trump and the like.

So what do these things have in common: a unicorn, Bugs Bunny, and the corporate tax rate of 35 percent? They are all fictional, every one of them.

I want to move now to another subject. I'll make this my last, and I'll make it kind of quick. If we're going to grow the American economy, we have to make the critical investments that are the foundation of economic growth in any and every country. Whether you are Singapore, whether you are China or any of the European countries, France or Britain, the United Kingdom or the United States, there are fundamental investments that the society has to make, and many of these investments are made through the general public's government. Let me just turn to those investments.

This is part of our Make It in America agenda, the Democratic agenda of rebuilding the great American manufacturing base. If America is going to make it, we must make it in America. We have to rebuild the manufacturing base of America. We can do it, but it's going to take critical investments. I want to just point them out here as we go through this and then compare these to the Republican proposal, the budget proposal that we're going to be voting on.

The first one is trade. Now, the Republican proposal doesn't deal with trade and goods because they're not going to do any more harm to it, but this is a fair trade policy. This is a policy of trade where we do not give away our manufacturing industry to places like China. I am sick and tired of going into Target or any other store in America and finding "Made in China," "Made in Europe," made everywhere but in America. Enough of that. We need to see "Made in America" once again on the store shelves in America.

In California, the California government—not my responsibility, I wasn't responsible for it at the time—when they go out and they build a new bridge from Oakland to San Francisco, a multibillion-dollar bridge, and they buy steel from China because it's 10 percent cheaper, I'm going, Stop it. Stop it. And so today, in the Resources Committee, I introduced an amendment.

Now it's "Drill, baby, drill." It's our Republican colleagues who want to drill anywhere and everywhere and all the time. I think it's the wrong thing to do. We need to move to renewables. But if we're going to drill, then why don't we drill with American-made equipment? Why don't we require that those drilling rigs, those pipes, those technologies, the drill bits, the blowout preventers be made in America? I introduced that amendment. The Republicans brushed it aside saying they didn't want to go that way. Okay, fine. But we need, on trade policy, to make sure that our trade policy does not disadvantage American manufacturers.

Taxes. I just talked about taxes. Why in the world would the Republicans vote against a tax policy that actually is now law? We passed this last December. Why would they vote against a tax policy that would reduce—nearly eliminate—the tax breaks that American corporations get when they send jobs offshore? Why would you vote against that tax break that American corporations have? I don't understand it. It's over, at least partially over, there's more that needs to be done, and my Democratic colleagues and I are asking our Republican colleagues to work with us to eliminate the rest of those tax breaks that American corporations get when they send jobs overseas.

We talked about some other issues here. For example, last December, the Democrats pushed through, Obama signed a bill that allowed American corporations and businesses to write off 100 percent year one—this year—100 percent of capital investment so that we encourage American manufacturers to invest in America so that they can be more productive.

Energy policy, extremely important. We cannot any longer put our economy and our national security at risk to foreign oil producers. So I guess part of the "Drill, baby, drill" is to try to deal with that, but that's not going to solve the problem. We need additional and new energy sources, and that's where the green energy, the future energy comes in.

Don't take it from me. Talk to our American military. Talk to the Navy, the Air Force, the Army. They think way ahead, and they know that they cannot depend upon oil. They need to move to other sources of energy. They did it years ago. They had wind on their ships. Then they went to coal. Then they went to oil. They are now using nuclear power. But they also know that many of their pieces of equipment—a jet airplane isn't going to have a nuclear reactor. So they want to free themselves from the grip of the petro dictators around the world and they want to be able to have energy made here in America. This is biofuels, advanced biofuels of all kinds.

We ought to follow the lead of our military here, and we must create energy projects that provide us with clean renewable energy, whether it's

nuclear or the green energy: solar, wind, biofuels and geothermal, all the rest. So energy policy becomes extremely important.

Labor. It turns out, if one were to look at American economic history, you would be able to track the rise of labor in the thirties, forties, fifties and sixties tracking perfectly with the rise of the middle class in America. So as labor became more predominant in America, we saw the American middle class grow right along with the labor movement.

Beginning in the 1970s, we saw the decline of the labor movement. If you track the decline of the labor movement, you will find the decline of the American middle class tracking perfectly with the decline of the labor movement. Now we find all across the Midwest—in Wisconsin and Ohio—a major movement to take yet another shot at labor, to weaken labor or to destroy labor. In the process, you will find the further decline of the middle class of America should they succeed at that.

But this is more than just the labor movement. This is preparing the American worker to be competitive in a modern economy. This is education. This is job training. These are programs to retrain and to bring into the workplace workers who are prepared to deal with the modern machinery and the modern equipment that a well-placed and well-executed economy must have.

I want to move to the next one, which is, in fact, education. Earlier today, I met with the President of California State University, East Bay, part of my district in California.

□ 1850

And the president, Mohamoyad Qayoumi, who happens to be an Afghan, was talking about programs that they're putting in place in the East Bay of California, San Francisco Bay, to encourage the education of children—modern technology, using iPhones, using techniques in computer technology—so that the kids who are into these things in a big way will be able to learn, not going out and buying expensive textbooks every year that are out of date the next year, but rather to use online publications and be able to bring to the students all of the world.

I was going home last weekend, and I got a call from my wife. She said, Can you find a light bulb for the projector? It's out. We need a light bulb for the projector. I said, I just got off the airplane. I don't know what I'm going to do.

I got online, I punched up my Safari, and I looked for light bulbs. In a matter of moments, I found, not too far from the airport, a photo shop that had the light bulb.

The whole world is here. The whole world is available for a student who's just curious. You cannot help but be curious. All you need to do is get on-

line, and you can find out everything about the world around us, anything you're into with science, and it turns out that this little piece of equipment, according to President Qayoumi, is also a tool for the teacher. The test can be taken on this. And in taking that test, the teacher immediately knows what the student does not know. And so the next day in class that could be dealt with.

I think I'm running out of time here, and I'm going to finish very, very quickly with intellectual property. This is the transition of all of the research into the manufacturing sector. Make It in America. We have to do this. We can do this if we have the right policies in place.

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

FEDERALISM

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the topic of enduring consequence. Last month, the members of the Constitution Caucus came to the floor to commend limited government as the guardian of human dignity. Tonight, we would like to continue that conversation by discussing one of the indispensable pillars of limited government. America's guarantee of limited government and her bulwark of liberty can be attributed to Federalism.

Federalism is the subject which we often forget here in Washington, D.C. I believe this is a tragic irony because our great Nation is the birthplace of this truly revolutionary political concept. Federalism is not an abstract philosophy. Simply, it is the separation of power between the Federal Government and State governments. It is one of the cornerstones of our American experiment in self-government.

It was unheard of before the American founding and unfortunately is all but forgotten today.

Until our Founding Fathers devised our unique system of government, nations around the globe were dedicated to the faulty idea that power or sovereignty was indivisible. The great wisdom of the American founding was to reject this notion and build a robust government with a system that carefully divided power on two different levels.

Yes, we are most familiar with the separation of three branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial; but too many in Washington have forgotten that there is another division in government—the division between States and Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have one of the greatest documents to govern our country that has existed for over 200 years and has been one of the documents that has guided so many Ameri-

cans and people across this country into personal responsibility, to the ability to take opportunities that we have been granted in this country.

The 10th Amendment sums up this structural integrity of the Constitution and the dual sovereignty of the Federal and State governments. The 10th Amendment says this: "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."

As a former State legislator, I've seen this and been very frustrated at times as a State legislator in the powers that the Federal Government continues to assume and is basically overreaching the responsibilities and the powers of the State government. Federalism, as you know, was a huge debate and discussion as part of the founding of our great Nation back when our Founding Fathers were discussing what should be in the Constitution.

During the debate over States' rights and Federalism, there needs to be a balance between what the States are responsible for and what the Federal Government is responsible for. And our Constitution lays those responsibilities out and defines those responsibilities very clearly.

I believe it's very important for us, as Congress and Congressmen and Congresswomen, to refamiliarize ourselves with our Constitution and realize that the boundaries that have been laid out by our Founding Fathers are well defined. And the intent and the vision that was laid out is one that is still applicable today.

I believe that the Federal Government continues to overreach as to those boundaries—whether it's massive spending, whether it's an overreach in our health care bill that just passed last year, whether it's the stimulus package which the Federal Government is now assuming the responsibility to stimulate our economy rather than trusting in the American people.

It does not add anything to the Constitution that was not already there in its structure, but in making the principle of Federalism more explicit, the 10th Amendment underscores the importance of Federalism.

To see Federalism succeed, we must hold faith in the integrity of the Constitution. A living document is just an empty vessel. Federalism is neglected when politicians make the Constitution a blank slate for the dominant political trends.

As James Madison wrote in Federalist Number 45: "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite."

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read again the 10th Amendment of our 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.”

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd submit to you that many of the programs that the Federal Government currently not only operates but also is proposing under several different bills over the past several years really are overreaching into the State governments' responsibilities and also into what they are fully capable of doing.

Many times the frustration that we had of dealing with Medicaid and the mandates that were handed down to the States were tying the hands of our State governments.

Coming from the State of Indiana, I'm very proud of what has been accomplished because of those who respect not only the simple economics of balancing budgets and realizing that you can't spend more money than what you have, but as a member of the Indiana House of Representatives of 2005, I worked with our Governor and our Senate to see that Indiana passed its first balanced budget in 8 years.

As we've discussed repeatedly here in Congress already, what about balanced budgets, what about the responsibility of making sure that we do not spend more money than what we have? Our Federal Government just closed its budget with a \$1.5 trillion deficit, and that's hard to imagine that we could actually spend that much more money than what we take in. Any Hoosier family knows that once that line at the bottom of the checkbook hits red, there's a problem, and we need to reevaluate what we are currently doing in our spending and our income.

□ 1900

Either you start cutting spending or you start increasing your income. As we all know with the difficult economic times that we're in, increasing income is not always as easy as we would like it to be. So what we need to do is control what we can control, and that is the spending.

Today, Indiana is squarely in the black because of very difficult decisions. It has a AAA credit rating, and is home to the fewest State employees per capita in the United States. The initiative was taken when times were difficult and in realizing that we were falling on tough economic times.

As we move forward in this Congress, I believe that we need to take the same principles and the same values that States have and local governments have and families have across the country, and businesses, who all realized that you cannot continue to spend more money than what you are taking in.

Progressivism has been the greatest foe of federalism. Progressivism believes in a government of, by, and for the experts, statisticians, and bureaucrats. Federalism believes in government of, by, and for the people and their unique communities. So, again, here I would argue that communities and people are much more capable, be-

cause they know their particular circumstances and how they are to manage not only their own dollars but their own lives, whether it's education or whether it's being involved in their church, in giving to their church or charity groups.

But instead, we're seeing a government that continues to intrude in taking more and more of those responsibilities, but also the rights that we all have as citizens, in taking those away from Americans and giving them to the Federal Government. We all know the Federal Government is never capable of fully meeting the needs that every individual has in our country.

Progressivism ends up elevating unelected experts to rule over the entire Nation. Rules promulgated by an alphabet soup of agencies choke out representative government, and Congress calls hearings to slow them down. We are seeing that repeatedly right now, Mr. Speaker, with hearings that we are having currently in our committees and in asking questions of the bureaucracies on the rule-making decisions that they are making every day. It continues to choke out not only our freedoms and opportunities that we enjoy as Americans, whether it's in business or whether it's as individuals, but also the bureaucracies are becoming much more powerful.

Now that the Congress is not passing overreaching legislation, we're seeing the bureaucracies taking on that role. And I believe that it is crucial for us as Americans to step forward and to remind ourselves what our Federal Government's responsibilities are. The Constitution clearly defines those responsibilities. And I believe it's important that we all become more familiar again with our Constitution and with the responsibilities that the Federal Government is responsible for.

Likewise, federalism today should not be confused with nullification, nor with the idea of secession. Federalism must be revived so that the rights of citizens might be upheld and their duties fulfilled. Federalism is the protector of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I can only imagine at the time, as our Founding Fathers were debating federalism and creating a Federal Government with the State governments that they had at the time, that they never imagined that the Federal Government would become as large and bureaucratic and bloated and irresponsible as it is today.

When the Federal Government exercises control over health care, welfare, housing, unemployment, and even the so-called stimulus of our economy, there is less incentive for citizens to act within their communities and States to fulfill the duties they once assumed. Civic virtue suffers as power flows to Washington, D.C. Ordinary Americans are neglected in this top-down solution.

Many argue that Washington knows better, that bureaucrats know better,

that the experts know better. But I know, growing up as a son of a farmer in northern Indiana, that my parents, my grandparents, they all knew what was important for our family. They knew what was important to our community. Whether it was being involved in our school, whether it was being involved in our church community, whether it was being involved in our local economy or our government process. Families and individuals can make those decisions, what's important, and make those priorities, pass those priorities on to their families.

I believe that what's happening today in our country is that we're seeing less and less not only interest, but also responsibility is now being assumed by our Federal Government, because it continues to overreach and to continue to take away the responsibilities of local governments, whether it's a school board which would make much better decisions for their local community and their school, whether it's a county council that knows the challenges that they have with their counties.

I know for us we have a lot of lakes and rivers, a lot of sandy soil, sewer systems that need to be built to keep our environment clean and better for our children and grandchildren as we pass on the resources that we have. We are starting to have our hands tied more and more because of regulations coming from Washington, D.C.

I believe that that is what our Founding Fathers intended. They believed in ordinary citizens making extraordinary decisions for their communities and that the structure of our Constitution protected that.

In short closing here, as I want to turn it over to my colleagues, I would warn those who are in Congress that we think ourselves too wise if we believe that federalism espoused in our founding documents is an antiquated relic of the past. Governments are the products of fallen men. Human nature is the same today as it was in 1787. When the Federal Government grows beyond its original purpose, when it greedily claims powers belonging to the States and local communities, it arrogantly assumes that 535 Federal legislators and hordes of bureaucrats can direct with perfect clarity the lives of over 300 million Americans.

I would be amiss to claim that I know the daily concerns of Buckeyes, or those who are in New Jersey, or from Texas, or from Oklahoma, or from California. But I know Hoosiers because I am one. I know and believe these simple truths. The rich diversity of our Nation's 50 States impels us to greatness. There are legitimate concerns which must be addressed by a well-balanced Federal Government. Yet the Federal Government ought to defer to the States in those matters that the States are best prepared for.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. Thank you, first of all, first and foremost, for leading this caucus tonight and leading this Special Order tonight as we speak about federalism as a safeguard of a limited government. So we come here tonight to discuss that and think about it in the larger sense, to discuss basically the revolutionary principles that federalism is and its critical role in our system of government that makes individual liberties possible in this country.

As the founder of the Constitutional Caucus, I welcome a public discussion on federalism tonight. It is such a crucial discussion, a discussion of federalism, a discussion of the role of government in our lives. And it lies at the heart of the American social contract between the government and the people. You see, it's federalism that keeps the Federal Government basically within its proper boundaries. So it is crucial to an understanding of the American commitment to liberty and to freedom and how well it will safeguard this generation and future generations as well.

When we think about these topics, it's often easy to take for granted our Federal system of government and the freedoms that it affords all of us. But such a system was, by no means, preordained.

□ 1910

And if you go back some 200-plus years, ordinary colonists, armed with a desire to be free, rebelled against the world's mightiest empire to achieve our independence from an obtrusive, overcentralized and a faraway government.

And what was in its place? Well, in its place our Founders established for the first time in history a national government of defined and enumerated powers that is basically prohibited from overstepping its confined jurisdictions.

So the Federal Government's powers were to be truly national in scope, and the Founders believed that because States and local governments operated closest to the citizens, elected officials who were at that lower level, or the local level, would be the ones who were most competent to make the laws that would govern daily lives.

Now, this was a message espoused by James Madison in *Federalist No. 45*. You know, Madison wrote back then: "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government are few and they are defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite."

So, you see, you have established this dual sovereignty, the sovereignty of Federal and State governments. And it's underscored then how basically in our Bill of Rights, as the 10th Amendment reads, as the gentleman from Indiana already said: "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."

The beauty of the 10th Amendment is not at first easily recognizable, as some would say, on first blush that the 10th Amendment is almost redundant. Some would say it offers nothing new from what has already been written into the confines, or four corners, if you will, of the Constitution. And so it is the limited powers of the Federal Government that are articulated throughout the three sections of the Constitution.

In fact, however, the Founders, looking at the Bill of Rights, initially believed that they were really not necessary and, actually, that they could be seen as potentially dangerous. Why was this? Well, both the Federalists and the anti-Federalists understood that the Bill of Rights limited the powers of government.

But the perceived danger here of the Bill of Rights lay where? At the potential for misunderstanding by future generations. This misunderstanding basically comes about by this, by forbidding the Federal Government from acting in certain areas, which is what the Bill of Rights would do. It was argued then, what, that the Constitution implied that the Federal Government could do what? It could act in all other areas that were not expressly prohibited from engaging in.

But let's be clear, the 10th Amendment makes clear that the Constitution provides no implied powers to the Federal Government. And so it is here that we see Federalism for what it basically is. It is the cornerstone, if you will, of the Constitution and the most effective tool for the preservation of this, our liberty.

So the 10th Amendment inclusion as the final amendment in the Bill of Rights is, therefore, no accident. It is, rather, as one might say, the culmination of the Founders' vision of American democracy. It reaffirms a commitment to a government strictly defined and with those limited powers.

It is this institutionalization of armor, if you will, of liberty and the perpetual struggle against this tyrannical government. This amendment is, in short, the realization of the principles of the American revolution.

And as we come to the floor tonight and every day here in this Congress, we are heirs to that revolution. Unfortunately, today America seems to have surrendered some of its birthright. The scope and reach of the Federal Government is growing at a disturbing pace. The incessant expansion of government has led to the bailout of the banking industry and the auto industry, sweeping financial regulation, and the proposal of cap-and-trade systems that would demand that rationing of American economic prosperity and productivity.

The tentacles, if you will, of the Federal Government are tightly wrapped around housing, education, transpor-

tation, unemployment policy—you name it—in almost every aspect of our lives. The American people, when you think about it, are controlled by the Federal Government in almost every single aspect of their lives, from morning to evening, from what light bulbs we are allowed to buy to the health insurance we have to buy. It is all required under regulations by the Federal Government.

Now, as I come to the floor, today is the 268th birthday of Thomas Jefferson. If he were alive today, I doubt that he would recognize the Federal Government as one that has remained true to the revolutionary Founders of this country. Rather, I would imagine that he would see a centralized and bureaucratic form of government that resembles the one that he and the rest of the Founding Fathers rebelled against. That is exactly what the Constitution and the amendments to it and the principles of Federalism were meant to prevent.

Out-of-control spending may be the clearest sign now of where we are today in having neglected these principles of Federalism. It is the Federal meddling into the lives of the American people. What it has done is resulted in the unprecedented and also, I would add, the unsustainable level of funding that jeopardizes the very economic well-being of the United States.

Our current path, therefore, threatens the American standard of living and our prosperity, the American Dream and the American status as a superpower.

You see, by nationalizing every issue, what we do there is we deprive the American people of the benefits that Federalism would normally bring. The Founders intended the States to serve as, as has often been called, the laboratories of democracy, which would compel the States to compete against each other to attract individuals and businesses, if you will.

This competition would result in innovations and innovative solutions, the greater accountability and transparency of public servants and the diffusion of power that limits the reach of the national government. Federalism, it's the constitutional guarantee of that good government.

So we come here tonight, and we must renew our commitment to Federalism, to the Constitution. By allowing this, our Constitution to be interpreted, though, by the whims of the judicial and executive branches, we have undermined the structural integrity of this document as well as the safeguards that a limited government describes.

To conclude, at the beginning of this year, Members of this body take an oath—to do what?—basically, to support and defend this Constitution of the United States. We owe it to the people we represent to remain true to that oath. Restoring adherence to Federalism must begin where? Well, right here in this Chamber.

I hope that my colleagues will join me, as the Members are here with me

tonight, in re-embracing this idea and this notion and this practice of Federalism, one of the great pillars of the American founding principles.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. GARRETT.

At this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from the Fourth District of Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you to the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

I am here tonight to talk about the proper relationship between the Federal Government and State and local governments, this issue of Federalism, our Nation's founding documents.

When I was first elected, I embarked on a listening tour right after November 2, during which I met with local officials from across my district to talk about issues that they were concerned about, what was on their minds, what challenges they were facing in their offices. At each stop, local leaders talked about the problems facing their communities; and even though every county is different, every community is different, the Federal Government seemed to cause the same problems in each one of them.

In one county in my district, I was told a story by a county commissioner of the time that the commissioner asked his staff to count all of the Federal and State mandates that they placed upon their health and human services department at the county. They counted up the mandates that they were under from national, State regulators, Congress, State legislation, State legislatures. The county commissioner actually asked his staffer to quit counting when he reached 9,000 individual mandates that that one department, at the county level, was under.

On this listening tour and since then, since being sworn in on January 5, at the town meetings that we have held, it never ceases to amaze me that one of the strongest moments of bringing applause to the town meetings is when we talk about what happened on this floor when we first started the 112th Congress, the time when we read, both Democrats and Republicans, the Constitution of the United States before the American people right here on the U.S. House floor.

When I talk about how we joined together in reading the Constitution, people always applaud because it matters to them, because they believe this country continues to be guided by that most fundamental document of our country.

Those 9,000 rules, though, that that county commissioner was talking about were created by Federal and State regulators who don't understand the problems that each of our unique districts faces because they have never been there. They don't know what it's like. They don't understand that each county, each city, each school board knows how to govern their jurisdiction better than anyone in Washington ever could, and they do not understand that an unfunded mandate imposed on the entire country does not work.

□ 1920

Each State and county in this country is unique and often has far better solutions than those of the people here in Washington, D.C., can devise. The Founding Fathers understood this very well and designed a system focused on limiting the authority of the Federal Government and on putting power closer to the people. Our Federalist system has long served as the safeguard of limited government.

As a State legislator from the Eastern Plains of Colorado, I will never forget the time that I received a call from a cabinet member from the previous administration who was urging me to vote for a particular piece of legislation because there was Federal money involved and that the only way that Colorado would receive this Federal funding was if we passed a bill that the Federal Government wanted. They were dangling money out in front of us to pass a bill. That instance proved to me what we continue to see today, which is the power shifting "away" from the States and "to" the Federal Government—but to what end?

Last year, Congress passed a health care bill that places increased Medicaid obligations on already cash-strapped States, which have no way to pay for them. Regulations from agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency continue to drive up the cost of energy and force American jobs overseas. Just today, we heard Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator BEGICH, and Representative YOUNG testify before the Energy and Commerce Committee on a bill about the need to pursue energy policies in Alaska, policies that will allow them to access the resources of that great State and to release, unleash, as much as 1 million barrels of oil a day. The State is supportive. Witnesses for the Department of Natural Resources testified. Unfortunately, the Federal Government continues to block their progress. The Founding Fathers wouldn't even recognize our country today as the one that they formed over 200 years ago.

Education is another area in which there is the employing of Federalist principles. There is no better example of which we can talk about the differences between the Federal Government and the State government and how the Federal Government continues to overstep its bounds. The Board of Education in Douglas County, Colorado, has taken it upon itself to truly innovate in the area of education financing; but the problem with the system in the Federal Government is that it's a top-down approach. Since when is the Federal Government able to better communicate the needs of children in a community than that community, itself? There are some good initiatives in Congress out there, like the A-PLUS Act, by Mr. GARRETT from New Jersey, which would allow the States to opt out of No Child Left Behind funding and use that money toward programs they think deserve attention.

Along with Federal funding comes very prescriptive mandates. The more

Federal funding a school receives, the less it's able to listen to its own community—to its teachers, to its parents and, yes, to its students. The more it is forced to listen to the Federal Government say "you can use this money, but you have to use it here, and you have to use it this way," it's tough for a lot of States to say "no" to that in these cash-strapped times. I look forward to addressing some of these issues during the debates of the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind; but we must put power back in the hands of teachers and parents, who know best how to teach their children.

Health care is another challenge this country faces as Congress is imposing an individual mandate on citizens to purchase federally approved health insurance. This mandate is contrary to the Federalist principles that we are talking about this evening. The bill forces States to expand their Medicaid eligibility standards. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, by 2019, Colorado will see a 47.7 percent increase in Medicaid enrollees as compared to the estimated national average of 24.7 percent.

The health care bill was created by the Federal Government, and the cost of its expansion has shifted directly back to State budgets. Further, under the takeover of the health care bill, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the authority to enact and to execute rules and regulations that local administrators are required to follow. This takes the power away from States and local governments and wrests it in the hands of the Federal Government.

What is more important, though, is the ingenuity and progress in health care that has been established and accomplished by the States on a State-by-State level. Through this process, they've made significant improvements to our health care industry. Unfortunately, I believe the health care bill that was passed in the last Congress is a step away from that direction.

Last week, I had the opportunity to take my 7-year-old daughter to Philadelphia to see the Liberty Bell, to visit Independence Hall, and the National Constitution Center, to talk to the people who work at Independence Hall about the great symbols of freedom in our country, about the writing of those founding documents, about what it meant to talk about freedom, about liberty, about our great Republic. I am reminded of the time when, during recent events in Libya and Egypt, my wife and daughter were watching television, watching the news, when the President spoke on TV. They were talking about the fight for freedom that continues in the Middle East, and the President mentioned how we have to continue working for freedom around the globe.

My daughter looked at my wife and said, "But we are free."

To that, my wife looked at her and said, "Yes, but we must always continue to work for it, to fight for it."

That's why we are here tonight, talking about how we can ensure those fundamental liberties, those fundamental notions of freedom, that are enshrined in our basic form of federalism.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you.

Next, I would like to yield to the co-chair of the Constitution Caucus, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you.

Tom Nevins, who is actually a social archaeologist, gave an interesting discussion about Ancient Central America in which he said, in 1521, Cortez led a group of Spanish soldiers to what is today Mexico City. There he found an Aztec society and an Aztec capital with 15 million inhabitants. Cortez gave simple instructions to Montezuma, II, who was in charge at that time, which was, either give us your gold or I'll kill you. For whatever reason, Montezuma gave him the gold, and then he proceeded to kill him. In fact, in the siege of what is today Mexico City, approximately a quarter of a million Aztecs died from starvation in that siege, and within 2 years the Aztec empire was totally controlled by the Spanish.

A decade later, the Inca civilization had the same thing happen to them, led by Pizarro, who, once again, said, Give us your gold or we'll kill you. They got the gold, and they proceeded to kill him. Also, within 2 years, the Inca civilization was totally dominated by the Spanish, which meant that both the Aztecs and the Incas were a highly centralized government, a highly centralized society, a highly centralized economic system, and because of that they were easy prey for a smaller but a very well-trained and well-organized Spanish Army.

By the 1680s, the Spanish moved into the deserts of New Mexico where they moved against the Apaches. There are two things that are different about the Spanish efforts with the Apaches in New Mexico. Number one, there was no gold to be taken. Number two, the Spanish lost. In fact, for almost two centuries, the Apaches were able to hold at bay the Spanish. One of the reasons they were is that the Apache civilization was very decentralized. They had tribal leaders. Yet, as the tribal leaders were either captured or killed, they just simply got another tribal leader. The greatest of all is the one whose name we probably mispronounce and call Geronimo.

As Nevin said, this Apache civilization was not loosey-goosey. They had customs; they had traditions; they had a very sophisticated society, but they also were decentralized. I am told that, in the Apache language, the phrase "you should" simply does not exist. Whereas, if we look at the thousands and thousands of pages that produced ObamaCare and cap-and-trade, you will find the concept of "you should" being repeatedly inserted over and over and over again, which means a centralized society has certain strengths and cer-

tain weaknesses. Its greatest strength is the concept of uniformity. Everyone can be coerced into doing the exact same thing at the exact same time. A decentralized society has certain strengths and certain weaknesses.

□ 1930

Its greatest strength is creativity, flexibility and the opportunity of its people to have options in the way they live. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, you and probably Mr. STUTZMAN are wondering what I am actually doing here: I came into the wrong Special Order; like, what does this have to do with the topic at hand? I think it does have to do with the topic at hand because the idea at the Constitutional Convention was: Do we have a centralized or a decentralized society and government here in this country?

Indeed, they tried to separate powers horizontally between the three branches of government, but more significantly, and more importantly, vertically between national and State governments as a specific way of trying to make sure that we had a decentralized system of government, one that puts a greater emphasis on creativity, on flexibility and the ability to ensure that our citizens had what they call personal liberty, what I simply say are the options to make choices for themselves in the way they wish to do that.

The Founding Fathers had a great fear of control. That is why they rebelled against the British in the first place. They had a great fear of bureaucracy. It is why in the Declaration of Independence they talk about the swarms of officials who were sent here by the British Government to devour from us our substance.

Today, we have in our government a Federal Government that apparently tries to vacuum up as much power, as much money, and as much influence as possible. Our government bureaucracy today in Washington is one that is based on command-and-control style of leadership which builds a heavy emphasis on rules. And obeying the rules of procedure is far more important than just coming up with a commonsense solution to the problem which happens to be at hand. In fact, one of the questions that we have is, have we become, in essence, too big today? Have we become more centralized than decentralized? And does that give some inherent weaknesses to our society and our country that we have today? One of the things that we have to do is try and rethink this entire situation.

Tomorrow, Members of this House will be inviting legislators from around the country who are back here, and we will have a conference in which State legislators will meet with Members of Congress to discuss this very issue of what direction this country will be going in the future and to recognize very clearly that this is not an issue between the left and the right.

The idea of Federalism, of balancing powers of creativity and a less central-

ized government, is not a Republican or Democrat issue. It's an issue of the direction of this country, because it's about people. It's about whether people actually have options in their lives or whether they don't. And when we recognize this, it becomes apparent that the only way to make sense of the situation is to make sure that fewer decisions in Washington are allowed to be directed towards the States and local governments and that the people make more decisions in their lives.

As Justice Rehnquist said, surely, there can be no more important fundamental Constitutional question than the intention of the Framers of the Constitution as to how authority should be allocated between the national and State governments. That's the battle which we still fight for and struggle with here. And it's the one in which we cannot afford, for the future of this country, to lose or to fail.

If sometimes when I was teaching school my students didn't quite understand the significance of the fall of the Aztecs or the Incas, then that was an annoyance. But if we, as Members of Congress, fail to recognize the distinction between the centralization of power and the decentralization of power, which was the very foundation of this country, that is not an annoyance. That becomes a tragedy.

I am very grateful to the Constitutional Caucus, especially Chairman GARRETT of New Jersey and Representative STUTZMAN from Indiana, for your leadership in organizing this. I am proud to join my good friend from Colorado and, hopefully, my good friend from New Mexico as long as he does not try and change any of my story about the Apache. That's my story, and I'm sticking to it.

But this is important. This is one of those key issues. This is one of the quintessential issues that will define where we go, either forward to a brighter future or forward into a less secure and more dangerous future. And I appreciate being able to be a part of it. I thank you for allowing me to be here for a few minutes.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. BISHOP, for your comments.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about some of the comments that were made tonight from Mr. GARRETT and from Mr. GARDNER, as well as from Mr. BISHOP, it brings back a lot of thoughts from experiences of serving not only as a legislator but also as a farmer and as a businessowner of a small trucking operation that we have, a family business, back in Indiana. I think about how the freedom that we have comes from not the Constitution; it comes from God. The rights that we have are God-given, and the Constitution protects those rights.

I know that many times over the years we look at the Constitution as a dry document. It doesn't seem to be exciting. It doesn't seem to be one of great interest. But I can tell you today, Mr. Speaker, as we watch our

Federal Government—as we've started to do the debate of budgets, of health care, and of our military actions around the world, and of the size and the scope of our Federal Government—it is crucial for us, for all of us, to remind ourselves and to reeducate ourselves on what our constitutional role is.

As Mr. BISHOP said, many times we talk about the horizontal separations of our government with the executive, the legislative and the judicial; but also we need to remember the vertical branches of government, and we need to remind ourselves that the States actually established the Federal Government.

I can only imagine as our Founding Fathers were debating this and looking at the States that were in existence and thinking of the challenges they faced, the challenges of military action against them and how do they defend themselves, the discussion of taxation, and to come together and to establish a Federal Government that was designed to not only protect but to protect the rights, protect us physically, but to also protect the rights of us as individuals. Now looking back, Federalism is that balance of a Federal Government that complies with the constitutional guidelines, whether it's our national defense, whether it's our borders, or whether it's commerce and currency, the responsibilities are limited.

But as time has gone by, the Federal Government has continued to grow and to pursue and to take away those responsibilities from States and from our local communities. As Mr. GARDNER mentioned, the different local community visits that he has made, it reminds me of ones that I made as well in Indiana, whether it's talking with the mayor in Kendallville about the challenges with fire and police, whether it's the Topeka Town Council and the challenges they have with economic development, or whether it's Nappanee with their sewer challenges, Fort Wayne or Angola with streets and sewers and things that they know what they want to do and what they would like to accomplish that are all affected by Federal Government one way or another.

And it drives costs up for not only them but ultimately for the citizens. As spending continues to accumulate and increase, we have to remember that the American taxpayer, the American citizen, we as citizens are the ones who ultimately are going to be responsible paying that bill.

And as we come into our budget process over the next couple of days, I think that we should be reminded and would be remiss if we did not take the opportunity to look through the scope and look through the eyes of what our Founding Fathers imagined and intended for our country through the Constitution as we face \$14 trillion of debt. States, local governments, and families don't have the ability to continue to borrow dollars; specifically,

States and local governments don't have the same ability that the Federal Government has. And so they are disciplined. And so they realize that the decisions they make affect local communities.

The Federal Government and we in Congress need to take on that same discipline and realize that the spending that we authorize today is going to affect our children and our grandchildren. I have two children, two sons, a 9-year-old and a 5-year-old; and I know that they are going to have to assume the responsibilities and the consequences of what happens today in Congress.

And I refuse to stand by and allow for more spending and for the Federal Government to continue to grow. I want to see a country that respects the individual's life and liberty and our local communities' decision-making at the local levels and at the State level rather than a government, a Federal Government that continues to believe that they can authorize and tell the American people what to do and what they cannot do.

□ 1940

So with those thoughts in mind going into the budget process, I believe we have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to challenge the status quo. We hear a lot of comments on this floor about what the changes are that are being proposed in the budget that just passed out of the Budget Committee last week and is going to be debated here on the floor tomorrow. I believe we cannot demonize the situation that we are in and use scare tactics with the American people. We need to be factual. We need to be honest. We need to realize the realities that we are in as Americans, because we are all in this together. This is not a Republican problem; this is not a Democrat problem. We see finger-pointing on this floor all the time. And frankly, I know as a freshman Congressman, that is not why I came here. I came here to fix the problems we have because of a bloated government and because we have overstepped the boundaries of our constitutional role.

If we do not face the fact that we have trillions of dollars of debt, that we are overspending—and we have to also realize that we cannot raise taxes on the American people at a time when the economy is struggling, when American families are struggling and paying bills. By raising taxes, we only drive the cost of doing business higher and we drive the cost of living higher. Money cannot be circulated through the economy dictated by the Federal Government to stimulate or drive our economy. The American people do that much better.

I believe as we again debate the budget, we need to realize that if we want to pass on a better future for our kids and our grandkids, for our country, for ourselves, if that's the way people need to look at it, I believe we lay out the situation, whether it is with Medicare

and realizing that we cannot continue down the road with the program as it currently stands. If we want to hand that off to our children and our grandchildren, some modifications have to happen.

I believe if we as Republicans and we as Congress, specifically Republicans in the majority here in Congress, lay out the plan and we make the case that something needs to be done, the American people are with us. They realize the debt that is hanging over us, and they realize the deficits that are over us cannot be sustained and we are going to have to make changes. But we cannot make progress in a bipartisan fashion if we continue to use scare tactics, and I believe that going back and looking at the constitutional role of our Federal Government, that all of us as Americans realize, as the many generations before us did in the challenges that they faced, that we are up to the challenge. So, Mr. Speaker, as we move into tomorrow, I believe that our constitutional responsibilities will be defined by what we do and what we say and what we vote on in the upcoming years.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of your comments reminded me of a story shared with me by a constituent several years ago. They talked about their time attending law school. They were talking about in their constitutional law course, they were starting with the Bill of Rights, going through the amendments reading cases. And when they approached the 9th and 10th Amendments of our Constitution, the law professor of this particular class said we are just going to skip the 9th and 10th Amendments because nobody really knows what these do anymore. And they went right on and beyond the 9th and 10th Amendments.

Our discussion tonight has been on the issue of federalism, has been on the issue of the powers that rightly rested with the Federal Government versus the States. And here we are dealing with a law school, a public law school where this individual was told we're going to skip the 9th and 10th Amendments because nobody knows what it means.

I believe the American people have a great interest in what the 9th and 10th Amendments mean. I know that many of our public law schools have audit opportunities, and I believe the people who are interested around this country in what students are being taught, what public law schools are teaching regarding the Constitution, regarding the 9th and 10th Amendments of this country, they have a right to audit that class and maybe they should start attending some of these law school courses to learn just exactly what our schools are teaching when it comes to federalism, the 9th and 10th Amendments, the liberty amendments of this great Nation.

I just thank you for the opportunity to share that story with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you.

It is probably all too common, unfortunately, because this document, I believe, as I said earlier, is one that doesn't appear to be exciting. But when you read it and when you realize what it does for our freedom and that it protects our rights as individuals of this great Nation, it is so important for us to understand, and if we don't know, to find out, to listen to others who have gone before us, whether it is our Founding Fathers or whether it is those who have served in different capacities, whether it is in schools or whether it is in government, there is a reason for it. It is the 9th and 10th Amendments, and it is the 9th and 10th points of our Bill of Rights. I think that is what of our Founding Fathers meant. They meant it to be at the end to give those responsibilities back to the State governments because they knew that the Federal Government wasn't going to be responsible. They couldn't absolutely take care of everybody with the role and the size that the Federal Government was at that time.

We are in a situation today where I believe many Americans believe and they know in their heart what is right, and that our Constitution protects those rights and that we believe in freedom. We believe in that entrepreneurial spirit and that we can go out and make something of ourselves.

As I said, I am the son of a farmer and have the opportunity to serve in Congress, which is a humbling experience, but at the same time knowing that we have a responsibility for our kids and for our grandkids, for our country, for the freedom that we have, for the opportunity we have. I believe that this is a perfect time for us to know what the Constitution says, to understand it and to apply it. Whether you are on the school board, which is one of the most important positions I believe any individual can run for, to be involved in our children's education, whether it is on the city council, town council, county council, State government, those are all such important, township government, are all so important because an engaged person involved in the community, involved in the government, can make a difference. That is what I believe to be so fascinating is that this document empowers us as Americans. It doesn't take power away. It doesn't give power strictly to the Federal Government. It is one that believes in the American people.

As I mentioned before, with the budget debates coming forward, if we continue to go down the path of higher spending, higher taxes, of more regulation, that we only take away opportunity. We take away the empowerment that was given to the American people, and that we all should be grateful that we can go back to the Constitution and have this discussion and

have this dialogue about the responsibilities of the Federal Government and making that case to those of us in Congress and to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the responsibilities and the opportunities that State governments, local governments, not only can they do, but they can do it better because they can meet the needs of their local communities because they hear from local citizens. I believe that government that is closest to the people serves the people better.

With that, I appreciate each of my colleagues this evening being part of the Constitutional Caucus discussion here on the House floor. I am looking forward to many more. I know that each of us have great responsibilities in front of us in realizing what the Federal Government's role is, according to this document, and that we take these very seriously in the upcoming days and that we don't continue to grow the size and the scope of government.

I thank the Speaker for the time.

□ 1950

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 34, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-62) on the resolution (H. Res. 223) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

—
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

—
 POLICY OF TAXATION

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

Mr. PEARCE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address the body tonight.

I was not able to hear the President's speech today, but I was able to then get a transcript and read it. I note in the opening of that speech that he says, on page 1, that the debate that we're having here in Washington is about the kind of future that we want.

It's about the kind of country we believe in, and then he describes that's what his speech will be about today.

As I read the context of the speech, I realize that the President and many Americans believe in very dramatically different models of country, and the kind of future that we believe in is dramatically different. I find in the President's speech that he centers many of his comments around taxing. Maybe it's taxing the millionaires and the billionaires. So I think that if we're going to talk about the kind of country that we live in, the kind of future that we want for the country, for our children and grandchildren, it is imperative that we begin to discuss this policy of taxation, this idea that we should and can tax the rich greater proportionate shares. It is that which I would like to address tonight.

Now as we talk about the future we believe in, understand that economic growth and vitality are critical concepts. And so one must then ask, How does the country achieve economic growth? How does it fail to achieve economic growth? That would be a key question. One of the core economic truths of economic growth is that when we tax the citizens more than approximately 23 percent, that we find an economy that will be stuck in stagnation. When we lower the taxation rate, then we find an economic vitality, creation of jobs. And so somewhere in that threshold of about 23 percent, we understand that every time we raise taxes, we kill jobs; and every time that we lower taxes, we create jobs. That was the essence of the argument that President Kennedy levied when he said we need to lower the tax rate in order to create more government revenues.

I often talk about the economic chaos that we're facing in our world right now, in our country; and it begins at this point. We begin with looking at the chart; we have basically an imbalance. We are spending \$3.5 trillion every year, and we're bringing in \$2.2 trillion every year. Our economy is stuck in stagnation. We don't have the ability to create jobs. And the President is talking about raising taxes in order to create revenue. President Kennedy would understand that when we raise taxes, we actually diminish the 2.2 figure, we actually lower the 2.2, because jobs are lost, productivity is lost; and, therefore, those jobs don't pay taxes to the government and the government's revenues begin to decrease.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle often describe the necessity to tax away Exxon's profits, that we should take every single dollar they make. In fact, we had one Presidential contender in the last race on the Democrat side saying we should tax Exxon's profits and spend them. We heard the Speaker of the House at that point using that same language, that we should tax the profits of Exxon and spend them.

Now let's take a closer look at that. Exxon makes good profits. They have a

good business. They have good investments. But almost every year, Exxon spends the majority of its profits reinvesting them in new drilling. As they drill wells, people are hired to work on the drilling rigs. They're hired to work on the logging rigs, on the cementing rigs. They're hired to do the tasks of finishing the well, putting it into productivity before Exxon can ever make a profit. So as we take away that profit from them, we take away the future drilling. We take away, then, the jobs from the economy, and that is the reason that higher taxes penalize and kill jobs.

Another example that I have about job creation was from Bill Sweat in Artesia. I asked at one of my town halls, What does it take to create jobs? He held up his hand and said, It takes me \$340,000 to create one job. That's because we drive bulldozers in our work. And actually they won't let me drive the bulldozer down through the main streets of Artesia, so I have to buy a pickup truck, too. So he said basically for \$400,000 that he can create one job.

When the government, when Washington taxes away those obscene profits—those obscene profits in the eyes of some—then what happens is Mr. Sweat takes longer and maybe even never gets to the point of having the \$340,000 in the bank in order to pay for that new bulldozer and hire one more person.

So as the President begins to tell us that his view of this country is one where we're going to tax the people who are producing, then we have to wonder what we're going to get. Often a truism is that what you tax, you get less of; so if he's going to tax the producers, the millionaires and the billionaires, you're going to get less of them. I think that's a question we should ask: Is that a course that we want to chart for our future?

My friend from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is here tonight, and maybe he has some insights; but I would like to suspend my conversation on the idea that we can tax the rich and find prosperity for our Nation. I think the rich should pay taxes the same as everyone else, but when we raise the tax level beyond that 22, 23, 24 percent threshold, then we need to understand the result is going to be economic stagnation. That's what we're finding right now.

So when Mr. Obama concentrates his speech today on taxing, taxing the wealthy, that they would pay their fair share in the society, understand he is talking about a future that looks somewhat like Cuba's. Cuba taxes wealthy people, and they haven't had job creation for decades. The Soviet Union taxed wealthy people. They didn't have jobs. Europeans even tax at a greater rate than we do, and they've had economic stagnation up until recent times when they began to cut the cost of government, cut the size of government and lower taxes and found themselves creating jobs.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan at this point for comments that he might have.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We've seen throughout our lifetimes the argument put forward that the way out of a fiscal mess is to raise taxes. And we've learned one thing: if they tax it and take it, they spend it. Over and over and over again the same siren song: government must increase revenues, that revenues are the problem. In short, the hardworking American people are the problem because they don't pay through the nose for the Federal Government's overspending.

I think the American people understand that we have not a revenue problem but a spending problem. So as we go forward, I think it is wise to remind many of our colleagues that if taxation is the road to prosperity, why do they not have 100 percent taxation? Because they know that it does not work. They know that it is a short-term expedient that has long-term damaging consequences to the economy. And as you go forward and you try to punish productivity, you produce unemployment, you produce poverty. In short, the cycle continues anew. As productivity drops, revenues drop. Then the calls for more revenue come in because the spending never stops, because the spending as we saw with the stimulus and other legislation of the past Democratic majority is that they will then spend even more money to try to get their way out of a crisis.

□ 2000

It was disappointing to see the President buy into the logic that your prosperity comes from the government rather than from the fruits of your own hard work, and that somehow the government is entitled to whatever of your money it deems necessary to continue its wasteful spending habits. Again, this is rejected.

As the gentleman from New Mexico understands, we live in a very difficult period of time. We are making the transition from an industrialized society to a globalized, consumer-driven economy. We have seen families across America and businesses across America make the difficult decision to survive, to compete. They have not only had to discard things that they wanted, but things that at times they felt they needed. And yet one entity, one entity above all has failed to emulate the difficult decisions made by men and women across America, and that entity is Big Government. And the reason is very simple: You can only spend what you make, but Big Government can spend what it takes from you.

And so today, we saw the President again make the argument that if we just took more from the American people or a certain segment of the American people—disregarding his rhetoric that we were all in this together. Evidently that is now as pass as some of his other pronouncements. The reality

remains that we have to grow our way out of this. We have to adapt to a consumer-driven economy. We have to have a citizen-driven government, one that understands that the founding principles of this country are there for a reason; that now that we have reached the height of the zenith of the industrial welfare state that fosters dependence of individuals upon it rather than fostering and facilitating self-government and liberty and prosperity, that the day will come when this government and its fiscal recklessness proves unsustainable.

The question before us now is a very simple one: Will we responsibly and constructively address this crisis by performing our constitutional responsibilities and fulfilling the promises we made to our constituents, or will we go on with the same tired tax-and-spend policies that didn't work in the seventies, which in many cases were known quite simply as "soak the rich; spend the bread"? Bad idea.

So to the gentleman from New Mexico, I thank him for his time and point out that the fiscal debate which will continue here tomorrow is a very simple one: You can protect the Big Government policies of the past or you can look forward to a self-government, a citizen-driven government, a consumer-driven economy that unleashes the entrepreneurial genius of America and the diligence of workers and allows families to move into a future of liberty and prosperity. Or, in short, you can support the President and the politics of the past, or bankruptcy; or we can look forward and let the American people lead us into a new era of liberty and prosperity.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And he pointed out that we cannot sustain this course, that actually this course is doomed to fail. I draw attention to my chart again, the far right-hand corner of the chart in which we show here exactly what the Office of Management and Budget says.

This is the President's own economic arm of the White House that says that our prosperity through time has been increasing—that's the upward sloping line—but now it's flattening out to the red zone in the chart. But then we see the chart absolutely stops at some point in time, that's about 2038. That is the point that Mr. MCCOTTER refers to that we are on the path to stopping our economy. Our economy will actually fail because of the policies that we have now. And this is the future that is being demonstrated by our President today in his speech.

Now, as he talks about taxing, understand that we have lost jobs because of our tax policy and we've lost jobs because of our regulatory policy. Now, in the speech today, he talks about tax policy, but it's going in the wrong direction. In previous speeches, he has talked about the need to reform corporate taxes. In his State of the Union speech, he acknowledged that we are

taxed too high, that we can't create the economic growth that we need because we are taxing corporations in a fashion that exceeds other nations in the world. So he acknowledges it there.

I was hoping today in his speech that he would clarify, that he would begin to set a target, that he would set a timetable where we can start pulling back those manufacturing jobs because of a reform in tax policy. But curiously, in defining our future and in defining the way that we are looking at the values of the country—that's his declaration for what he wants to do in his speech today—he omits the job creation piece of taxation policy toward our corporations. He acknowledges that in his State of the Union speech. In his State of the Union speech he said that we are taxed at too high a rate, that he wants to cure that. He said that we must have reform. He said we need to use our savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years, and that was what I think Americans were looking for.

Americans maybe can't express the companies that have left this Nation to find lower tax rates and better economic regulations in other countries, they might not be able to name them, but they implicitly know that they exist. I will look at, again, my chart.

The revenues in this Nation are \$2.2 trillion. That's the accumulated taxes that we've paid to our government. The expenses are 3.5. Yes, we can cut our expenses, but we should be concentrating and growing the jobs and having people go back to work. As they go back to work, they begin to pay taxes, and our \$2.2 trillion begins to increase. But as every single individual is hired, they come off welfare, unemployment and food stamps, and then they go down into the productive part of society, so we find our economic imbalance collapsing toward itself. The costs collapse as we are hiring people and putting them back to work. And that should have been the concentration of President Obama's speech today.

In the past, because of our policies, we have lost the producers in this country, a list of them: Fender Guitars, Converse, Etch A Sketch, Radio Flyer, Levi's, Craftsman tools, Stanley tools, USA flags, Rawlings baseballs, Brach's candy, IBM computer, NBA uniforms. These are just a partial list of companies that have decided that it is cheaper to manufacture somewhere else because our policies make it too difficult. If we're going to rebuild our economy, we need to rebuild that manufacturing base, and we do that through tax policy. That should be the concentration of both parties at this time in our Nation's history.

The President also mentions, on page 2, that we're amassing alarming debt levels back in the 1980s. If I look at my chart—again, I show our deficits. This year our deficit is \$1.3 trillion; that is, our spending exceeds the revenues by \$1.3 trillion. That deficit runs over and I show it going into our debt barrel,

that accumulated debt for generations past. And Mr. Obama mentions adequately that that debt in the eighties started reaching alarming levels. But from the time of George Washington until the first President Bush—that's after 1980—we had an accumulation of about \$5 trillion worth of debt. If you look at the chart, you can see that we have an accumulation today of almost \$15 trillion. So we had \$5 trillion back in the mid-eighties, and now we're at \$15 trillion.

I would point out to the President, when he says we were amassing debt at alarming levels in the 1980s, that the debt he has accumulated in his Presidency is almost equivalent to what we accumulated from the time of George Washington to the first President Bush. That is alarming.

It's an alarming statistic that we have a deficit today in this budget of \$1.3 trillion, but in 2007—the last budget written under a Republican Congress and with President Bush as President—the last deficit was under \$200 billion. That would be the equivalent to 0.2. Today we are over \$1.1 trillion, and even up into when the President came into office, our annual deficit was less than half a trillion. We now have over \$1.5 trillion that the President is suggesting our debt levels should be next year. So in his time alone we have increased deficits from the billion dollar category, increased them to the trillion dollar category, and that is alarming debt.

□ 2010

That is what has got other nations pointing to us and saying that is not sustainable. They're afraid when they loan us money, that it is not going to be paid back. So nations are increasingly reticent to lend us money.

That then results in the Federal Reserve buying most of our debt. This year, our Federal Reserve is on track—now keep in mind they get much of their money from the government and then they're loaning us money from the other hand—our Federal Reserve this year is on track to lend us about 60 to 70 percent of the money that we borrow.

Now, Mr. Bernanke expresses deep belief that there are buyers for those Treasury bills out there. There are people who are going to lend our Nation money. But as they look at the economic instability that we're facing, they understand the need that we have to, number one, correct spending but, number two, to grow the economy and create jobs.

Now, there are those skeptics who do not believe that tax cuts will create jobs. Again, I follow the example of Exxon. When you take their profits away, you tax them more, then you actually decrease the amount that they're spending with drilling companies, offshore platforms that they're spending in different communities to get services done to their wells as they drill them.

Also, I would remind the listeners today of Mr. Sweat and that \$340,000 for the bulldozer. Those are the evidences that we get that tax cuts will create jobs.

But if we want to look at the other model, tax increases killing jobs, we can look no further than our own country at a time of the tax cuts of 2003. Over the next 4 to 5 years, our economy created over 5 million jobs. As the threat of taxes loomed, as the economic slowdown came in, as the uncertainty of the current administration began to take hold, then we have lost almost 3 million jobs.

So just the talk of taxes, the talk of the cap-and-trade tax permeated the discussions in 2009, it began to cause people to shy away and say we better not invest because we're afraid we're going to be taxed.

The discussions of the health care bill also related the belief that the people had that Washington was going to raise taxes in the health care field. And so again, consumers began not to purchase as much, investors began not to buy new equipment, people everywhere were becoming more cautious, and we slipped into stagnation. Our economy began to stagnate and lose jobs and has not yet been creating those jobs at any significant rate. We're still above 8 percent unemployment, and that was to be the floor we would find if we spent the money on the stimulus in a previous vision that the Obama administration gave to us.

As we think about other examples, I always like to use the example of Ireland. Fifteen or 20 years ago, Ireland began to lower its corporate tax rates. They believed, as I'm saying tonight, that if they would lower tax rates to corporations, that the companies would actually come flooding into the country. They would come there to produce. And it created the Irish miracle, the economic miracle of growth that was caused by Ireland cutting its corporate tax rate from about 36 percent down to around 12 percent. A significant decrease.

Companies began to flood into Ireland. The contrast is also given by Ireland. As they began to find prosperity, they began to spend more than they bring in, this same model that we're looking at here. They began to raise taxes. And now corporations are flooding away.

Just today I was visiting with the managers of a cheese plant that is on the east side of New Mexico. They're an Irish company. They've come here to produce because it is just too difficult, too high, the taxes are too great in Ireland. My brother-in-law works for Hughes Tool. He was at Hughes Tool back when they moved factories, production facilities back into Ireland. This year, my brother-in-law went to disassemble the last plant in Ireland because they've gone up on their tax rates and no longer was it a good place to operate.

If we're interested in solving the economic chaos that we're facing, we can't

get there simply by spending cuts; we can't get there by taxing the rich. In other words, taxing the rich is going to drive us further away from the goal, further into stagnation, further into job losses. If we're going to rebuild our economy, we must concentrate on economic growth.

And the nice thing is that the actuarial tables tell us that if we will grow jobs at about 3½ percent, that this imbalance begins to disappear, that the worry of the future begins to dissipate simply because we grow the economy, we create jobs, we take people off of unemployment, we take people off of welfare, off of food stamps. Our 3.5 cost to the government begins to diminish, the 2.2 begins to grow, we find ourselves reaching balance, and over the long term, we find ourselves beginning to reduce this \$15 trillion debt. We find ourselves able to sustain the \$202 trillion worth of unplanned expenses—excuse me, they're not unplanned, they're simply unpaid for—the expenses of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That's where the real threat lies.

And nowhere in Mr. Obama's plan did I see a dealing with those significant drains on our economy. His only plan is to tax the rich, the millionaires and the billionaires, by making them pay their fair share. And that, he says, is going to fix the economy.

That, my friends, is going to wreck the economy.

When we choose that course of making the rich pay more than their fair share, they owe it to us. It's only fair, he says in his speech, that they would pay a little more. When we do that, we're going to choke jobs off even more. Other nations, our 2.2 is going to be less. We're going to put those people out of work, just like we did offshore in Louisiana. We put about 100,000 people out of work there. We're on the way to putting them out of work.

Those people, instead of paying taxes, are going to pay no taxes, but they're now going to cost us unemployment benefits; they're going to cost us in Medicare, Medicaid. They're going to cost us in food stamps, welfare. And they're not going to be producing.

So with this vision of taxing the rich, we're going to move more to an unproductive society because you cannot create more productivity by taxing it. If that were the case, every nation would be productive. Every nation can always go up on taxes. But not every nation can create the environment to where innovators are allowed to produce.

The innovations in the oil and gas industry have been dramatic, and yet that's the single area it appears that President Obama is going to kill first, that whole specter he refers to as "yesterday's fuel," "yesterday's energy."

If it is yesterday's energy, let the President take the lead and cease using it. Use the energies of tomorrow. Stop using that energy of the past. Let him fly an airplane on something besides

jet fuel. Please. Give us that bold vision and courage and leadership. Let him show us the way if fossil fuels are a thing of the past.

But I suspect, like you and me, that the President is going to continue to drive his limousine on petroleum-based products. He's going to continue to fly Air Force 1 not on solar power, but on jet fuel. I suspect that all of Americans are going to do it. The only thing that we're going to have as an outcome is less plentiful energy, fewer jobs, a greater imbalance in our government and our government spending, greater uncertainty for the future.

□ 2020

That's a shame that that's the leadership that we're getting. Because at this point in our world's history, it would be possible, if we are literally looking to recreate our economy, to draw back the manufacturing jobs of the past, to put them back to work here, to rekindle the industries that are gone so that we do have a bright future, so that people have not just jobs, but careers to face; that they are able to plan for their future; that they are able to save for a house, save for the kids' education; that they are able, truly, to live the American Dream.

That's what has made this country great in the past, and I think that Americans at this point in time will find that leadership for the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today after 4 p.m. on account of family medical reasons.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 307. An Act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

S.J. Res. 8. Joint Resolution providing for the appointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1248. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 10-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1249. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Demand Response Compensation in Organized Wholesale Energy Markets [Docket No.: RM10-17-000; Order No. 745] received March 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1250. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 5-11 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1251. A letter from the Acting Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1252. A letter from the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's annual report for Fiscal Year 2010 prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Public Law 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1253. A letter from the General Counsel, General Accountability Office, transmitting the annual report on the implementation of Section 203 of the "Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002" (No Fear), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1254. A letter from the EEO Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report about the Commission's activities in FY 2010 to ensure accountability for antidiscrimination and whistleblower laws related to employment; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1255. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Antidrug and Alcohol Misuse Prevention Programs for Personnel Engaged in Specified Aviation Activities; Supplemental Regulatory Flexibility Determination [Docket No.: FAA-2002-11301; Amendment No. 121-315A] (RIN: 2120-AH14) received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1256. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Henderson, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0937; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-35] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1257. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Charleston, WV [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1010; Airspace Docket No. 10-AEA-24] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1258. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Memorandum on New Exemptions for Passenger Carrying Operations Conducted for Compensation and Hire in Other Than Standard Category Aircraft received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1259. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Bryce Canyon, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0961; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-12] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1260. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Newport, VT [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0938; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-108] received April 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1261. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lancaster, NH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1009; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-111] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1262. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wolfeboro, NH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1007; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-109] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1263. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colebrook NH [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1008; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANE-110] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1264. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Easton, MD [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0936; Airspace Docket No. 10-AEA-23] received April 4, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. Supplemental report on House Resolution 218. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473 (Rept. 112-60, Pt. 2).

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 223. Resolution

providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 (Rept. 112-62). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1504. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for engineering, final design, and construction of the Altamont Corridor Rail Project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 1505. A bill to prohibit the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture from taking action on public lands which impede border security on such lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. CHU, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 1506. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1507. A bill to implement a comprehensive border security plan to combat illegal immigration, drug and alien smuggling, and violent activity in the southwest border of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, Armed Services, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Appropriations, and Foreign Affairs, 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. POSEY:

H.R. 1508. A bill making appropriations to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard are paid during any period of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prohibit the inclusion of Social Security account numbers on Medicare cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1510. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit a pat down search of minor for purposes of air transportation security without the consent and presence of a parent of the minor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1511. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program and to expand the program to include more small businesses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1512. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the representatives of the Federal Reserve banks from membership on the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STARK, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HINCHAY):

H.R. 1513. A bill to prohibit the conducting of invasive research on great apes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1514. A bill to limit United States assistance to Egypt unless Egypt is honoring its commitments under the 1979 peace treaty between Egypt and Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1515. A bill to provide driver safety grants to States with graduated driver licensing laws that meet certain minimum requirements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 1516. A bill to authorize loan guarantees for projects to construct renewable fuel pipelines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1517. A bill to amend titles 10 and 28, United States Code, to provide for military sexual assault and domestic violence accountability, and for other purposes; 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. CRITZ (for himself and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend section 310 of the Trade Act of 1974 to strengthen provisions relating to the identification of United States trade expansion priorities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr.

OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WU, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VISCIOSKY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CHU, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. POLIS, Mr. FARR, Mr. REYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TERNEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BACA, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. KIND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. FALCONE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BOREN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WATT, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1519. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that oil and gas drilling and production operations on the outer Continental Shelf must have in place the best available technology for blow-out preventers and emergency shutoff equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1521. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the West Hunter Street Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1522. A bill to repeal the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LATHAM, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1523. A bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide for Debbie Smith grants for auditing sexual assault evidence backlogs and to establish a Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1524. A bill to build capacity and provide support at the leadership level for successful school turnaround efforts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 1525. A bill to provide high-quality public charter school options for students by enabling such public charter schools to expand and replicate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1526. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to except from the early distribution penalty certain qualified retirement plan distributions used to purchase a residence that has been in foreclosure for a year or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 1527. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide each individual taxpayer a receipt for an income tax payment which is allocable to various Government spending categories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 1528. A bill to protect and enhance consumer privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 1529. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 to provide for implementation of additional recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1530. A bill to establish the Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for core curriculum development; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. GARRETT):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the freedom, security, and stability of Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the National Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender name-calling, bullying, and harassment faced by individuals in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. LONG (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the third Saturday in April as "National Auctioneers Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

9. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 37 urging the members of the West Virginia Delegation to oppose any actions by the Congress to reduce funding for Community Service Block Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

10. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 21 supporting the Federal Government's efforts to provide electricity to residents of the Navajo Nation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

11. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution No. 6009 urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to accept "Life of the Project" conservation easements; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1504.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 1505.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States), and Clause 1 of Article 1, Section 8, which grants Congress the authority to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, and Clause 18 of Article 1 Section 8, which allows the authority to make laws deemed necessary and proper.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1506.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

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

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 1507.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the enumerated powers listed in Article I, section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1508.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1509.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1510.

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

This law is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and the 4th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1511.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1512.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause).

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H.R. 1513.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 1514.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution states that all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1515.

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

Article I, §8, clause 1, commonly referred to as the Spending Clause.

By Mr. BOSWELL:

H.R. 1516.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 1517.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. CRITZ:

H.R. 1518.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1519.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. INSLER:

H.R. 1520.

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

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, Section 3, which provides that Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 1521.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1522.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1523.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads: The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1524.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1525.

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

Article I, Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1526.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; The 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1527.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1528.

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

Article 1 Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1529.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1530.

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 "provide for the common Defence," as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H.R. 1531.

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

This bill is introduced under the powers granted to Congress under Article 1 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 35: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 58: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. LONG, Mr. KIND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 100: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 104: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 177: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 178: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 181: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 186: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 190: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CHU, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 198: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 206: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 237: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 303: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 333: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MICA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 399: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GRIMM.
H.R. 412: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 420: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MICA, and Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 428: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 431: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 432: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 498: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 531: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 546: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 577: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 589: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 615: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BARROW, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LONG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 631: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 645: Mr. KELLY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 652: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 674: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 721: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 740: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 743: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 750: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 763: Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 776: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 798: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 822: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 838: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 865: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CRITZ, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 876: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 885: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 894: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 904: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 905: Mr. MACK and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 995: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 998: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1000: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 1002: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1006: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1016: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1025: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. JONES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REYES, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1057: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1058: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1074: Ms. BUERKLE.
H.R. 1082: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1110: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1111: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1140: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 1166: Mr. ROONEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1181: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1182: Mr. LONG, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KLINE, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COLE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGEN of California.
H.R. 1186: Mr. FLORES and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 1195: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1206: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1212: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1219: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1229: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1230: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1231: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1236: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1240: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1242: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1249: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1270: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LONG, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 1286: Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 1287: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1288: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1297: Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. COLE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
H.R. 1303: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1317: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 1323: Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HALL, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HECK, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 1326: Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1327: Mr. FLORES, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1338: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1340: Mr. WEST.
H.R. 1341: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGEN of California, and Mr. CANSECO.
H.R. 1370: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1380: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1386: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1391: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1418: Mr. JONES and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1425: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1426: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WU, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1433: Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1440: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1448: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1469: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 1474: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 1475: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1477: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1488: Mr. WEINER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 1501: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. LONG, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COLE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. REED, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. LUCAS.
H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. CAMP.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H. Res. 19: Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 137: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H. Res. 179: Mr. LEVIN.
H. Res. 180: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H. Res. 208: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H. Res. 209: Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H. Res. 210: Mr. SIRES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2011

No. 54

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, who made light to shine in darkness, shine on Capitol Hill. Restore our lawmakers to the light of Your glory as we have seen revealed in Your sacred word. May they permit Your sacred Scriptures to provide a lamp for their feet and a light for their path. Refusing to lean upon human wisdom alone, help them to seek Your guidance and to follow where You lead. Like a shepherd, guide them and our Nation through the darkness and dangers of these challenging times.

We glorify You, gracious God. We praise You for all Your blessings. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in morning business until 3 p.m. today. During that period of time, Senators will be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The Republicans will control the time from 11:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m., and the majority will control the time from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

We are working on an agreement to complete action on the small business bill. It has been a difficult thing to do. We have a number of amendments that are pending. Some Senators will not allow an agreement on those amendments unless they get their amendments. There are a lot of amendments, and we are trying to work our way through them. The three amendments at the top of the list are one offered by Senator CORNYN, one by Senator HUTCHISON, and one by Senator SANDERS.

We have not been able to work through this legislative morass. We have spent more than enough time on this bill. I am going to continue working on that with time here not being so heavily used. Certainly yesterday was a case in point. Everyone is looking forward to the final conclusion of this fiscal year 2011 budget. We are going to have a vote this week to complete that. Everyone, I guess, is anxious to get

that done. We need to get the small business jobs bill done.

Additionally, the text of the long-term CR has been filed in the House and is available for review. We expect to receive it from the House sometime tomorrow—of course, from my perspective, the earlier, the better. So I ask Senators to come and talk about this resolution. If they have any problems, things they like or dislike, they can come and talk about this bill. This would be the time to do that because we will be cramped for time when the bill gets here. Senators, of course, will be notified when votes are arranged.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.J. RES. 37

Mr. REID. H.J. Res. 37 is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to this joint resolution at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair announce morning business?

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2407

business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with Republicans controlling the time from 11:30 to 12:30 for the purpose of a colloquy and the Democrats controlling the time from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

NEED FOR SERIOUS FISCAL ACTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, all across the country this morning, Americans are struggling—and they are not getting much in the way of help or hope from Washington. Those who are unemployed or eager to hire are frustrated by the mountain of burdensome new rules and regulations Democrats have imposed on them in the past 2 years and by the uncertainty that comes with every proposal to create another one. They are shocked that a White House which does not even try to balance its checkbook would repeatedly propose to raise taxes. And more and more, they are worried about the consequences of our debt and the President's reluctance to do anything about it.

But even more upsetting to many Americans is the repeated attempts of the White House to seem as if it is doing something about these things when it is not. That is just what the President has sought to do in talking about the need to reform entitlements and lower the debt, but refusing to lift a finger to do either. And that is just what I fear he will do again this afternoon in outlining his vision for tackling these problems without so much as presenting a single new idea or anything approaching a workable plan to get us there.

The truth is, the President is only entering this debate at all because he can no longer ignore the growing bipartisan calls for action. If he were serious, he would be talking about a detailed roadmap for action, not just grabbing headlines by announcing another speech.

Of course, we can hope that the President presents more than just his vision for the future this afternoon. But those who have hoped for that from this President have been disappointed many times before. What we are likely to get instead is a broad-

brush notion of what the President wants to see—a vision that includes calls for strengthening entitlement programs that few people would disagree with but which will never come about absent Presidential leadership; a partisan call for tax hikes on struggling job creators, and, I fear, a call for tax hikes on energy producers when gas prices are already creating heavy burdens for so many.

No doubt we will also get a fair share of finger-pointing and an attempt to cast Republicans in the worst possible light for actually laying out a serious plan to address the crises we face while others merely talk about their vision. But we can still hope that the President leaves the scapegoating aside for a change and finally admits the obvious: that we can only solve these fiscal crises if we do so together.

So either the President agrees today that Republicans have a point when it comes to the seriousness of our fiscal problems and admits that the old approach of pretending they do not exist will not work anymore or those problems will become harder and harder to solve. Either he pretends that old programs, unlike everything else in life, do not need to adapt to survive or he joins us in acknowledging those programs will no longer be there for the people who are counting on them if we do not take serious action now.

We need to keep our promises to seniors and to a rising generation of Americans—and we will—but we can no longer afford to make promises to younger workers that we all know we cannot afford to keep.

Look: if big government created jobs and opportunity, then we would be in the middle of a boom right now. That experiment has failed. And that is why the national conversation has shifted from how much Democrats want to expand the scope of government to how much both parties should rein it in.

The fiscal crisis we face will not be solved by “freezing” unsustainable government spending or by raising taxes on the very small businesses we are counting on to create jobs. And the programs we cherish as Americans will not be preserved for the next generation through speeches alone. Americans do not want to hear the President's vision today—he has had 2 years to lay that out. They want to hear his plan.

Americans do not want to hear the President criticize or distort the serious efforts of those in our party who want to solve our problems head on. They want to hear a detailed counterproposal of his own. And they do not want to hear that the price of gas at the pump is going to get even higher, or that their opportunities to find or create jobs will shrink. Now is not a time for mere speeches or political attacks. It is a time for action.

That is what Americans want from this President. That is what they are failing to get. I hope that changes today.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOLUNTARISM

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I rise to mark National Volunteer Week and Delaware Volunteer Week. All week long throughout the Nation and across the great State of Delaware, Americans and Delawareans will be engaged in volunteer service. Volunteer opportunities include helping the homeless, tending to the environment, mentoring children in schools, and working to keep communities safer and stronger and free from fires and accidents and injuries, among many others.

Here in the Senate one can't talk about community service or national service or voluntarism without thanking and recognizing our colleague Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI from Delaware's neighboring State of Maryland. Senator MIKULSKI has been the leader on voluntarism for many years, most of them alongside the late Senator Ted Kennedy. I am proud to be working with her to fight to save our national service programs.

When Delaware's tireless Governor Jack Markell was sworn into office in 2009, he decided to forgo the traditional Governor's inaugural ball and he, along with his wonderful wife, our first lady Carla Markell, instead organized a week of service projects across the State. Today that week of service continues and has become a tremendous opportunity for nonprofit organizations and community service organizations across the State to connect with Delawareans excited about teaching our children the value of voluntarism, connecting with neighbors and helping improve and strengthen our communities.

I have long believed that those who engage in voluntarism and service to others in fact get more out of it than they put in.

Voluntarism, as you know, Madam President, is a fundamental part of what it means to be American. It is a great—some would say the greatest—part of America and its cultural traditions. However, voluntarism need not be confined to my State or this week. It is something from which every American can benefit at every stage in their life.

In my view, one of the most effective voluntarism efforts in modern history is one with which I was first engaged when I was a resident briefly of the State of the Acting President pro tempore when I was working for the national “I Have a Dream” Foundation in New York City now many years ago.

The national AmeriCorps program—a partnership between the Federal Government and local nonprofit communities—was launched with bipartisan support, initially an idea proposed by President Bush and then enacted by President Clinton. The AmeriCorps program is now one which has had a tremendous and far-reaching impact over the last 17 years. It enables 75,000 Americans to serve annually via AmeriCorps with a very wide range of programs—programs where the funding is raised and its focus is directed by State, by State commissions of volunteers, community leaders, who help identify the best and most appropriate, most effective partners for this federally funded program that is also matched one to one with dollars from the local community. So far more than 60 million hours of community service annually has been provided by AmeriCorps members.

In Delaware, voluntarism has a long tradition and a great history, and the volunteer fire service is one of the strongest parts of that long and proud history of our State. There are more than 88 volunteer fire companies in our State. They provide the vast majority of fire suppression services for our communities.

They faced a real problem when I became county executive: a steady loss in membership. As working-class families were under more and more pressure, with both parents working, they were under more stress, more demands, and it became more difficult for people to dedicate the time and energy needed to be trained and to serve as volunteer firefighters, and, in particular, to deliver ambulance service—one of the most important aspects of our volunteer fire service.

So in partnership with our New Castle County Volunteer Firefighters Association, and with the YMCA, and with AmeriCorps, I worked tirelessly to launch a new AmeriCorps program called the Emergency Services Corps.

The Emergency Services Corps helps recruit volunteer firefighters and conducts CPR and first aid training and provides fire awareness training for schoolchildren all across our county. So far they have recruited more than 220 volunteer firefighters and logged more than 108,000 hours of service to our community in the 5 years since it was created as a partnership between all these different entities.

I just thought I would draw attention to that one example today of the hundreds of AmeriCorps programs across our country that I think are a shining example of how the young people of this country—people at all ages across this country—bring their gifts, their talents, and their spirit to volunteering.

In every generation of Americans, heeding the call to service has been the answer to our greatest challenges, and with so many out of work, suffering from hunger or facing homelessness right here in our own country, I think

it is critical we all pitch in to help. It is an affirmation of our bond of citizenship and our compassion for our fellow citizens.

So I would like to encourage everyone in my State to visit the Volunteer Delaware Web site to find service opportunities this week. I am putting a link to it on my Web site at www.coons.senate.gov. For those who happen to be outside Delaware, I hope they will visit www.nationalservice.gov and participate in this National Volunteer Week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam 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.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, may I be recognized to speak in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in morning business.

MEDICARE

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, the Paul Ryan/tea party budget of the House of Representatives privatizes Medicare. Let me repeat that. Medicare, the program of medical care for senior citizens that our seniors have come to depend on—the Paul Ryan/tea party budget of the House of Representatives privatizes Medicare.

This is not an empty threat. It is not this Senator's or any other Senator's political interpretation. The budget of the House Republican Budget Committee chairman would end Medicare as we know it. It ends Medicare. It hands seniors' health care over to insurance companies. It would break a sacred contract between workers who paid into the system thinking it would be there for them when they retired. But under this new scheme, senior citizens will not have a Medicare Program anymore. They would have to pick an insurance plan, and a voucher would be given directly to the insurance company.

Under the proposal—I am not making this up—a voucher, paid for by the Federal Government, would be given not to the senior citizen to go shopping, it would be given to the insurance company that they chose. Medicare for senior citizens would be turned over to insurance companies. If this sounds incredible, it is, because under that plan insurers would decide what doctors seniors get to see and what health benefits get covered.

Now, why do I say that? That is an HMO. An HMO is a health maintenance organization. That is an insurance company. They have a panel of doctors, they have a panel of hospitals, and

they determine what is in the coverage that a senior citizen gets.

Contrast that to Medicare now, that Medicare fee-for-service. The senior citizen makes the choice of their doctor, of what are the things they look for in their total medical care, paid for because they are senior citizens and are eligible for Medicare, of which they have been paying in all of their lives through a Medicare tax.

So now this proposal is to privatize Medicare, take it out of being a government fee-for-service plan, and, instead, insert it into a privatized insurance company.

Do senior citizens want to change their Medicare and turn it over to insurance companies? I do not think so. If insurance plans raise their costs, which we know they do, seniors then would have to pick up the bill. Seniors would have to pay more out of their pocket for this voucher program.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, out-of-pocket costs—this is according to CBO, the nonpartisan actuarial accounting organization—according to CBO, out-of-pocket costs would more than double for seniors.

This voucher program proposed by the chairman of the Budget Committee in the House, Congressman RYAN, is not like Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage has been a great program for senior citizens, and in our State of Florida we have more signed up for Medicare Advantage than any other State because of what it does. It provides benefits at low cost to senior citizens because the Federal Government directly negotiates with the insurance companies' plans. That is different from what Congressman RYAN and the tea party are proposing. So insurance companies, under Medicare Advantage, have to provide guaranteed health benefits at a low price that is negotiated. As a result of the new health care reform law, Medicare Advantage premiums have actually gone down. These are the premiums that are paid by senior citizens.

So do not let folks confuse you between what is proposed by the Budget chairman in the House and the existing Medicare Advantage Program. The Ryan/tea party budget leaves these decisions up to the insurance plan. In other words, insurance companies will be in charge of seniors' health care. I do not think that is what our senior citizens intend to have happen.

The tea party wants to end Medicare. That is the bottom line. Yet the House budget does little—interestingly, little—if anything to actually reduce the Federal deficit, which is what they say their budget is for, to reduce the Federal deficit.

Well, look at it. The House Budget chairman claims his budget includes \$5.8 trillion in spending cuts, but when we look at it closer we learn this claim was an accounting gimmick. We have seen these gimmicks over and over in budgeting in the Federal Government.

For example, first, we learned that his staff had made a \$200 billion mathematical calculating error in calculating interest savings. Then, second, we learned that \$1.3 trillion of the savings is artificially derived from a misleading assumption that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan would continue indefinitely. Third, and most importantly, of his savings, \$4.2 trillion of the savings come from the spending cuts that fly out the back door in the form of tax cuts for millionaires.

At the end of the day, those \$5.8 trillion in spending cuts in their budget translates into less than \$200 billion in real deficit reduction over those years, or less than 1 percent of the total debt held by the public.

So the Congressman Ryan/tea party budget does little to address the deficit while making every single senior citizen in this country get their health care from an insurance company.

So that is why Senator BAUCUS, our chairman of the Finance Committee, and I have introduced a resolution. This Senate resolution calls on the Senate to oppose this radical voucher program. Medicare has been providing affordable health care for seniors and disabled Floridians and Americans for decades and decades. It is a very popular program with our seniors. Medicare should not be dismantled. It should not be turned over in a voucher program to insurance companies that will eliminate choices. It should not be turned over to insurance companies that will increase costs, and, certainly, seniors' health care should not be turned over to insurance companies.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we are all kind of on pins and needles about what the President is going to say today in his speech on the budget at George Washington University. I hope he comes forward with a strong program to get the budget deficit down because Presidential leadership will help us get the job done. Congress can do it on its own, but it will be a lot easier if we know we are working with the President instead of against the President.

I hope the President's remarks reflect the fact that elections have consequences and the consequence of the last election was a very strong message to Washington that we ought to get spending down and government ought to be smaller. In anticipation of what he says, I wish to make some remarks, and my anticipation is based upon things that have already been said from the White House by staff about the direction the President's speech is taking.

If we learned anything during the last 2 years, it is that America can't tax and spend its way back to prosperity. The voters understood that and

sent a powerful message to Washington last November: Stop piling debt on the next generation. Stop the overspending that mortgages our children's future and jeopardizes job creation.

Thanks to the gravitational pull of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives responding to the results of the last election, the compass is starting to point in the right direction. Despite the two-against-one lineup of the debate, meaning the President and the Democratic Senate on one side and the House under the control of the Republicans on the other side—that two-to-one lineup—we have a continuing resolution at the start of what must be a long-haul, committed effort.

The continuing resolution we will pass this week is just the beginning because the hard work has only just begun. That is reflected in the leadership demonstrated by the House of Representatives' Budget Committee chairman PAUL RYAN. He did what the President failed to do in his budget proposal—get serious. Today, I hope we have evidence that the President is getting serious. But up until now, the President ducked, even ignoring his own deficit reduction commission report fresh off the printer. He hasn't said yes or no whether he supports the recommendations of the Bowles-Simpson commission.

In sharp contrast, House Chairman RYAN stepped up and put ideas on the table for fiscal responsibility. Today, in response to this effort, to show the voters we got it in the last election and that it is time to reduce spending in Washington, the President is giving his speech on reducing the debt. After reluctantly coming to the table for very modest reductions in spending that are going to be in this continuing resolution we will hopefully pass this week, the President has quickly moved past any focus on getting spending under control and seems to be going back to that same old saw that we have to have tax increases to reduce the deficit. But history proves tax increases do not bring an additional dollar to the bottom line. Tax increases are a license to spend even more than the \$1 that might come in from a tax increase, and we also know increasing taxes is not going to reduce the deficit. Only growing the economy is going to reduce the deficit. Tax increases can have a detrimental impact on growing the economy because government consumes well; it doesn't create well. Only workers and investors and people who invent and people who create, create wealth.

There has always been a tug of war in Washington between tax-cutters and big spenders. There are those of us who believe taxpayers have a right to keep more of their own money and decide how best to save and spend and invest those dollars. Others in Congress and in Washington believe Washington knows best and work relentlessly to divert more private resources into the

public coffers. Recycling even more tax dollars through Washington, especially during an economic downturn which we are in now, and eight-tenths percent unemployment proves it. Doing more of that doesn't make sense if we want recovery.

Consider the work of two U.S. Presidents from opposite sides of the political spectrum. Study the history of John Kennedy on one end and Ronald Reagan on the other. They understood that raising taxes bore negative consequences for job creation and economic growth. My colleagues may remember that during World War II and afterwards, we had 93 percent marginal tax rates. Who decreased that? Not some Republican President but a Democrat President. He reduced it because it was not raising revenue and it was hindering the economy. We had a situation when corporate and personal income tax rates climbed during the Great Depression, we have proof unemployment kept climbing as well. In fact, if there are two things we want to remember from Hoover that we should never make these mistakes again, they are that he raised taxes tremendously high and he signed the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, leading us into the Great Depression. As America struggles to shake off the biggest economic downturn in decades, we can't afford to repeat the same mistakes. We should learn from history.

In an economy where consumer spending accounts for nearly 70 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product and small businesses account for 70 percent of the new jobs, it would be foolish to divert even more of America's taxpayer money into the Federal Treasury. With a smaller tax liability, small business owners can expand their operations, upgrade their equipment, and hire more workers in their hometown communities. But tax policies designed to increase revenues for more government spending will not help these hometown business leaders create new jobs that can attract and retain talent and vitality in those small towns. What is more, raising Federal tax rates would stunt the positive ripple effect that occurs in the local economy and in the local tax base when small businesses are able to grow and expand their sales output and profits.

Raising taxes sets the stage for paralyzing setbacks for small business. So we should not forget that many small business owners are subject to the highest marginal tax rates and Federal estate taxes. I have worked for a long time for tax policies that give small business owners the freedom and opportunity to hire, expand, and grow their businesses without having profit-burning taxes and overly burdensome regulations get in the way of getting ahead and living the American dream and creating those jobs. Marginal tax rate increases are especially harmful to small businesses because small businesses are typically organized as flow-through entities. Since small businesses create 70 percent of the new jobs

and unemployment, at 8.8 percent, remains historically high, it doesn't make sense to raise taxes on small businesses.

Supporters of the tax increases for those earning \$250,000 a year would like to camouflage the tax hit on small businesses, but their attempts to mislead cannot withstand an honest examination. The marginal tax rate hikes would directly target flow-through businesses that employ 20 million American workers. It is a waste of resources for Washington to recycle tax dollars through the public sector when small businesses can do more good and get more bang for their own buck and taxpayers, in general, deserve more bang for their buck.

I have a chart that shows my colleagues an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, the official non-partisan scorekeeper for Congress. In its January 2011 "Budget and Economic Outlook" report, CBO reports that taxes have averaged 18 percent of the gross national product from 1971 to the year 2010. So this is the historical average. What is very significant about an average going back to 1971—is it seems to me a level of taxation the people of this country have not revolted against. It is a level of taxation that has not been harmful to the U.S. economy, as we have seen great growth during this period of time.

So here is where we are. Beyond the very negative impact of tax increases, there is no evidence that tax increases lead to deficit reduction. In fact, if history is any guide, Washington will simply spend the money.

I often quote a Professor Vedder of Ohio University who has studied tax increases and spending for more than two decades. This is the very same study I was referring to as I started my remarks today. "Over the entire post World War II era through 2009, each dollar of new tax revenue was associated with \$1.17 in new spending."

So it is akin to a dog chasing its tail. It is never going to catch it. If we raise \$1 and it doesn't go to the bottom line, and Professor Vedder says it doesn't go to the bottom line, it is a license to spend \$1.17. How do we ever get ahead? Then we have people who want to increase taxes because another dollar coming in is going to lead to \$1.17 of spending. It would be one thing for me to vote for a tax increase if it went to the bottom line. It is another thing to vote for a tax increase that just allows more spending and raises the deficit instead of getting the deficit down. People in my State of Iowa don't tell me they are undertaxed. They know all too well the problem is that Washington overspends.

Before this chart is taken down, just so my colleagues can understand, there is no reason to raise taxes above this historical average to bring in more revenue because we can see the projection by CBO. The existing tax rates are going to bring in more revenue without increasing tax rates just because of the economy growing.

With the existing tax rates, revenues coming in will return to the level we had after the 2001 tax bill—that bill reduced taxes by providing the biggest tax decrease in the history of this country. We brought in additional revenue with reduced rates—more revenue than would come in by raising marginal tax rates. That ought to be calculated. You should not do anything that is going to destroy this situation.

Some are proposing eliminating the cap on wages for social security taxes. This would result in a huge tax increase of 6.2 percent on income over \$106,800. Both employees and employers pay these taxes. Those in favor of this will argue that it is needed to protect benefits for social security beneficiaries. We have been down that road before. We raised the tax rate in the 1980s. This was supposedly also to protect benefits, but look where we are now. There is no guarantee that raising taxes in that way will guarantee benefits.

Referring to this chart again, to be specific on this growth out here, CBO projects that taxes will average 19.9 percent of gross national product from 2010 to 2021, rising to 20.8 percent of GDP by 2021. If we increase taxes, I think it will put that economic growth in jeopardy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from Investors Business Daily.

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

[From Investors.com, Apr. 11, 2011]

TAX THE RICH? GOOD LUCK WITH THAT

(By Walter Williams)

I've often said that I wish there were some humane way to get rid of the rich. If you asked why, I'd answer that getting rid of the rich would save us from distraction by leftist hustlers promoting the politics of envy.

Not having the rich to fret over might enable us to better focus our energies on what's in the best interest of the 99.99% of the rest of us. Let's look at some facts about the rich laid out by Bill Whittle citing statistics on his RealClearPolitics video "Eat the Rich."

This year, Congress will spend \$3.7 trillion dollars. That turns out to be about \$10 billion per day. Can we prey upon the rich to cough up the money?

According to IRS statistics, roughly 2% of U.S. households have an income of \$250,000 and above. By the way, \$250,000 per year hardly qualifies one as being rich. It's not even yacht and Learjet money.

All told, households earning \$250,000 and above account for 25%, or \$1.97 trillion, of the nearly \$8 trillion of total household income. If Congress imposed a 100% tax, taking all earnings above \$250,000 per year, it would yield the princely sum of \$1.4 trillion. That would keep the government running for 141 days, but there's a problem because there are 224 more days left in the year.

How about corporate profits to fill the gap? Fortune 500 companies earn nearly \$400 billion in profits. Since leftists think profits are little less than theft and greed, Congress might confiscate these ill-gotten gains so that they can be returned to their rightful owners.

Taking corporate profits would keep the government running for another 40 days, but that along with confiscating all income

above \$250,000 would only get us to the end of June. Congress must search elsewhere.

According to the Forbes 400, America has 400 billionaires with a combined net worth of \$1.3 trillion. Congress could confiscate their stocks and bonds, and force them to sell their businesses, yachts, airplanes, mansions and jewelry. The problem is that after fleecing the rich of their income and net worth, and the Fortune 500 corporations of their profits, it would only get us to mid-August.

The fact of the matter is there are not enough rich people to come anywhere close to satisfying Congress' voracious spending appetite. They're going to have to go after the non-rich.

But let's stick with the rich and ask a few questions. Politicians, news media people and leftists in general entertain what economists call a zero-elasticity view of the world. That's just fancy economic jargon for a view that government can impose a tax and people will behave after the tax just as they behaved before the tax, and the only change is more government revenue.

One example of that vision, at the state and local levels of government, is the disappointing results of confiscatory tobacco taxes. Confiscatory tobacco taxes have often led to less state and local revenue because those taxes encourage smuggling.

Similarly, when government taxes profits, corporations report fewer profits and greater costs. When individuals face higher income taxes, they report less income, buy tax shelters and hide their money. It's not just rich people who try to avoid taxes, but all of us—liberals, conservatives and libertarians.

What's the evidence? Federal tax collections have been between 15% and 20% of GDP every year since 1960. However, between 1960 and today, the top marginal tax rate has varied between 91% and 35%.

That means whether taxes are high or low, people make adjustments in their economic behavior so as to keep the government tax take at 15% to 20% of GDP. Differences in tax rates have a far greater impact on economic growth than federal revenues.

So far as Congress' ability to prey on the rich, we must keep in mind that rich people didn't become rich by being stupid.

Mr. GRASSLEY. According to this article, even if the government confiscated all of the income of people earning \$250,000 a year, the money would fund the Federal Government today for a mere 140 days. CBO statistics tell us that the top 5 percent of households earn 29 percent of the income and pay 43 percent of the income tax collected by the Federal Government. This chart here shows that these 5 percent of households have seen their taxes go up or hold steady while the other 95 percent of households have seen their taxes go down.

We are in a situation where people are talking about increasing taxes on higher income people because, supposedly, they can afford it—and probably they can afford it. But I get sick and tired of the demagoguery that goes on in Washington of taxing higher income people. This group of people is already paying 43 percent of all of the income tax coming in to the Federal Government, while 47 percent of the people in this country don't pay any income tax whatsoever. How high do taxes have to go, generally, to satisfy the appetite of the people in this Congress to spend money? And particularly, how high do marginal tax rates

have to go to satisfy those clamoring for higher taxes that the wealthiest in this country are paying enough money?

In addition to the CBO statistics on households, IRS statistics show that 1 percent of the wealthiest people make 27 percent of the income and pay 40 percent of the income taxes. If it be 41 or 42 percent, maybe we can look at it. But I never get the sense from anybody who is proposing these higher marginal tax rates on upper income people that they are ever going to be satisfied that those people are paying enough taxes. So I will get back to what I said. You could confiscate all the income earned by people that make over \$250,000 a year but you are only going to run the government for 140 days. What do you do for the rest of the year if you only want the wealthy to pay all the taxes?

We ought to have some principles of taxation that we are abiding by. I abide by the principle that 18 percent of the GDP of this country is good enough for the government to spend. That leaves 82 percent in the pockets of the taxpayers for them to decide how to spend. Because if 535 of us decide how to divide up the resources of this country, it doesn't do as much economic good. If the money is left in the pockets of the 137 million taxpayers to decide whether to spend or to save it, and how to save it, or what to spend it on, it responds to the dynamics of our economy. They would be participating in the American free enterprise system in a way that the 535 Members of Congress don't know enough how to do. If we relied upon the 535 of us to decide how to spend more resources of this country, we would not have the economic growth we have. We would be Europeanizing our economy, and we know that is bad.

This principle of 18 percent of gross domestic product is good and it has been consistent throughout recent history. This chart here shows that it is not a straight line, but it is pretty even over a 50-year average. I think it averages out at about 18.2 percent. You have the marginal tax rates going back to 93 percent during World War II and staying there until, as I said, Senator Kennedy becomes President and he decides the marginal tax rate is too high for the good of the economy and he reduces it. I am told because of the Vietnam war, it went up. It stayed even at 70 percent until President Reagan. Then it goes down to a 50 percent marginal tax rate. Then it stays there a while. In 1986, it goes down to 28 percent. Then we have the promise of no new taxes when President Bush reneged on that promise, and it went back up to almost 40 percent. Then they went up again here and stayed here, and then we had the tax decrease of 2001.

Do you know what this shows? Everybody has an idea that if you raise the marginal tax rates, you will bring in more revenue. But the taxpayers, workers, and investors of this country are smarter than we are. We have had

a 93-percent marginal tax rate—then 70 percent, 50 percent, 28 percent, and now a 35-percent marginal tax rate. But, regardless of the rate, you get the same amount of revenue, because taxpayers have decided they are going to give us bums in Washington just so much of their money to spend, and it works out to be about 18 percent of gross domestic product.

So we have a President who will probably give a speech today and say we are going to raise taxes on higher income people because, like him, they ought to pay more money. What do you get out of it? You can mess with these marginal tax rates all you want to, but you will bring in about the same amount of revenue. Why? In part because people have decided that, if we are going to tax them to death, they are going to take more leisure and they are going to invest in nonproductive investments. Bottom line—increasing taxes doesn't bring more revenue into the federal Treasury.

You have to keep marginal tax rates low so you can expand this economy. As we have seen, when taxes go down, unemployment goes down; when taxes go up, the incentive to employ is gone. So here we are.

The national debt poses serious risk to the long-term economic health of the United States. It puts a heavy burden on taxpayers who will have less take-home pay to save, spend and invest if they have to send more money to Washington.

Washington needs to champion policies that grow the economy and create jobs, and in turn, increases revenue to the federal Treasury, enabling deficit and debt reduction, not defend ways that grow the government.

The President and 535 Members of Congress collectively represent many different constituencies across the ideological, political, geographic and demographic spectrum. Although representing many, we can work as one to make America an even better place for posterity. If we continue to live beyond our means and get in the way of job-creating economic opportunity, we will push future generations over a fiscal cliff of no return. That is why Washington must clamp down on new spending and shrink the national debt.

I hope we have a President who is willing to look at history and learn from history in his speech today.

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. BARRASSO. Madam 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.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak until 11:30 in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEBT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week America's government was brought to the brink of a shutdown, and the shutdown was avoided literally at the eleventh hour just last Friday. The same day, the President called Speaker BOEHNER to try to advance the talks. According to Politico, the President told Speaker BOEHNER, "We are the two most consequential leaders in the U.S. Government." The President was right, so why was only one of those two leaders actively trying to lead on the issue of the day? Speaker BOEHNER was trying for weeks to put together a deal that could serve the American people, but right up until the end, the President was missing in action. Even Senator MANCHIN, a member of the President's own party, said the President had "failed to lead this debate."

Now the President is finally saying he wants to talk about what steps our country needs to take to get our fiscal house in order. I really do hope the President is serious, but I have my doubts. This is a line we have heard from the President before. Back in February 2009, the President called experts to the White House for what he called a fiscal responsibility summit. In his opening remarks, the President said this:

Contrary to the prevailing wisdom in Washington these past few years, we cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences to the next budget, the next administration, or the next generation.

That was February 2009. For the last 2 years of this administration, all the President did was add trillions of dollars to that debt.

Late last year, the President's debt commission released their report on America's fiscal situation, and the findings were sobering. According to the report, they said the problem is real, the solution will be painful, there is no easy way out, everything must be on the table, and he said Washington must lead. The President ignored the report.

America is done waiting for him to take this issue seriously. Last week, the House Budget Committee chairman PAUL RYAN put forward the first concrete plan to address our debt crisis. Now the President has suddenly decided that crisis needs to be addressed. The President has a national address scheduled for today, and maybe that will be the moment of truth. I hope it will not be another one of the President's recycled speeches; empty words cannot fill America's pockets.

Last November, the American people told us they wanted the truth. They wanted to know their representatives could make tough decisions. That is what we heard on election day. They wanted to make sure there would be a future for their families and for their children. I think the American people deserve results. The President has paid them back with excuses, with delays, and with business as usual.

Republicans have been the leaders on trying to reduce the spending. The

President's party has only criticized, complained or, in the final moments, tried to take credit. They refuse to lead and have refused to act.

Now the President's party wants us to raise the debt ceiling in what they call a clean bill. That is a fancy way of saying they want us to borrow more money with no strings attached. The President opposed doing the same thing back in 2006 when he was a Senator. This is what he said then. The President, on the floor of the Senate, said:

The fact that we are on the floor today debating raising the nation's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign the Government cannot pay its own bills. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our Government's reckless fiscal policies.

I would just say that if President Obama thought raising the debt ceiling at a \$9 trillion level was a sign of leadership failure, why then is President Obama asking us to raise it beyond the \$14 trillion now?

Facts are stubborn things. The numbers do not lie. Every day, this government borrows over \$4 billion. We did it yesterday, and we will do it today and tomorrow. Over 40 cents of every dollar Washington spends is borrowed money, much of it from China. Every American child born today and tomorrow and the next day owes over \$45,000. Next year, Washington will spend 68 cents of every tax dollar on Social Security, on Medicare, on Medicaid, or interest on the debt. If we as a nation continue on the President's path, Washington will spend all of what it takes in on these items alone. Everything else, from defense to education, will be paid for on a budget of borrowed money. Where is the money going to come from? A lot of it from other countries, countries that do not always have America's best interests at heart.

John F. Kennedy once said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." In a few years, that could change to, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what your country must do for China. Consider this: When John F. Kennedy was President, America only owed 4 percent of its debt to foreign countries. Today, we owe half of our debt to foreign countries.

Debt is not just a disaster for our future; the amount of debt we owe right now, today, is so high that it is hurting our employment at home. Experts tell us our debt is costing us 1 million jobs, and the evidence is clear that our debt is disastrous in the present as well as for the future. A debt such as this makes it harder for American families to buy cars and homes, to pay tuition for their kids to go to college, and then it makes it harder to create jobs for those kids who will be graduating this year and next year until we get the spending under control.

The President's party simply offers more of the same old failed policies

that produced the problems in the first place. Some in the President's party have suggested raising taxes to make up for the debt. I expect the President to do that this very day in his speech.

The President's speech today comes just a few months after he submitted his budget. After seeing that budget, it is hard to take the President seriously. Don't take my word for it; one writer in the Washington Post said it already:

President Obama's budget was irresponsible, failing to take on entitlements and relying on rosy assumptions.

The international magazine *The Economist* called the budget "dishonest."

America needs a President who shows real leadership and a concrete plan. That is what the American people are expecting.

I will not vote to raise the debt ceiling unless some very specific steps are taken. It is time we passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Many States have to balance their budgets, families have to balance their budgets, live within their means. Washington needs to do the same.

It is also time for us to place actual legal limits on what we do spend. A statutory limit on total government spending will force Washington to make the hard decisions each year to get us back on track. A hard cap on government spending will start us on the path toward fiscal balance and sustained growth. Ronald Reagan used to talk about starving the beast. That is what we need. Since President Obama took office, the beast has only grown fatter.

The President's party likes to accuse their opponents of being antigovernment, so why didn't the President's party bother to pass a budget or fund the government last year when they should have? And why are they driving our government further into debt, hurting America's standing and our credit on the world stage?

The President's party likes to pretend they are standing up for the little guy. They should have listened to Ronald Reagan when he said: "You can't be for big government and big spending and big taxes and still be for the little guy." The President and his party are for big government, big spending, and big taxes, and they are not for the little guy.

The fact is, the President and his party are not that interested in solutions. Instead of solutions, the President's party has hidden behind nasty words, words like "extreme" and "Draconian." Many American families are living within the same budget they had in 2008, and Republicans believe the government should do the same. Is spending no more than you did in 2008 extreme or is it extreme to support trillions more in wasteful Washington spending? Is tightening our belts like families do Draconian or is it Draconian to spend money we don't have and force our children to pay it back?

Some members of the President's party have gone even further. One lead-

er of the President's party said that Republicans wanted to starve 6 million seniors. That is a pretty disturbing claim. The problem is, the Washington Post said that she made it up. This same person called the Ryan plan a "path to poverty"—a "path to poverty," she said—"for America's seniors and children." The Ryan plan doesn't affect anyone over the age of 55. It saves Medicare for those who have not gotten there yet, and it stops the spending that puts every American on the path to permanent poverty. Meanwhile, the President says he doesn't want to point fingers. Yet so far his White House has responded to the Ryan plan by doing nothing but point fingers. They went back to their same old bag of tricks, and they tried to scare our seniors and their families.

The President also accused Congress of playing games. Yet his first budget was nothing but a giant game of kick the can, and his address today looks more likely to be just another campaign speech rather than a legitimate plan for the future.

The time has come to lead, not sit on the sidelines. The time has come for the President to act, not just to talk. As a doctor and a Senator, I believe our economy is in need of critical care. Our budget is hemorrhaging. There is not a quick or easy fix. A bandaid will not help this patient. Treatment cannot be delayed. The time to act is now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, as ranking member of the Budget Committee, I am concerned about where we are as a nation, as we struggle to get our house in order. The chairman and cochairman of the Debt Commission, Erskine Bowles, Senator Alan Simpson, have told us we are facing the most predictable financial crisis in our Nation's history. When asked when we could have a financial crisis, we are talking about another recession, a double dip, or maybe worse, maybe a worldwide cataclysm from excessive debt—hopefully not—but that is what they told us we are facing, the most predictable crisis in history.

We have gone 714 days in this Congress without passing a budget as we are required to do. The Budget Act requires Congress to pass a budget by April 15, and we have not achieved that. That is particularly problematic at a time of national crisis.

I see my colleague Senator CORKER from Tennessee here, who has worked very hard with some constructive bipartisan efforts to do something about the debt trajectory we are on. But I

guess I want to first ask him, as a highly successful mayor of Chattanooga, received great plaudits around the country and within the State for his leadership, he had to deal with real numbers, real expenditures, and real budgets. As a very successful businessman, he has had the same challenge. So I guess I would ask him for his perspective, having been in the Senate now several years, what he thinks if we as a corporation, a mayor, or a nation, facing the most severe debt crisis perhaps in its history, that we have not had a budget and do not have a plan. I guess my first question, Senator CORKER is, how, from a businessman, a former mayor who had to run a city and balance your budget, what is your perspective?

Mr. CORKER. I was on the floor last week as we talked about the continuing resolution. I said that the most frustrating thing to me coming to this body—I have been here now 4 years—is we never know where we are going.

It is an amazing thing to have 535 people serving in Congress, and there is no roadmap whatsoever as to what we are going to do. I think it is pretty evident, by the time we have this debt ceiling vote—that I think most people perceive to be the real line of demarcation—I think it is evident we are not going to have a budget passed again even for that.

So I have been working with the Senator and the other Senators on the floor and people on the other side of the aisle. I think one thing I can say is that, on this issue and candidly on every issue, I have no desire to message. I want to solve this problem as you do. I know you have been a leader on this fiscal issue, as have Senators ISAKSON and BARRASSO and others.

I want us to solve this problem. I think if you have not even had a hearing yet on the budget, it is likely that we will not have a budget this year, which is pretty amazing. So what I am trying to do is put in place something called the CAP Act. I have worked with a number of Senators on that, where what we will do is take where we are spending, our national spending relative to our economy, and we will take it down to the 40-year average of 20.6 percent in the post-entitlement period.

If we do that, we can save our country 7.6 versus existing policy over the next decade, which goes a long way toward solving the problem. It totally reverses the amount of indebtedness we are accumulating as a country. So I am working—since I do not think we are going to have a budget, which is pretty amazing—working on another route so we actually know where we are going.

Generally to the American people, they have to watch us and think, what in the world is going on in this dysfunctional body. We have got \$3.7 trillion being spent, \$2.2 trillion coming in. There is no plan whatsoever to deal with that. We are going to have to create other vehicles to deal with that. So I am generally working with people on

both sides of the aisle to come to that end.

I thank the Senator for his efforts on the budget, but I will say to you and say to the American people, as I have said many times, I have never been in a place that is more dysfunctional. No matter what the American people think about the way we handle their money, I promise you it is even worse. And I do hope—I am glad the President, by the way, is going to address this issue at 1:35 today. I know that PAUL RYAN has put forth a budget which is a roadmap, and I appreciate so much his effort.

But as a country, I think we all know we have to deal with this issue in a serious way. Spending is at all-time highs. We have not been here since 1945, on Federal spending relative to our economy. I know others want to speak and have other appointments and I will stop. I thank the Senator for his leadership. This is the No. 1 issue for Americans. It threatens our national security. It threatens our economic security. And between now and the time we vote on the debt ceiling increase, it is my hope we will solve this problem and move into a different direction.

Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator for his work. I think the legislative statutory cap on spending is something I have worked with Senator MCCASKILL on, you have worked with her on, and has potential to help us deal with the crisis we are in.

I will agree with the Senator, and I truly feel the American people have a right to be angry with Congress, because Congress has run up the largest deficits in history. We are on a trajectory that every witness we have had before the Budget Committee, and some fabulous witnesses outside of the government, all say it is an unsustainable path that places our Nation at risk. We have no real plan to deal with it. We should never have been in such a deep hole. So I think people have a right to be upset with us.

Senator ISAKSON, I know, is one of Georgia's most successful and effective businessmen. He has been involved in running the Education Department in the State of Georgia. I guess I would ask the Senator as a businessman, and as an American citizen, how do you feel about where we are? Do you think we are in a serious crisis that requires us to alter our business-as-usual approach, or do we have to take tough decisions, or is it something we sort of hold off and maybe things will get better in the future?

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama for the question. I will tell you this, I was in the real estate business for 33 years. Leverage is essential in real estate. You have to borrow money and put in equity as well to make a real estate transaction work. You cannot just do it for all cash. But too much leverage will destroy you. America has just been through a period

where many American homeowners were destroyed by too much leverage. They borrowed more than they could afford to pay in order to borrow for a house.

The United States of America is at the point where we have too much leverage. We have too much debt. Our deficit continues to escalate, adding to that debt. I tried to think—when I thought about what I would say this morning, I did not know you would ask the questions you asked. But it is appropriate that you did.

I was trying to think of an example we could put forward of a leader in the private sector who addressed a tremendous problem America faced and solved it. You know who that leader was? Lee Iacocca. I do not know how many of you will remember it, but in the 1970s Chrysler was busted. The cars did not work, people did not buy them, they were going broke, they had too much debt. They hired a guy named Lee Iacocca, brought him up from the ranks and said: Lee, we need to fix this company or we are going broke. Lee Iacocca as a leader put everything on the table: benefits, how they made their cars, discipline, rules, everything. He brought everybody to the table, the labor unions, the workers, the advisers, the economists, and the board of directors.

He said: Look, we do not even care who takes credit, we need to fix the Chrysler Motor Corporation. In a short period of time, Chrysler went from the worst rated consumer satisfaction to the best. They raised the guarantee on their product. They reduced their debt by efficiencies, and they became the most productive automaker of their time in the 1970s.

America has the ability to return to our productive times but only through leadership. I am looking forward to the President's remarks today. I hope he will be a Lee Iacocca. I hope he will not take things off the table. I hope he will not play politics with where we go. All of us have to decide to put everything on the table and make sure we prioritize America's future and get our debt and deficit under control.

I just had the Georgia Hospital Association leave my office. I will tell you the last thing I told them. They were talking about, please make sure we do not cut this, that, and the other. I said: You know, medicine is 17 percent of gross domestic product, but it is about 80 percent of our challenge in terms of Medicare and Medicaid with the future years of the debt and the deficit. We are going to have to put everything on the table. We are going to have to make sure we rein in our expenses while not destroying 17 percent of the private sector.

Quite frankly, I fear the health care bill that passed in December of 2009, and was signed last year in March, is a bill that is overly prescriptive, overly regulatory, and disincentivizes competition in terms of health care.

I hope the President will be open to suggestions in terms of bringing about

competition, making our citizens consumers, making sure we are price competitive in the delivery of the best health care in the world, not a government that tries to manage everything and be so prescriptive.

Yes, we have a problem, but we are a great country where Republicans and Democrats need to sit down at their kitchen table like the American people and make decisions that are in the best interest of their future.

I commend Senator CORKER on the CAP Act. It is the right way to go. I also want to bring up the biennial budget. I know the Senator from Alabama is the ranking member of the Budget Committee, and I have talked to Chairman CONRAD about this. We have an example that works, and that is to change the way we do our business.

In the last 3 years we have had 4 hours of debate on spending \$10 trillion. That is not the way to run a railroad. We need to change our process from an annual appropriation to a biennial appropriation where we appropriate money in odd-numbered years and we spend in even-numbered years, which are election years, looking for savings and waste and reprioritizing the way we spend money.

I know this must be true for the Budget Committee, and I know myself, if I am given the time and the task of finding savings or overexpenditures, if I am given the charge of doing so, I can do it. But if I am told to come in January, raise my right hand, and then by October pass as much spending as I can, I will spend too much money. It is human nature.

The American people ask of us only to do what they have to do. They don't have the luxury of too much leverage. If they borrow too much, they go bankrupt. We need to empower the American people by the Congress doing what the American people have to do.

The biennial budget, the CAP Act, and then Senator HATCH, with a number of Senators in this body, have introduced the balanced budget amendment—those are three components that change the paradigm, the process, and I guarantee will change the result.

Mr. SESSIONS. I couldn't agree more. I have been a long supporter of the biennial 2-year budget. I do believe it can work. It has a large amount of bipartisan support in the Congress. It can help us. I see Senators BLUNT and BARRASSO. I believe Senator BLUNT was here first. He has been involved in the leadership of the House of Representatives for many years. He is already showing himself to be a very wise and valuable contributor to our debate.

First, I would like to ask him, does he think the American people have a right to be unhappy with their leadership when they wake up and find that we have had \$1 trillion deficits for 3 years in a row and will virtually average a \$1 trillion deficit for the next 10 years and there is no plan in the Senate except the President's budget that

he submitted to us, that has the deficits increasing in years 7, 8, 9, 10 to \$1.2 trillion in the tenth year? Is this an unsustainable path? Don't the American people have a right to be upset with us and demand that we stop business as usual?

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the Senator. Of course, they have every right to be mad. They have every right to be as frustrated as we are that the work in which the Senator from Alabama is so involved as the leading Republican on the Budget Committee hasn't been able to produce a result. We are unlikely to have a budget again this year.

I was just asked by a reporter walking over here—and, yes, I was in the House for some time before I came to the Senate—for somebody like you who has been in Washington, wasn't the tea party a big challenge?

I said: No, the tea party was not a big challenge. They were a great opportunity for us to have someone out there talking about getting this spending under control. And I listed the struggle we were involved in before Senator BARRASSO got to the Senate, where we actually took on entitlement spending in 2005. As I recall that effort, I got lots of calls on entitlement spending reforms, where we cut entitlement spending the only time in a decade by \$40 billion. I got lots of calls, and not one of them was supportive of cutting spending. As far as I know, every phone I had rang everywhere I had a phone for 100 days, as far as I know, all the time. No matter how early we came in or how late we were leaving, those phones were all ringing. Every call was: Don't cut my program.

As Senator ISAKSON said, as he was talking to the friends we are seeing today from hospitals around the country, the ones from Georgia, we have to look at everything. We have to look at ways to produce better results. The government is the last place left in America—and this relates to government at almost every level and almost every government at every level—where we measure how much we care about something based on how much we spend on it instead of the results we get.

Everybody else, 20 years ago, made the decision if they were going to be competitive they had to produce a better product, a better result, and spend less money producing that better result. Only the government still thinks the other way—and we do this without a plan, apparently. The Senator can correct me if I am wrong because the Senator is a student of the budget in ways that are not exceeded by anybody in the Senate, but we are still trying to finish last year's work. I think it is the only time in the history of the Budget Act where neither House of the Congress passed a budget. There have been times when both of them passed them and couldn't agree. There have probably been times when somebody didn't pass one but never a time when nobody passed a budget. Nobody passed a sin-

gle one of the 12 appropriations bills it takes to run the government. How irresponsible can we be?

Now we have this situation where we are spending so much more money than we are taking in, and the numbers are so big it is hard to be as afraid of them as we should because who knows how much money \$3.8 trillion is. It is not just Senators and House Members; I don't think the Secretary of the Treasury really knows how much money that is. But we are spending way more than we are taking in.

Have we ever had a time before when neither House of the Congress passed a budget?

Mr. SESSIONS. I am not aware of it. We are now 715 days without a budget. This is particularly problematic since we are facing such an acknowledged debt crisis. The Secretary of the Treasury Geithner came before the Budget Committee. I asked him a number of questions. I asked him about the Rogoff and Reinhart study that says when our debt reaches over 90 percent of our economy, 90 percent of GDP, it causes the economy to slow down, be dragged down by that debt 1 percent of GDP. So if it was going to increase it 3 percent, it would increase it 2; and this amounts to, another study says, 1 million jobs. One percent of GDP growth is 1 million new jobs added. So it is very serious.

I asked him was that true. By the way, I think my colleagues are aware that we are past 95 percent of GDP today. We are over the 90 percent mark, and by September 30, we are projected to be 100 percent. So we are well above the number. The true number is not the public debt but the gross debt, and the gross debt would be 100 percent by the end of September.

Mr. Geithner said, yes, he agrees with the study that shows it pulls down the growth, and added: It is in many ways more serious than that because it could lead to a debt crisis, the kind of thing Erskine Bowles, the President's choice to head the debt commission, has warned could happen. We have a responsibility to lead the Nation that avoids us undertaking a crisis that we can see coming. We have a clear and present danger to the American Republic, this debt.

Mr. Bowles, a businessman, President Clinton's Chief of Staff, the choice to head the debt commission by President Obama, told us we are facing the most predictable debt crisis in our history, and it could happen within 2 years. I think this is really serious.

We have to change business. I think the momentum from the American people in this past election was basically a statement saying, we don't know what the problem is; it is all convoluted. But I believe as the Senator indicated at the beginning, the American people have a right to say: Get it together and fix this problem.

Mr. BLUNT. If the Senator will yield for another moment, while we have a hard time dealing with these big numbers—and I think they approach now

\$3.8 trillion in spending and \$2.2 trillion in money coming in—we are adding \$4 billion a day. We are borrowing \$4 billion a day. So in the time we had a continuing resolution for 10 days to try to decide how we cut spending, we borrowed more money in that 10 days than we saved.

Then people said: That is Draconian. It is terrible. We can't spend this much money and continue to do it.

If your family was bringing in \$22,000 a year and spending \$38,000 a year, and you had already borrowed way more money than any bank should lend you, as you just suggested, you would know that was a problem you couldn't sustain very long. If your business was bringing in \$2.2 million a year and spending \$3.8 million a year, you would know you are not going to be in business very long. Those are the kinds of real-world situations we have multiplied by thousands of times, but it has to be solved. The blueprint to solve that is the budget. We don't have one.

The Senator's responsibility for the country is to be in that budget fight. I know the Senator is there. I know he is frustrated we don't have a blueprint, but we need a blueprint. Then we need to spend lots of time on this floor and in committees figuring out how we produce a better result and spend less money and what the Federal Government is doing that just simply isn't well done, and shouldn't be done, and constitutionally there is no authorization to do and stop doing that.

I am pleased to be in this fight with the Senator from Alabama and with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is a very serious crisis. The President submitted a budget to the Congress 2 months ago. I am hoping and expect that if he makes big changes in his plan for the future, we will see that in real numbers and not just a vague vision. A vision gets too close to being a dream. It gets too close to being vapors. We are in a real situation with real money.

I have been a very aggressive critic of the President's budget. I believe it is the most irresponsible budget ever presented to Congress. We are facing a systemic, deep, long-term crisis. Everybody knows it. His budget raised taxes \$1.7 trillion. His spending was even more. In the net projection over 10 years, he would increase the debt of America \$3 trillion more than the current trend we are on. Instead of taking us off the trend, it accelerates the trend. It was a stunning development.

For example, at a time when inflation is 2 percent or so—according to the experts, at least, low inflation—he is proposing in his budget that the State Department have a 10.5-percent increase, an 11-percent increase for education, a 9.5-percent increase for the Energy Department, and a 60-percent increase in the Transportation Department to fund high-speed rail with no money to back that up. It is stunning to me that we could have those kinds of increases proposed in a formal

written document—four volumes—that the President is required to submit that I have on my desk back in the office. And he makes no projections in that document to change any of the unsustainable problems we have with Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—zero reform.

I understand he may talk about that this afternoon. I hope he will. But I believe he should go further—if he is going to propose changes—in that we need a new budget. We need to see what the numbers are. That is what Congressman RYAN and the House Republican Budget Committee have done. They have produced a real budget that can be analyzed and scored, as we call it, by the Congressional Budget Office.

If he is going to make changes in his plans for the future, I truly believe the President should talk more than about vision and dreams for the future but give us real numbers.

Senator BARRASSO, an orthopedic surgeon, has served in the legislature in Wyoming and has been a tremendous advocate on many issues, none more important than the health care debate we had.

I say to Senator BARRASSO, as someone who has not been too long in Washington and has already been elected to the leadership in the Republican Party—well deserved as a result of your proven acts—how do you feel we are handling the American people's money? What thoughts does the Senator have?

(Mr. FRANKEN assumed the chair.)

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, it is my impression that in so many ways Washington gets it wrong. The Senator is correct. I appreciate his leadership.

I did have the opportunity to serve in our State legislature in Wyoming for 5 years. The constitution in Wyoming says you have to balance your budget every year.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, did you do that?

Mr. BARRASSO. We balanced our budget every year, just like the families in Alabama or Wyoming have to balance their budget every year and have to live within their means. That is what we do. You take a look at the revenue, and then you do not spend any more than that. You live within your means. That is what families do. It is what the State does. That is why I was so proud to stand with the Senator as one of the cosponsors of the balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. I think this country has to balance its budget and do it every year.

The President's spokesman yesterday—kind of the word of the day at the White House seemed to be "vision." He kept saying the President is going to give his "vision." The day before, the word was "balance." In his press conference, he kept saying the word "balance." I would like to hear a vision that we have to balance the budget of the United States. That is what I want to hear from the President today when he gives his speech at 1:30 this after-

noon. I do not want to hear some recycled speech about, well, raise taxes, but that is what I am anticipating from the President.

I have talked to people in Wyoming after church on Sunday morning, and they have seen you, I say to the Senator, on Sunday morning talk shows—I think last week with Bob Schieffer; "Meet the Press" the week before that.

They say: Do you know that Senator?

I say: Yes, I do.

They say: Well, he makes us proud because he talks about the kinds of values we have—living within our means, balancing our budgets, not leaving our children or our grandchildren with mountains of debt.

They agree with the Senator when he makes his statement about—I think the Senator quoted someone from the budget commission about this is a predictable crisis that is coming.

Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, said the greatest threat to our Nation's security is the debt. And look how much we owe to foreign countries, significant amounts to China. You cannot continue to be a great nation with a debt like that to foreign countries, often moneys owed to people who are not our friends, who do not necessarily have our own best interest at heart.

So it is incumbent upon us as a nation to get this spending under control. That is what I see as the main issue. Hearing Senator ISAKSON on the floor and Senator BLUNT and others talking about this, it is why all 47 Republican Senators together unanimously endorsed the idea and cosponsored a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, because we know that is the responsible thing to do.

Mr. SESSIONS. I agree with the Senator, that is common sense.

Alabama Governor Dr. Bentley, a fine physician, announced that we are going to have to cut through the rest of the year in the discretionary spending 15 percent because we have a constitutional amendment that says the budget has to be balanced. Of course, we do not have that in Washington. But what would the Senator say if someone—the American people—asked you: Well, Senator, I hear the President is proposing an 11-percent increase in education, a 10-percent increase in the Energy Department, a 10-percent increase in the State Department, \$60 billion for the Transportation Department, at a time when we are going broke and spending money the likes of which we ought never to have spent before? How would the people in Wyoming react to that?

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, they would want to know if whoever would say such a thing was actually still connected to the reality of the real world and trying to live within our means. You cannot do that. You cannot do that for very long at all.

When you look at the President's budget, when you look at the spending that has come out of this administration and you look at the debt our country has accumulated since the time

George Washington became President, what you see is that from the time George Washington became President until the time George W. Bush left the White House, this President, through his spending and his budgets, has doubled the national debt in 5 years and tripling it in 10. That is what this budget he had submitted to the Congress just not that long ago—a couple months ago—has done.

Now we are going to hear a new—I am not sure what we are going to hear today. Are we going to hear him standing behind the budget? The President put together a debt commission to take a look at this. I am still not sure where he stands on his own commission—the President's own commission—what his position is on that, because they have taken some strong positions, where he is in relationship to the reality we are facing today with this predictable crisis coming. So it will be interesting to hear what the President says this afternoon and what his new vision might be.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think that is right. We are talking about, is this a huge reversal from what we got just 2 months ago because it did not address Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security that now we hear he might be addressing.

The Senator mentioned the debt commission. They spent most of the last year studying and hearing experts, becoming exceedingly concerned about the future. Mr. Erskine Bowles, who was chosen by President Obama to head that commission, when he first saw the President's budget, said: It is nowhere near what is necessary to avoid a fiscal nightmare.

This is really serious. The budget the President submitted here was rejected by his own Chairman, saying: It is nowhere near what is necessary to avoid a fiscal nightmare. Since then, he has followed up to say: This is the most predictable crisis the Nation has ever faced. He said: Not just for our grandchildren, it could impact us now.

So I ask the Senator: Don't you think, if the President is going to make a speech and announce a change in his policy, he should—as the House budget people have done—submit a budget to the Congress that can be analyzed by the Congressional Budget Office, scored, and we can actually use it as part of the discussion about how to bring debt under control?

Mr. BARRASSO. My impression is that he should have a responsibility to do that and do it for Congress.

Last week, there was going to be a major speech—last week or the week before—on energy at a local university. He went and made a speech on energy, and the headline was that it was the same old speech on the same old issues, and very little new was there. So the concern today is, we are not hearing anything in front of Congress. It is a speech at a local university. I am hoping to hear what a real vision is. What is the roadmap and the specifics?

The other Chairman of the debt commission—you mentioned Erskine

Bowles—the other was Senator Al Simpson from Wyoming. He was quoted today to say: We need specifics. If the President just talks in generalities, that is not going to go very far.

I think specifics is what the Senator just outlined. As the ranking member of the Budget Committee, you would actually like to see numbers on a piece of paper that can be scored, and we can go look through it and say: Will this work? Will this not work? How do the numbers add up? Let's get into the specific details because that is what we are looking at. When you have a nation that is spending \$3.8 trillion or \$3.7 trillion and only bringing in \$2.2 trillion, the problem is we are spending too much.

Mr. SESSIONS. Absolutely. I just have to say, let's be frank about it. We had one budget submitted to both Houses of Congress from the President just 2 months ago, and it was very irresponsible and has gotten no support that I can see anywhere. But the House is on track, it looks like, to pass a budget this week that will be forward-looking and substantive and alter the debt trajectory we are on, put us on a path to prosperity, because the biggest and really, to me, only real threat to our economic vitality and our ability to bounce back from this recession is the debt we are carrying.

But I have to acknowledge the Senator's former colleague, Senator Simpson, and Erskine Bowles said this about PAUL RYAN's proposed budget in the House: that it is "a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our nation's enormous fiscal challenges"—our "enormous fiscal challenges."

All right. They go on to say this, and I think it is relevant, as the Senator suggested, to the President's speech this afternoon. They go on to say: Going forward, anyone who issues an alternative plan to Chairman RYAN's should be held to the same standard when offering their own solutions. We simply cannot back away from these issues.

I know that is a firm, strong statement. I know it is probably different from what we are going to hear from the President, which is "speech" and "vision" and "hopes." But doesn't the Senator think we do have a right? Aren't they correct—this bipartisan commission, appointed by the President—aren't these leaders correct to say: We expect you, Mr. President, to fulfill your statutory duty to submit a real budget, and if you have changed it from the one you submitted earlier, submit us a new budget.

Mr. BARRASSO. I think that would be the only responsible thing to do because right now the Congress is dealing with the budget that was submitted a couple months ago. That is the confines in which we are working. So it will be interesting to hear what the President says a little further down the line from now.

I see Senator COATS from Indiana is joining us on the floor. He knows that

in Indiana, families who are trying to live within their means and make ends meet and paying more for gasoline now due to the President's energy policies—about \$700 more per family a year for gasoline. If they are trying to deal with bills and the mortgage and kids, it makes it that much harder. So families get it. Families know what happens when there is a squeeze, and they cut back on their spending for other things. That is what this country needs to do right now. That is what we need to do as a nation.

I am so glad Senator COATS has returned to the Senate because he had been here previously and has now returned to join us to give us some of his sage advice and recommendations, and it is really wonderful to work with him.

I say to the Senator from Alabama, I know you welcome him as well. But with that, let me say thank you so much for your leadership. As I told the Senator, the people of Wyoming after church say: Do you know that guy who was on television this morning? He sure did express the values we all have.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the American people get it. I think the American people understand that the driving issue of our time is the debt that threatens every good and hopeful wish we have for the future of our country.

Senator COATS, who is one of our finest Members of the Senate—he left us, served as Ambassador to Germany, spent a number of years in Europe, and then came back and has been reelected.

Let me ask him, fundamentally, this question. Pete Domenici—you served with Pete—served with a Democratic wise lady, Alice Rivlin, on another debt commission. He testified before the Budget Committee recently: I have never feared more for my country. That was a deep, personal statement from Pete Domenici, who chaired the Budget Committee in the Senate previously. I ask the Senator, what are you hearing from your constituents, and what is your belief at this time in history about the dangers we face?

Mr. COATS. Well, it is interesting that the Senator asks that question because I just left my office and a meeting with Pete Domenici literally 15 minutes ago.

Mr. SESSIONS. Really?

Mr. COATS. Because he came in to express that same urgency and burden. As former chairman of the Budget Committee here for so many years, he certainly understands the current fiscal situation. His views echo the voices and views of people across this country—from economists, whether they are liberal or conservative, whether they are from Harvard or Indiana University, the whole spectrum—saying this is an emergency, this is an urgent fiscal crisis we face. The time to address this crisis is now, not later. This has to rise above political considerations for 2012 because our country is on the precipice, and unless action is taken now, it may very well be too late.

We have had a number of these sessions as a caucus, and we have even had some meetings with our colleagues from the other party, where experts have come before us—again, not carrying any kind of ideological bent on this thing but basically saying: Look at the numbers. Do the math. By the way, it is not calculus, it is third grade math. When we spend \$3.7 trillion and our revenues are only \$2.2 trillion, we have a huge \$1.5 trillion deficit, and this has happened year after year after year. Cumulatively, we are well over \$4 trillion in debt over just the last 3 years, and this is going to skyrocket from here. So it is not as if we are at the peak. With the aging population and the increase in mandatory spending coming down faster than we can deal with it, we are in a dire situation.

Here is the reason I came back to the Senate. People ask all the time: Why in the world, after a lot of years of service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, as an ambassador overseas—you are of retirement age—why don't you enjoy the fruits of your labors? Why would you want to throw yourself back into the arena, particularly at such a critical time when the decisions you are going to have to make are not going to always be popular and when the requirements of what we are going to have to engage in to do what we need to do are going to be very demanding? The answer is, for the sole reason that I also have this great fear within me that we are seeing a country that has been the most prosperous free country in the history of civilization about to unwind. We have spent ourselves into a situation where we are literally at the crisis point.

So I came back for one primary reason. As much as I enjoy seeing my former colleagues and being in the business of being a Senator and representing the people of Indiana, I came for one reason only; that is, I have such a concern about the future of this country. I have three children and eight grandchildren now, another one just born recently. But it is not just my grandchildren, it is America's grandchildren and America's children whom we are loading debt onto that they are not going to be able to dig out of. It is going to deny them the opportunities we have had in our generation—to save money so we can go to college and get a good education, so we can get married and have a family and afford to buy a home, so we can enjoy the opportunities that freedom and prosperity have brought to us as a nation.

It not only affects us domestically, but it affects our role on the international scene. Already, NATO is saying we can't do this alone in Libya. We need America. I am not getting into the issue of whether we should be engaged in Libya. That is not the point. The point is that be it a tsunami or a nuclear accident or a flood or a disaster anywhere in the world, who is the first to show up and the only one with

the capacity to deal with it? The United States—the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Marines, U.S. troops not carrying guns but carrying water, carrying food, bringing aid, first aid ships. Whom does the world turn to in times of distress and disaster? It is America. America has been a generous nation because we have had the capacity to be a generous nation. All of that is at risk. So whether it is domestic or whether it is international, we are at risk.

We know we cannot solve this problem unless we can work together. We don't control two of the three thirds of government. We control the House of Representatives, and we have seen what PAUL RYAN and others have done there, including JOHN BOEHNER, to get us started on this process of what we need to do. But we have not done that yet in the Senate. We are trying to work with our colleague so we can. But in the end, if the President of the United States does not engage in this effort, we will not succeed. We can talk all we want. We can present all the plans we want, but until the President gets engaged, we are not going to succeed because he is the one who ultimately has to sign this bill. He is the one who ultimately has to sign off on it.

Currently, and for the last 3 months, he has been totally AWOL, off doing other things, at a time while the house is burning down. I am hopeful that, in just 1 hour and 10 minutes or so, the President will come forward not with nice phrases, not with generalities, not with fluff that we heard in the State of the Union Address—some nice sounding things but no backup—but with specifics: Here is what his plan is. I hope what I hear from him is: I, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, want to sit down and get in the arena with Republicans and Democrats in the House and in the Senate and work together to avoid this potential crisis; and I agree this is not something we can do in 2013. This is not something we can play politics with. This is not something we can defer. We must do it now.

I believe the American people—I can speak for Hoosiers in Indiana; I can't speak for other States, but I believe the people in Indiana, and I think this is true across America—understand this better than a lot of the politicians do. They understand this because they are part of families that have to meet budgets. They are businesses that have to put the payroll to pay their employees. They cannot allow themselves to get so drastically in debt that they are not going to be able to recover. So they are asking us to take leadership, to step up and do it, make decisions not for one's personal political future but for the future of America. The President needs to join us in that effort.

I am hoping and praying that in 1 hour and 10 minutes, as the President finally presents to the country, he will do two things. No. 1 is to say: I am ready to engage and engage fully be-

cause this is the No. 1 issue facing the future of America. All is on the line. No. 2, here are my specifics in terms of what I will support or what I will work with. I hope he will say, as we have said: This isn't set in concrete. Let's work together to see what works and what will address the crisis we are facing.

So I thank the Senator for his leadership as head of the Republican caucus on the budget side. He has been out front. The Senator from Alabama has been out front from day one. I thank my colleague, Senator ISAKSON, whom I think will engage here next, as well as Senator BARRASSO, who said some nice words about me. But I think we are here for one reason and one reason only; that is, America is in trouble and we need to step up and do what we can, everything we can, to get us back on a path to fiscal health. It will not happen overnight, but if we can certify that we have a plan in place and that we are going to stick with it, we can save this situation and turn it around.

So I thank the Senator for his time and for allowing me to get in my 2 cents' worth. I am here to make the tough decisions and for no other reason.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana. I guess I have been critical of the President. Many people say it is political. I feel as though any President should look the American people in the eye at this point in history. I called on him before the State of the Union Address, over 2 months ago now, that he should tell the American people we are in this financial crisis, and that—the reason we are talking about reducing spending is because we have no choice. We can't spend \$3.7 trillion and take in \$2.2 trillion. We cannot sustain the debt course we are on, as every witness, Republican and Democratic, has told us. But I do believe it is a responsibility for the President of the United States, who can see this clear and present danger to our future, to at least join in and say we have to do something about it. He didn't do that at the State of the Union. He hasn't done it since. So maybe today that will be a big change, if we get that.

I do believe the Senator from Indiana is exactly right. He has the responsibility under the Budget Act to send us a responsible budget that changes what we are doing and puts us on the right track. If he wants to do it all by even more tax increases than he submitted already, which was \$1.7 trillion in his budget proposal, so be it. Put it out there. Let's talk about it. But don't deny we are in a crisis.

Senator ISAKSON understands finance better than anybody in this Senate. He lived through and provided leadership during the huge financial crisis. It looks as though we have moved debt from the private sector to the sovereign government sector, and that is why we are being warned we could have a similar type crisis, which is what I

understand Secretary Geithner to have meant and Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson to have meant.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his leadership. I know he wants nothing more than what is best for America. I would be glad to have the Senator share his thoughts at this time.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliment. It is probably overstated, but it is an honor and a privilege to serve with Senator SESSIONS as well as with Senator COATS.

I wish to reflect on something we shared this morning. Senator COATS and myself and others were with Senator AKAKA for breakfast this morning. He talked about 1941, living on Hawaii, the youngest of eight children. The Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and America went to war in the Pacific and in Europe. Sixteen million Americans of that generation went to the Pacific and Europe, fought and died. Some came back to this country and, because of the GI bill, 8 million of them went to universities and got bachelor's degrees and started the small businesses and the industries that took the U.S. economy to dynamic growth and opportunity for every generation that has succeeded them, up until now.

Senator SESSIONS and I and Senator COATS and Senator AKAKA, who is a great American, a Democratic Senator from Hawaii who is retiring next year, we are all part of a generation that will, at some time, leave a legacy to our children and our grandchildren. The Senator from Alabama has children and grandchildren, I have them, and Senator COATS does as well. I don't want to be the first generation since World War II to leave my children and my grandchildren worse off than every generation before left their children and grandchildren.

This economic war we have on spending and debt is every bit as damaging as a war with bullets and bombs. Because with too much leverage, with an inability to pay our debt, we have what happened to us once before in the last 65 years, and that was the early 1980s when we had the misery index: double-digit unemployment, double-digit interest rates, double-digit inflation. I remember the days when I ran my business when the prime rate was 21 percent. I remember when unemployment was 14 percent and inflation was 12 percent. It was called the misery index. What happened is, America started borrowing too much, spending too much, and business contracted.

We need to make sure we don't let that happen again because the greatest economic threats to the security of America are runaway interest rates, runaway inflation, and runaway unemployment. We don't want to be the cause of that. We want to be the platform that allows free enterprise and American business to come back, the American economy to come back, reduce our deficit over time, and reduce our debt over time. We don't have to pay it all off, but we have to stop the

increase. We have to begin to get back in order so we are not an overleveraged Nation.

I pledge this, as Senator COATS did, and I know the Senator from Alabama did as well: I will not leave my grandchildren and my children worse off than I was left by my parents and my grandparents. We have the greatest Nation on the face of this Earth. Democrats and Republicans, the President, Congressmen, and Senators need to sit down at the American kitchen table and do what we have asked of the American people: get our spending in order and look to a brighter, more prosperous future for those who will succeed us.

I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator one more question. Let's take the Ryan budget. I think it is far more realistic. It is the one that is, as was referred to by Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, a serious, honest, straightforward approach to addressing our Nation's enormous fiscal challenges. It is long term. It deals with Medicare, Social Security, discretionary spending.

I am optimistic about the future. If we were to put ourselves on that course and send the word to the American people, the American business community, the world financial community that we have gotten our house in order, is that the kind of budget that could unleash growth that we haven't seen in years now?

Mr. ISAKSON. Well, it is, because it will instill a degree of confidence that we have finally been willing to deal with our long-term problem of debt and deficit, with our entitlements but also with our spending.

But I want to refer back to a statement the Senator made in his previous remarks before he recognized me, when he was challenging the President to bring forward a budget in this speech he will make in an hour or so. He should bring it and put it on the table, along with putting PAUL RYAN's recommendations on the table, putting the deficit commission's recommendations on the table, and putting the group of six who are working on another document on the table—let's don't rule anybody out—and sit down and one by one go through them and find out what is the best answer and the solution for America.

It is time to stop the political job of picking and choosing for political purposes. We need to pick and choose for the American people. If we put everybody's ideas on the table, and they are genuine about their interests to solve the problem, we can do it, and we can begin this afternoon.

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the most important thing—and I don't want to be too negative—is to tell the American people the truth that every expert we have asked has said you could have a crisis sooner than you think. We should avoid that.

Congress and the President should acknowledge it and say that we under-

stand it and we are going to take steps to avoid it. But I have a sense that the United States is still a productive nation. The Senator from Georgia is attuned to the business community in Atlanta. They are still willing to work hard and invest and take risks to be more productive and create jobs. But this confidence the Senator mentioned—if we restore that confidence, is the Senator optimistic we can bounce back?

Mr. ISAKSON. Absolutely. With all due respect, I think the last couple years the government has tried to eliminate risk with overregulation of almost everything. If you eliminate risk, nobody gets out of bed in the morning and figures they are protected. We need to mitigate this and allow people to take a risk in order to get a reward. We can give them a platform of confidence and predictability so they will deploy capital, invest money, and employ people. The interesting point is, the byproduct of that is you have higher revenues. When you have a productive America on a progressive tax system, you get higher revenues. If people are more satisfied, they are more happy and more productive. There is less productivity when there is overregulation and underconfidence. We need to restore the confidence and have fair but equitable regulations and we need to empower the American investor to invest their capital and we will improve employment, improve revenue, and improve the future of the United States.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, our country requires us to stand and be counted. "Nothing comes from nothing," as Julie Andrews sang in that wonderful song. Things have to be paid for. When you borrow money, you pay interest on it. Interest under the budget the President has sent to us last year was \$200 billion—\$207 billion, I think. In the 10th year, that budget, as scored by the CBO, is imposing on the American economy a \$940 billion, 1-year interest payment. I know the Senator is familiar with Georgia. Alabama's general fund is less than \$2 billion. Our education budget is less than \$8 billion. We are talking about imposing on the American people an annual interest payment of \$940 billion. The Federal highway fund is \$40 billion, and Federal aid to education is \$70 billion. This is going to crowd out everything.

That is why we are on an unsustainable path. We need the President to engage, and I hope today he will initiate his engagement, in which he tells the American people we can't continue this way. Would the Senator care to close it out?

Mr. ISAKSON. I will close by just saying amen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, there has been a lively debate on the floor

concerning our 2011 budget. Now we are starting to talk about the 2012 budget. I think it is important to point out what I hope is the obvious, which is that the budget of our Nation represents our vision for our future. It is a policy document that speaks to what our priorities will be. It provides the financial tools for us to be able to meet those objectives.

I know we are in very difficult fiscal times, but this is not the first time in the history of America. I remind my colleagues that in the 1990s we were confronted with a large budget deficit. I happened to have been in the House of Representatives during that time. We saw, through the leadership of President Clinton, that we were able to bring our budget into balance, and we did that from large deficits. We did it in a way that maintained America's priorities and maintained the priorities for our children and our future because we continued to fund those essential programs that allowed our Nation to grow.

As a result of what we did in the 1990s, we saw unprecedented growth in our economy because we did our budget the right way, speaking to America's future and to our priorities, and doing it in a fiscally responsible way. I think President Obama was correct when he stated in his State of the Union Address that America will meet the challenges of international competition, and we will do that by outeducating, outinnovating, and outbuilding our competitors.

That requires a budget that speaks to those priorities, that speaks to educating our workforce, to provide the type of climate where America can continue to lead the world in research and innovation, that we pay attention to our infrastructure, whether it is transportation, water infrastructure, energy infrastructure, so we have the capacity to be able to compete internationally and that we can create the jobs that will be critically important for America.

We need more jobs and we need good-paying jobs. That is what President Obama's vision is about, and our budget needs to underscore that vision. Yes, we need to do it in a fiscally responsible way but in a way that allows America's future to be secure. That is why I so much opposed the budget that was sent over to us from the House of Representatives, the 2011 budget, H.R. 1, before the ability to reach a compromise. I did that because when you look at what H.R. 1 would have done—particularly in light of the budget agreement we have now reached on the 2011 budget—you cannot help but notice a huge difference between our visions for America. We all agree we have to have a workforce that can compete.

Look at the stark differences between the budget agreement and the House-passed budget. In NIH research—and I take pride in this, since NIH is headquartered in Maryland—most of the funding for basic research, which is

critically important for innovation—you cannot get to the applied research unless you have the basic research, and you cannot get good high-tech jobs unless you invest in basic research. Thanks to the budget agreement we reached, most of the funding will be able to be maintained for the basic research at NIH. If the House budget would have become law, it would have been \$1.4 billion less. That would have been a huge hit on America's ability to be able to compete in this global marketplace. You also need to have a trained workforce. You need job training and Job Corps programs. Most of the funding has been maintained in this budget agreement for our job training and Job Corps programs; whereas, if you look at the House-passed budget, they eliminated all funds for job training and a 40-percent reduction in the Job Corps program. That was restored under the budget agreement that allows America to have the competitive workforce it needs to meet future challenges.

Perhaps the area that I think people in Maryland and Minnesota may recognize the most is what happens to Pell grants. Most students cannot make it today, unless they have help in higher education. It is too expensive to be able to afford without the help of programs such as Pell grants. You need to have education beyond high school if you are going to be competitive today. Well, the House-passed budget would have reduced Pell grants by 15 percent. I can assure you that tuition isn't going down by 15 percent this year. Tuition at colleges and universities is going up and up.

I am proud we were able to, in the budget agreement, maintain the maximum Pell grants at \$5,550. We maintain funding for Race to the Top funds because we want excellence in K-12. The House-passed budget would have zeroed out the Race to the Top funds.

To me, if you talk about a budget that speaks to America's values, to give young children the chance to succeed in school, Head Start has never been a partisan program. It has been supported by Democrats and Republicans because there are proven results in Head Start. People who participate in Head Start will do better. We have those results, so it is in our economic interest.

The Republican-passed budget in the House would have knocked 218,000 children off the Head Start Program. It would have reduced 55,000 teachers and aides from Head Start Programs around our Nation. I am pleased to see that the agreement we will be voting on shortly restores all the funds for the Head Start Program, so our children can get the Head Start they need to succeed in K-12.

The budget speaks to our energy policies and transportation policies. It is interesting to look and see that the agreement reached by our negotiators restores more than \$268 million in renewable energy and alternative energy

sources. If we are going to be able to be competitive, we need an energy policy that makes sense. If we are going to keep jobs in America, we need an energy policy that makes sense. If we are going to be secure, we have to get ourselves off foreign oil. We need alternative energy sources.

The compromise restores a lot of the funds that were not in the House-passed budget document. I might talk about one issue that is very important to the people living in this region. We made a commitment years ago that the Federal Government would participate with the surrounding jurisdictions in the funding of the Nation's transit system, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit System, which is critical to getting Federal workers to work and to our Nation's Capital. Our government committed \$150 billion a year to modernize that system. Taxpayers of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia are contributing also to the modernization of a system that is aged and critically important. We live in the second most congested area in the Nation, as far as commutes are concerned. The House of Representatives, in the Republican-passed budget, took out that \$150 million—took it out. I am proud the compromise reached restores that \$150 million.

Our budget speaks to our health and our environment. The Health Resources Services Administration was severely cut in the Republican-passed budget. It would have affected care in each one of our communities. Our negotiators restored \$900 million to that budget. What does that mean? It means the 11,000 community health centers, located in all our States, will be able to continue the services they are currently providing.

I took the floor before and talked about the Greater Baden Center, located just a few miles from here, and how they have expanded service this year to deal with prenatal care. In Maryland and in America, our infant mortality rate is too high. For a wealthy nation and State to have the type of infant mortality rate we have is inexcusable. It is because we have low-birth-weight babies. Some die and others survive and have complications and have a tough time in life and they are very expensive to the health care system. In our health centers, we are doing something about that. At the Greater Baden Center, they are now going to provide prenatal care so pregnant women can get the attention they need and can deliver healthier babies. Under the House-passed budget, they would not have done that.

The math is simple. We invest in the health of Americans. We understand that. That is our budget. The Republican-passed House budget would have cut off those funds. The affordable care act will be able to implement it. We are not going to be stopped by the effort made in the Republican-passed budget.

As far as the environmental protection riders we have talked about, these

are the policy riders. I know this is confusing to people listening to this debate, and they understand that the House-passed budget by the Republicans had a lot of policy issues that had absolutely nothing to do with the budget. They blocked the Environmental Protection Agency from protecting the environment. Let me say that again. They blocked the Environmental Protection Agency from protecting the environment. They couldn't enforce the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act. For the people of Maryland and this region, that means blocking the enforcement of the Chesapeake Bay Program—a program that enjoys broad support from the people not only of our region but the Nation.

Well, I am pleased to say the budget we will be voting on later this week eliminates those restrictions. All of them are out. Thank goodness they are because they should never have been in the budget document to start with.

I will make it clear, Mr. President. I am very disappointed by many of the provisions included in this compromise. It is a true compromise. It is not what the Democrats would have written, I can assure you of that, and it is not what the Republicans would have written. It is a true compromise, and that is what we had to go through, I understand, but I feel compelled to at least let the people of Maryland know the cost of the compromises.

For example, the General Services Administration will have \$1 billion less to deal with government construction. What will that mean? Well, at White Oak, MD, we have the FDA's expansion. That will be put on hold. That will not only affect my community, but it will affect our country because we are talking about public health and food safety.

There is a rider that was attached that did survive that deals with the delisting of the great wolf under the Endangered Species Act. That is not how we should be acting. There is a remedy for dealing with the delisting. There is a process we go through. We shouldn't go down a dangerous precedent that starts congressional or political action on delisting species that are included under the Endangered Species Act.

The cuts for the community development block grant are much more than I would like to see. These are programs that are important for our urban centers. During these times, when their budgets are being hit the hardest, I think it is very unfortunate to tell them we are just going to add to their challenges. We should be helping them during these times. We shouldn't be taking resources away from them.

The Federal Transit Administration has a major cut in this budget. I find that regrettable, particularly as it relates to their new start budget. I come from a State that has major new transit projects we want to get moving—the purple line to connect our suburban areas around Washington, the red line

in Baltimore, Carter City's transit way to connect the 270 corridor for high-tech jobs. All those depend upon us continuing to move forward with sensible transit projects that, quite frankly, I think are in jeopardy as a result of the compromises that were needed to be made.

Teach for America is eliminated. The Federal participation in that is eliminated. On Monday I had a chance to teach for Teach for America. I was in a high school in Baltimore with some very dedicated young people willing to give up their lives so America can compete in the future. We certainly should have continued the Federal partnership in Teach for America.

I talked about the Environmental Protection Agency, but I didn't point out that the Republican budget in the House cut that agency by 30 percent—30 percent. We restored half of those funds, but the cut is still going to be pretty severe.

So I just wanted my colleagues to know that, whereas I am very pleased that many of the decisions made in this compromise for the 2011 budget will allow us to be able to move forward as a nation for America's vision—being able to out-educate, out-innovate, and out-build our competitors—there are challenges as a result of the compromise that have to be faced. Mr. President, these discussions will continue now to the 2012 budget.

We are already seeing that happen. In the House they are already starting to act on what is known as the Ryan budget, which we think is pretty much inspired by the tea party. It is pretty extreme. It is pretty radical. It is not a credible plan, in my view. It is not a credible plan to reduce the Federal deficit.

Now, why do I say that? Well, the Ryan budget concentrates on domestic spending. It doesn't touch military spending, and it doesn't touch our revenues. Let me correct that. It does deal with our revenues, but it deals with it in the wrong way. It not only extends every tax break that is currently available, providing tax relief for millionaires, but it provides additional tax relief. It lowers the highest rates.

Now, how is that going to be paid for? Well, they are expecting they are going to take more out of middle-income families. That is bad for middle-income families, but my guess is they will not even be able to reach those targets, and we will have huge deficits as far as the eye can see. It is not a credible plan.

The deficit commission taught us if we are to have a credible plan to deal with the deficit, we have to deal with domestic spending. We have to deal with military spending. We have to deal with mandatory spending. And we have to deal with revenues. We have to deal with all of them. The Ryan budget does not.

It is going to be hard for middle-income families, it protects America's wealthiest, and it attacks our seniors—attacks our seniors. The Ryan budget

would turn Medicare into a voucher program.

Now, I can tell you what that means in dollars and cents. It means our seniors, who currently have—currently have—the largest out-of-pocket costs for health care than any other age group of Americans, will see their health care costs go up dramatically—double. Some of us remember how it was for seniors to get health care before we had Medicare. We had to fight with private insurance companies. Private insurance companies are not interested in insuring people who make a lot of claims. Guess what. As you get older, you make a lot of claims.

What the Republican budget would do is tell our seniors: We are going to give you a voucher. It is a limited amount of money. Now you go find a private insurance plan out there. Whatever it costs, you are going to have to fill up the difference. We know it is going to cost a lot more than the voucher we are giving you.

That is what they are doing. They are making it more expensive for our seniors to afford health care where they are asking us to reduce their costs, not make it more expensive.

Then the Ryan budget goes further by block-granting the Medicaid Program. That means, quite frankly, Medicaid will not survive. We can talk about the hardships it will have on providing health care in our community, how it will have more and more people using the emergency rooms rather than using preventive care or seeing doctors, and that is all going to absolutely happen if we ever block-grant Medicaid.

Let me follow up on our seniors. Many of our seniors depend upon the Medicaid system, and their families depend upon it for long-term care—nursing care. That will not survive if we block-grant that to our States. So the Ryan budget not only is not credible as it relates to dealing with the deficit, it also is very punitive against our seniors.

What I find probably the most disappointing is where I started this discussion, saying our budget is our vision for our future, that it speaks to our priorities for our future. The Ryan budget leaves our children behind. If we are going to succeed, we have to take care of our children. They are our future. We have to deal with their education and with their health care. The Ryan budget puts them in severe jeopardy. It is a philosophical document that I don't think represents the values of America. I think our values are in our children and in our future and in our ability to meet those economic challenges.

I think there is a better way. President Obama is calling for a comprehensive progrowth economic strategy that will invest in winning the future. I would hope all of us could embrace that. Don't we want a comprehensive progrowth economic strategy that invests in winning in the future, that invests in our children, that invests in education and in innovation?

As President Obama says, he wants to meet our values for the dignity of our retirees. Think about that for one moment. How we treat our retirees speaks to what we are as a nation—the dignity of our retirees. Think about a retiree trying to find an insurance company that will take care of their insurance needs because we dumped the Medicare system. We can't let that happen. We can't let that happen.

There is a better way. Sixty-four of us in the Senate have said there is a better way. We have said: Look, it is time for us to be serious about a credible plan for our deficit, and we are prepared—64 of us: 32 Democrats, 32 Republicans—to not only cut our domestic spending, but we will look at bringing down mandatory spending, and we will look at military, and we will look at revenues. There is a better way to do this. I think we can represent the best of America's future in our budget by providing education, innovation, job growth, health and environment policies that make sense, and we can do it with fiscal responsibility. That is our mission.

So I know a lot of my colleagues come down to say we have to take care of the deficit—do the deficit—and I agree with that. But, remember, our budget document is our statement about America's future. It is our policy document, and America needs to stand up for quality education, for the best health care in the world, and for encouraging innovation that will give us the jobs of the future so that America can continue to lead the world. I think America deserves nothing less, and I intend to continue to fight for that type of vision for America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, the Democratic women of the Senate are on the floor today to talk about the three votes that will occur tomorrow: one, the passing of the continuing resolution, which I reluctantly support because of the many cuts in it, but also the two riders, one defunding the health care bill and the other defunding Planned Parenthood.

My gosh, how outrageous that we have to vote on these two riders. These two riders absolutely do not affect our deficit and our debt. In fact, the health care reform that we passed, by the CBO's own estimates and by independent evaluators, says we will actually reduce health care costs because of what we have done.

What are the consequences of what they are talking about? The rightwing is trying to change the conversation

away from, how do we create jobs in this country, how do we authentically reduce deficit and debt, into socially provocative riders that literally wage war against women. The extreme right-wing campaigned against the health care. They said they were going to repeal and replace. All they want to do is repeal. They have no idea for replacing. Let's talk about what they want to repeal. Let's talk about the war they are waging against women.

If you repeal or defund health care, it will have a Draconian impact on American women, make no mistake about it. In the health care bill, we ended gender discrimination in health insurance. No longer could insurance companies charge women 30 to 40 percent more than men of equal age and health status for the same coverage. The other thing we ended was denying women health care on the basis of a pre-existing condition. We were horrified to learn that in 8 States, women were denied health insurance access simply because they were victims of domestic violence. They were beaten up in their homes, they were beaten up by insurance companies, and now they want to beat them up on the Senate floor and beat them up in the Senate budget.

We are going to stand up. We are not going to tolerate women being pushed around and made targets of this war. No longer can women be denied coverage because they had a C-section or because they had a premature baby. We fought for preventive services. We fought for mammograms and for Pap smears. We fought not only for ourselves, we fought for men too, which included their screening.

If you defund health care, make no mistake—and every woman in America should know this—they are going to take the funding for mammograms away from you. They are going to take away the preventive health amendment that allowed you access to preventive screening at no additional copays or deductibles. Do we really want that? Oh, sure, you are going to be able to have your mammogram, but you are going to dig deep in your pocket.

We also wanted to end gender discrimination. We wanted to end the punitive practices of insurance companies toward women on the basis of pre-existing conditions. We also wanted to have preventive care. One of the greatest preventive-care-giving agencies is Planned Parenthood. It is the single most important health care provider, particularly to young women, in America. If we lose Planned Parenthood, 8,000 Maryland women will lose Pap smears and 7,500 women will lose access to breast care exams. Many of them will lose access to health care generally.

Just because the Republicans live in the Dark Ages doesn't mean American women want to go back. That is why we, the Senate Democratic women, will be voting against these two riders. Women must be clear: Defeating this amendment is a way to end the war

against women. There will be many fights ahead of us. We are under attack. We women are under attack, at all ages. The Paul Ryan budget particularly attacks senior women. We are going to fight this. We are suited up. We squared our shoulders. We put our lipstick on. This is not about gender, this is about an American agenda, and we will fight, and we will make our fight a victory.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank all of my Democratic women colleagues for coming today and speaking so passionately, as the Senator from Maryland has just done, on issues we feel so deeply about. You will be hearing from all of us because we are outraged that the price tag for a vote on the continuing resolution is to attack votes on women's health.

I yield to the Senator from California for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senators MIKULSKI and MURRAY, Senator's CANTWELL and SHAHEEN and STABENOW and LANDRIEU—I am going to really name every single Democratic woman. They have been unbelievable.

Since the beginning of this budget battle, our Republican friends in the House have insisted that this debate is about spending. I have to tell you, we went all the way to them—about 70-plus percent—on spending cuts. We understand we have to cut, but we are not going to cut foolishly, we are not going to cut into the heart and soul of our country. That includes women's health programs, title X, Planned Parenthood funding. For every dollar of taxpayer funds for title X, the yield is \$4. That is how great the prevention is.

Yet what do they want to do? We see these two riders, these two votes we have to have before they will allow us to have a vote on keeping the government open. They pounded the table and said: We have to have two riders. What was it? Was it some big budgetary item that maybe we overlooked? Was it some move that would say that taxpayers who are not paying their taxes due, like some of the big corporate giants that hire enough lawyers that they don't pay—no, it was not about that. Was it about some scandal they uncovered that they said could save us money? No. The two votes they want are about giving the shaft to women, women and their families. The two votes are about health care which primarily impacts women—by the way, also men, but primarily impacts women.

If that is the kind of budget war they are engaged in, they have met us on the battlefield. We have decided we will remain on that battlefield, which is this Senate floor, as long as we have to. We will go to the galleries, we will go to the press as long as we have to. We will fight it in our cities, we will fight it in our counties. We will fight

it. We believe at the end of the day people will see who is fighting for them—who is fighting for them.

I am going to read a couple of letters from my State. My State is the largest State in the Union. Planned Parenthood provides care for more than 750,000 women.

Listen to this woman.

Planned Parenthood is the only health care I have ever used.

“Ever,” she says.

I don’t have health insurance. So when I get sick, I get over it as soon as possible so I can go back to work. Planned Parenthood has provided me with the only health care coverage I can afford, pelvic exams, STD testing, birth control. It isn’t much, but can you imagine the millions of people who rely on Planned Parenthood suddenly living their lives without these basic services?

She answers her own question: “It is shameful.”

It is shameful. That is a letter from Sonja Kodimer. I have other letters from women in my great State.

Three million Americans get care at Planned Parenthood. Three-quarters of them have income below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. They rely on Planned Parenthood—many of them do—as their own only health care.

By the way, the other rider we have to vote on is to defund health care reform. My colleagues have said it. Senator MIKULSKI worked night and day with the late and great and extraordinary Ted Kennedy to get us to the point where finally we are telling the insurance companies: No, you cannot charge women thirty, forty, fifty percent more for the same coverage as a man. By the way, being a woman is not a preexisting condition. And you cannot deny a woman who had a Caesarian health care coverage.

If you are a victim of domestic violence, that is not a preexisting condition.

That is what we repaired in the bill in addition to many other things we did. They want to give the shaft to women and their families, and we are not going to stand for it.

Barbara Haya from Oakland wrote to me. She said that when she was a student with limited funds, she was denied health insurance because of a preexisting condition. Planned Parenthood was Barbara’s only source of basic health care services. When she needed cancer screening, Planned Parenthood was there. She says please don’t cut any funding to Planned Parenthood because without them she would not have her health care.

Let’s be clear. Nationwide, 97 percent of the services Planned Parenthood provides have nothing to do with abortion. They do not use a dime. It is illegal. It has never happened for that 3 percent, that is private funding. So don’t stand up and say this is about abortion. It has nothing to do with it.

As a matter of fact, if they have their way—this is a fact—and women do not get birth control, we will see more unintended pregnancies. We will see more abortions. That is just the fact.

So anyone who votes to defund Planned Parenthood, A, is denying essential health care services to women and their families, and, B, their policy will lead to more unintended pregnancies and more abortions.

So, yes, we stand here strong. Maybe some of us are five feet or under even in a couple of cases, but that belies our determination and our strength. We stand here united. And we say to the people of this country, you can count on us because we will be here as long as it takes to protect women and their families, and we will not allow women and their families to be held hostage. It is over. It is over.

I thank Senator MURRAY and Senator MIKULSKI.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I want to thank my colleague from California for her great statement, and the Senator from Maryland. And you will hear more of us.

Frankly we are here today because we are outraged. We strongly oppose the resolution on the floor that slashes health care for women and girls and middle-class families. I have to say as a woman and as a mother, I am angry that women’s health care is even up for debate right now. Middle-class families in this country are struggling. When I go home to my State of Washington, I hear about people who are worried about getting a pink slip or how they are going to put food on the table, whether their job is going to be there for them, and if we are making sure our economy is working for them and their children. That is what I hear about. I do not hear about, when are you going to slash health care for women. Not once.

We have seen a smokescreen. That is why we are here. Last week under the continuing resolution that was being negotiated between the House and the Senate and the White House, one remaining open item: eliminating title X funding for women’s health care. It was not about budget deficits; it was not about the debt; it was not about jobs or the economy. It was about an ideologically driven attack on women’s health care.

We were able to keep that out of the continuing resolution that we will vote on tomorrow. But the pricetag the Republicans in the House gave us to get to a vote to keep government open and to move our country forward is two votes: one that defunds Planned Parenthood, and one that defunds health care. Both of those are extreme attacks on women’s health care.

My colleagues have spoken eloquently about Planned Parenthood. This is not about abortion. Federal funds cannot go to abortion. We are frankly tired of having to correct the untruths that continually come out about this funding. But we are not going to give up and we are going to keep fighting and we going to keep correcting them.

Planned Parenthood is about providing Federal funds for care, such as mammograms, and cervical cancer screenings, and prenatal care, and family support and counseling. This is about preventive health care services for women, and we take it as a direct attack on every woman in this country and her ability to get the health care she needs.

The second vote is an attack to dismantle health care. Well, let’s remind all of us why health care finally became an issue that we were strong enough to deal with in this country. I will tell you why. Because women finally said, we have had enough. Let’s face it, women are the ones who take their kids to the doctor, they are the ones who see the bills coming in, and they are the ones who fight insurance companies on a daily basis.

They said, we have had enough. So we went through a long process here to make sure that we passed health care in a way that protected women. It was women who were denied health care coverage because of preexisting conditions time and time again. We said “no more.” Now they want to vote tomorrow to put that back into effect. We heard from women who were denied coverage for health care because they were a victim of domestic violence. We said “no more.” Now they attack that again.

There are so many reasons why this is the wrong approach. But I will let all of our colleagues know, we are going to defeat these amendments tomorrow. We are going to move on. But the Democratic women of the Senate are now vigilant, and we are here, and we are not going to allow the 2012 budget or further discussions as we go along to be a smoke screen to cover up a real agenda, which is to take away the access for health care and basic rights that women have worked long and hard and fought for in this country.

I want you to know you will be hearing more from us, but we are not going away. We are going to defeat these amendments tomorrow, and we are here to fight them until they stop being offered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. It is my great pleasure and honor to be here with my friends and colleagues who have all fought so long and hard to make sure that women’s voices and experiences are represented in the decisions we make here in the Senate and in Washington on behalf of all of the families we represent.

I have to say that people in Michigan, my family, friends, everybody across Michigan, are shaking their heads right now trying to figure out what the heck is going on. All of this is a diversion from what we want to be talking about and doing something about; that is, jobs, putting people back to work, making sure people have money in their pockets to be able to

pay their bills, and that they can tackle their house that very well may be under water right now, and how they are going to pay for gas with prices going through the roof, and how they are going to be able to take care of their kids and make sure they can have the opportunities to go to college that they want for them. All of the things we all want for our families, that is what families want us to be talking about right now.

I also have to say the people in my State are finding that the dollars they earn right now are hard to come by. These dollars are precious, and we need to be holding every program accountable, we need to get results for every dollar is spent, and make decisions that if something does not work, we need to stop doing it. We need to focus on things that do.

We know the whole deficit discussion is very critical for us, and that we need to be smart about the way we do things. That is not what this debate is about at the moment, certainly not only women's health care. But we understand that we need to be serious about this. Certainly in my role as chairing the Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee, we take that very seriously, and we will be doing that in the context of our responsibilities moving forward.

But I also know, and the people of Michigan understand more than I think anybody else across the country, that we will never get out of debt with more than 15 million people out of work, which is why we want to focus on jobs. They also know that women of all ages, seniors, middle-class families, did not cause the deficit hole we are in, and they should not be responsible for the sacrifice and burdens on their backs only in order to move us out of deficit.

We certainly are not going to allow a thinly veiled threat to women in general to become part of a debate about how we balance the budget and eliminate the deficit, which is a very real issue. The fact is, in order to get the budget completed for this year, women—women's health care—was held hostage. We were able to separate that, because the women came together in the Senate and said, there is no way we are going to allow this whole debate to become some political debate about whether women should get breast cancer screenings or cervical cancer screenings or blood pressure checks. So we separated that now from the agreement for the rest of the year. I am proud to have stood with women from all over this country to say no, we are not going to let you play politics with the women of this country and our health care. But now we have in front of us two different votes. This was the price we had to pay. And we are willing to stand here and make the case for why people need to vote no. But it is also deeply concerning that we have to be in a situation to debate whether women should get breast can-

cer screenings and cervical cancer screenings, and whether we should have access to health care as a part of the price to be able to come together on a budget agreement. That is exactly where we are.

The majority of the funds from what is called title IX for preventive care goes to health departments. By the way, I helped be able to support, when I was a county commissioner years ago, the Ingham County Health Department, setting up their preventive care center for women, health care screenings for women.

All across Michigan, 70 percent of the funds under something called title X go to health departments. There is a small amount that goes to Planned Parenthood. That is being very politicized now, because of the other side's wish to politicize women's health care. But in 2009, those centers provided 55,000 cancer screenings. We had almost 4,000 women—3,800 women—who got back an abnormal result on a cancer screening. Because they had a chance to get that screening, they then had the opportunity to do something about it, and lives were saved. Moms are alive today to be able to care for their children, and watch them grow up because they found out they had breast cancer early. Grandmas are alive and well today to be able to play with their grandkids and their great-grandkids because they found out early they had breast cancer or cervical cancer or some other health care challenge. I think we ought to celebrate that as the best of who we are and our values in this country.

The other piece we have in front of us will be to defund health care in general. We know, first of all, that women are health care consumers. Usually in families they are making the decisions about health insurance, if you are able to have health insurance, or how to purchase it or what will be covered and certainly caring about our families. We usually are the last ones to take care of ourselves. I certainly can speak to that myself as maybe other colleagues can, that we tend to make the decisions first for our children, our families, and not take care of ourselves as we should.

But we made a very strong statement, and I think a valued statement, in health care reform, to say that we want to make sure women have access to health care and that they can afford to get it, and that they are not penalized, we are not penalized as women, and that we are not going to have to pay more.

Right now, prior to health care reform, any woman purchasing health insurance on her own was paying more, sometimes up to 50 percent more, or more, for the same health insurance as a man, or even less health insurance, because she was a woman, because she may be of childbearing years, because of whatever the reason.

Women have traditionally paid more for the same insurance. That is no longer the case. Now, for the same cov-

erage, the same medical circumstances, women cannot be discriminated against. That is a good thing. I think that is something we should be proud of that we have been able to do, to make sure insurance companies cannot charge women more just because they are women.

We have also made clear that preventive care is an essential part of basic health care. I will always remember the debate I had as a member of the Finance Committee with a colleague on the other side of the aisle over whether maternity care is a basic part of health insurance and health care.

Of course, I think it is hard for people in Michigan to understand why we would even have to have that debate, because prenatal care, maternity care, certainly is a basic, not just for the women involved but for the baby, for the family. But we stood together and we said, we are going to make sure that maternity care is part of the definition of basic health care.

So there were a number of things that we did together, the women of this Senate, to make sure that over half the population, the women of this country, have access to quality, affordable health care for themselves so they can continue to care for their families and be a very important part of who we are in contributing to America.

We are here because tomorrow the question will be, should women's preventive health care services be allowed to continue as part of our framework in terms of health care funding, both broadly in health care reform, and narrowly under title X and family planning for the country?

We will say no to efforts to defund women's health care.

I hope going forward, as we tackle huge issues for the country around bringing down the debt and balancing the budget and growing the economy and creating jobs and looking to the future, that we will not see, once again, something as important as women's health care put on the chopping block as part of the debate. That is the message all of us have and the message we will be sending tomorrow, that women across the country need to know they are valued, that we want them to be healthy, that we want them to be able to afford health insurance, that we want them to get cancer screenings, that we value their lives. We don't believe folks should continue to play politics with their health care.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank Senators MURRAY and MIKULSKI for gathering with us today and all of my colleagues who are here. I am proud to join them.

Tomorrow we expect to vote on House proposals to defund Planned Parenthood and the Affordable Care Act. These resolutions have been offered not because anyone argues they create jobs or improve health care but

because House Republicans were willing to shut down the Federal Government if they did not receive a vote on Planned Parenthood and health care. That is right. Even though shutting down the government would have meant furloughing 800,000 people, including members of the military, they were willing to shut down the government.

This kind of a threat, especially in a recession, is irresponsible. Planned Parenthood is a critical provider of women's health care, especially to low-income individuals. Mr. President, 1.4 million Medicaid patients around the country—mostly women but not all—depend on Planned Parenthood as their main source of primary and preventive health care. They depend on Planned Parenthood for contraceptives, screenings for sexually transmitted diseases, and for screenings for breast and cervical cancer. In some parts of New Hampshire, Planned Parenthood is the only provider of preventative services for low-income women. It serves almost 16,000 patients annually. In a time of economic hardship, we should not be taking steps to reduce access to health care.

Let's be clear. This vote has nothing to do with abortion. By law, Planned Parenthood cannot use Federal funds for abortions. Moreover, Planned Parenthood provides family planning services that greatly reduce the occurrence of unplanned pregnancies. It is ironic that many of the most ardent opponents of abortion are the very people who want to shut down the family planning services that prevent unplanned pregnancies.

This vote is also not about deficit reduction. Despite what some Members of the Senate have claimed, 97 percent of the reproductive health services provided by Planned Parenthood in New Hampshire—and throughout most of the country—are preventative care. Over 90 percent are for preventative care. As we all know, preventative health care lowers health care costs and saves lives. Detecting cancer early through regular screenings greatly increases a patient's quality of life and chances of survival. In the long run it is vastly cheaper for patients in the health care system, and the Federal Government, for diseases to be prevented or treated early.

One of my constituents from Rochester, a mother of two, told me about her oldest daughter who works for a small restaurant. Her daughter can't afford health insurance, and it is not provided where she works. For her regular checkups and preventative care, she relies on Planned Parenthood. Because of the history of cervical cancer in her family, her daughter was regularly screened, and it was Planned Parenthood that first diagnosed her daughter with cervical cancer. Because of that early diagnosis, her daughter was able to obtain successful lifesaving treatment. There are countless stories such as this. We heard some of them this afternoon.

I also wish to address the other House proposal we have been discussing this afternoon. It is a proposal that would also hurt women's health care. That is the pending resolution to deny funding for health care reform. Already the Affordable Care Act is working for women across the country. As of last year, it is illegal for insurance companies to require women to obtain preauthorizations or referrals to access OB/GYN care. But there is a lot of work that still has to be done.

Currently, women in the individual health care market pay up to 48 percent more in premiums than men. Beginning in 2014, this kind of discrimination, because of the new health care law, will be outlawed. Issuers will be banned from issuing discriminatory gender ratings to charge women and small businesses with predominantly female workforces more for the same coverage.

In the same year, 2014, health care reform also makes it illegal for insurers to deny health care coverage on the basis of preexisting conditions, designations which have often been used to discriminate against women. Many women across the country today are denied coverage for preexisting conditions such as breast or cervical cancer, having had a C-section, or even just being pregnant. Some women have even been denied coverage for having sought out medical care for domestic or sexual violence. It is critical that we ensure low-income women have access to health care in these difficult times and that we ensure that all women have access to health care.

I urge my colleagues to vote against these two provisions tomorrow, these ideological attacks on women's health care. Let's get back to the business of creating jobs and dealing with this country's debt and deficit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues to talk about tomorrow's votes on two different amendments and to say that I am proud to join my female Senate Democratic colleagues in this effort and to speak out about this important issue.

To me the American people have sent us a clear message. They want us to focus on job creation, promoting innovation, and putting Americans back to work. But instead tomorrow we will be on the Senate floor trying to defend access to health care for women. We will vote tomorrow on whether to defund Planned Parenthood, an agency that serves hundreds of thousands of people in my State on important exams such as breast examinations and helping to prevent infections and various things.

Just a few weeks ago I talked about one of my constituents, a 22-year-old woman from Seattle who was diagnosed with an abnormal growth on her cervix at Planned Parenthood and received lifesaving treatment. She was uninsured, and without Planned Par-

enthood she would not have been able to get that kind of treatment. Certainly, her health would have been in major danger in the future.

I tell that story to emphasize the importance of Planned Parenthood on prevention and that they are centers of prevention for many women who have no other access to health care. We cannot jeopardize the access to that preventative health care at a time when it is so important for us to reduce long-term costs.

In fact, even in the investment area, every dollar invested in family planning and publicly funded family planning clinics saves about 4.2 in Medicaid-related costs alone. So preventive health care is good for us in saving dollars, and it is certainly good for our individual constituents who have a lack of access to health care. That is why I am so disappointed in the situation we have now, where colleagues are saying to us: You can get a budget deal, but you have to defund women's health care access to do so.

The avoidance of a government shutdown has also brought on a challenge on the backs of women in the District of Columbia because it included a provision denying DC leaders the option of using locally raised funds to provide abortion services to low-income women. For those who argue against big government, this is a contradiction because this is a real imposition on the ability of elected officials in the District of Columbia to decide what to do with their locally raised funds. I know, because I am in the Hart Building, what the mayor and others on the council had to say about this. This is an imposition on the health services of low-income women in the District of Columbia and certainly has gone almost unnoticed in the eleventh hour and sets a precedent for a dangerous slippery slope with what we are telling local governments to do.

It is time for us to focus on our budget, living within our means, and getting back to work, but certainly not to try to do all of that on the backs of women. It is not time to shut down access to women's health care.

Republicans in the House have decided to wage war and to say women should be a bargaining chip. The American people have sent us a clear message. They want us to get back to work, and they support Planned Parenthood and efforts of Planned Parenthood on preventative health care and health care delivery services.

A recent CNN poll showed that 65 percent of Americans polled support continued funding of Planned Parenthood. I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to say that these funds are used in funding organizations that may be involved in doing full reproductive choice services. But I ask them to think about that issue and that logic. Where will they stop? It is Planned Parenthood today, but are they going to stop every institution in America from receiving Federal dollars? It is illegal for Planned

Parenthood to use Federal dollars for full reproductive choices, including abortion. It is illegal. They cannot use those funds. Yet the other side would like to say that this is an issue where they would like to stop Planned Parenthood today, and then they will try to stop other organizations in the future. It is time to say no to this amendment tomorrow and to say no on trying to pull back from the full health care funding bill at a time when we need to implement the reforms to keep costs down and to increase access for those who currently don't have access to health care and return to the system with much more expensive health care needs in the future.

I am disappointed that at the eleventh hour of a budget debate that is about living within our means, about how we take the limited recovery we have had and move it forward economically, instead we are saying that we can't move forward on a budget and a recovery until we take everything that we can away from women's access to health care.

We will fight this tomorrow. I am proud to be here with my colleagues to say we will be the last line of defense for women in America who are going about their busy lives right now, taking their kids to school, trying to juggle many things at home and work. They are every day, as the budget people within their own homes, trying to figure out how to live within their means. The national budget debate has broken on this point: We can only have a budget agreement if we defund women's full access to health care. That is wrong.

We will be here tomorrow to fight this battle and speak up for women.

I wish to point out to my colleague from New York that I remember in 1993, in the year of the woman, when so many women got elected to Congress, it was the first time in the House of Representatives we had a woman on every single committee. The end result of that is we had an increase in funding for women's health research. So much of the research had been up until that point focused on men. Why? Because there wasn't anybody on the committee to speak up about how women had uniquely different health care needs and deserved to have a bigger share of funding for health care needs than were currently being funded. That is what we get when we get representation.

Women Senators will be here tomorrow to fight to say that women deserve to have access to health care through Planned Parenthood and title X. Please, for those working moms who are out there juggling, dealing with children and childcare, dealing with their jobs, dealing with pay equity at work, dealing with all of these other issues that women are struggling with—that they don't have to be a pawn in the debate on the budget, that there are people who believe, just like the majority of Americans do, that we

should move forward with this kind of preventive health care for women in America.

I see my colleague from New York who has been a staunch supporter of Planned Parenthood and women's health care choices, and I thank her for that leadership.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I commend my colleague for her extraordinary remarks and her leadership in fighting for these issues.

It is a privilege to be in the Senate today to listen to the remarks of all of the Senate women colleagues who care so deeply about women in America and how they are literally being used as a pawn in a debate about the budget.

These women have drawn a line in the sand, a line in the sand that we will not let you cross. You may not balance the budget on the backs of women, period.

It is very simple. The election last November was not about a mandate for these social issues. It was about the economy. It was about, How are we going to create jobs? How do we get a body of representatives to come together, work together across party lines, to come up with solutions? That is what the election was about.

The American people voted overwhelmingly for a vote and a discussion of issues relating to jobs. How do we create jobs? How do we create the atmosphere and the landscape so our small businesses can grow?

But that is not what the House of Representatives has focused on. No. They have created an entire agenda around an assault on women. Women's safety nets, women's health care, protections for women and children, early childhood education, prenatal care, Pap smears—you name it—this is what they are beginning to focus their attention on.

Millions of Americans depend on reproductive services. Millions of women depend on prenatal care, on early cancer screenings, breast exams—all of the types of preventive health care that families rely on. In fact, in New York, there are over 200,000 New Yorkers who rely on this preventive care.

For my friends and colleagues, this is a factual statement: Current law already prevents Federal money from paying for abortions. This has been the law of the land for over 30 years.

Shutting down the government to fight a political argument is not only outrageous, it is irresponsible. The price for keeping the government open is this assault on women's rights, equality, access to health care, access to preventive care.

Women shoulder the worst of health care costs, including outrageous discriminatory practices that we worked so hard through health care reform to fix.

The National Women's Law Center tells us that under the previous health

care system, a 25-year-old woman would have to pay 45 percent more to get basic health care than a male her same age. Some of the most essential services required by women for their basic health were not covered by many insurance plans, such as prenatal care, Pap smears, or mammograms or preventive screenings, including postpartum depression, domestic violence, and family planning.

The institutionalized discrimination in our health care system is wrong and it is a tax on women and their families. What we did in health care reform was to begin to address these issues to make sure the inadequacies of our current system could be addressed, safeguarding women's health, and making sure this institutional discrimination no longer exists.

Yesterday was Equal Pay Day. Women all across America earn 78 cents for every \$1 their male colleagues earn for doing the exact same job. Yesterday was the day it would take a woman to work all of last year and this year to earn exactly what that male colleague earned in 1 year.

Well, who does that affect? It affects families. It affects every family in America who has a working mother who is bringing money home to pay for her children, for her family, for their well-being.

So when we should be talking about the economy and issues about how do we have equal pay in this country, the Republican House is talking about how to continue this rhetoric and assault and negative effects on women and their families and what they need to protect themselves.

The votes we are going to have tomorrow to defund Planned Parenthood, to repeal health care—American women, make no mistake about it, this is an attack on you. It is an attack on every preventive health service, every safety net, everything you care about, whether it is early childhood education, Pap smears, mammograms, or prenatal care when you are pregnant. That is what their efforts are all about, and you should just know you have women of the Senate who will stand by you. We have drawn this line in the sand, and we will not allow them to cross it. We are your voice in Washington, we are your voice in Congress, and we will protect you and the basic safety nets and equality you should expect out of the U.S. Government.

Since I am the last speaker, 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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, you may not know it from the weather in Washington, but spring has finally arrived.

Even though it is cold and rainy outside, there is no mistaking the change of seasons in Washington. Every spring, the congressional office buildings are busy with people who want to visit their representatives.

I look forward to many of these visits. I look forward to seeing families who have traveled all the way from Utah to see for themselves and to show their children the Capitol, the White House, the Declaration of Independence, and the monuments to many of our Nation's greatest heroes.

But we truly know it is spring in Washington because the Halls of Congress are filled with people here for one purpose; that is, to ask for more money. When budget season hits, interest groups descend on the Capitol with one-track minds. Like the swallows to Capistrano, they return to the same spot each year to ask for more dough. The message is always the same: Their issue or their program is always critical, always essential.

Liberals like to beat up on businesses and demand their shared sacrifice. Translation: You better pony up. But the interest groups that thrive on taxpayer dollars always seem to be exempt from this required sacrifice. Somehow I don't think this is what the Founders had in mind when they guaranteed individuals the right to petition the government. Petitioning the government for more cash is somehow less inspiring than petitioning the government for redress of grievances.

I appreciate the sentiments of a new Member of the House of Representatives who hung a banner in his office that read: If you are here to ask for money, you are in the wrong place.

The fact is, Washington has an enormous spending problem. Washington is addicted to spending. The first step toward recovery is acknowledging that you have a problem. I suppose we can take some solace in the fact that few persons in a position of responsibility now deny that our deficits and debt are a problem.

Facts have gotten in the way. This morning, the Financial Times had an above-the-fold headline that read: "U.S. Lacks Credibility On Debt, IMF Says." No kidding.

Our total debt is now over \$14 trillion, with no end in sight. The administration is now asking the Finance Committee and Congress to raise the debt ceiling by \$2.2 trillion just to get this country through next year. The President's first two budgets were a tragedy. But when the United States was staring down the barrel of a third straight \$1 trillion-plus deficit, his fiscal year 2012 budget morphed into parody.

Recognizing the shellacking his party took over the issue of big spending, the White House had to talk a big game about deficit reduction, but their numbers never added up. This is how the Washington Post described the impact of the President's budget: After next year, the deficit will begin to fall

"settling around \$600 billion a year through 2018, when it would once again begin to climb as the growing number of retirees tapped into Social Security and Medicare."

Americans quickly saw this budget for what it was—business as usual, spending as usual.

Today, the President tried a do-over. He was going to give a big speech. That seems to be his go-to move. This time, he was going to convince Americans that he is very serious about deficit reduction. Unfortunately, he bricked this shot as well.

We are approaching a debt crisis, but the President seems willing to run the clock until the next election. This is a very dangerous game.

I think we need to be clear about how precarious our Nation's fiscal situation is. The fact is, we could be closer to a debt crisis than even the most pessimistic accounts. Because of this administration's dramatic ramp-up in Federal spending, Americans are deep in Federal debt.

Currently, Federal debt held by the public equals a modern record of about 69 percent of the Nation's economy—known as the gross domestic product. The Congressional Budget Office reports that current tax-and-spending law takes that figure to 76 percent of GDP over the next 10 years.

To put that number in perspective, consider the following statistic: At the end of fiscal year 2008, as the George W. Bush administration was winding down, the debt held by the public reached about 41 percent. That is less than 2½ years ago, in contrast with 69 percent of the debt. As bad as the 76-percent figure is, it gets worse under the President's fiscal policies.

President Obama's third budget was released on Valentines Day this year. If Americans were expecting some love and concern from our President, they sure didn't get it. The administration's figures claimed that the President's budget would raise debt held by the public to 87 percent of GDP. That is the administration's figures.

I have a chart that shows the growth in the debt—the national debt as a percentage of GDP. The current policy happens to be the red, the Obama 2012 budget is the blue. As you can see, by 2021, the national debt will be 76 percent of our GDP.

On Friday, March 18, 2011, CBO released its estimates of the President's budget. These estimates showed that debt held by the public would grow to 87 percent of GDP in 10 years, just like it says on the far right of the chart. That alarming figure is there on the chart.

Let me put this another way. According to the Congressional Budget Office, if we continue current tax policy, don't raise rates, fix the AMT, provide estate tax relief, and provide for a fix to the physician payment system or the SGR as it is known—policies supported by a clear majority of Americans—by 2021, the debt held by the public will reach 97 percent of GDP.

For those watching C-SPAN, whose jaws just hit the floor, I hate to tell you, but the news might even be worse. As bad as these numbers are—and they are very bad—they could be dramatically understating the fiscal consequences of our current deficit spending policy. This is because we face a hidden potential for even greater levels of additional Federal debt. We may be in the middle of a debt bubble. The stated current level of debt may grow astronomically without any policy changes. Let me say that again. If we do nothing to our current policy and continue to spend, the debt we currently hold may prove disastrous.

Here is what I mean by a bubble. I will use an example we are all too familiar with. An economic bubble can be described as significant trade volume in different products or assets with inflated values. Interest rates affect everything in our economy, from the monthly payments we make on a new car or home to the amount we are able to save at a local bank. Interest rates during both the dot-com bubble and the housing bubble were driven by policies at the Federal Reserve. During 2001, the Federal Reserve lowered the Federal funds rate from 6.25 percent to 1.75 percent. The Fed further reduced the rate in 2002 and 2003—there is the Federal funds rate—to around 1 percent.

These low rates had a substantial effect on the growth of mortgage lending between 2001 and 2004. The share of new mortgages with adjustable rates, which was around 20 percent in 2001, was more than 40 percent by 2004—adjustable rate mortgages.

Currently, just like at the beginning of the last decade, interest rates are very low. Ten-year Treasury rates are currently around 3.5 percent. During the past 2 years, this administration has spent recklessly, raising the total debt from \$10.6 trillion to over \$14.2 trillion. We are currently spending 40 cents of every \$1 on interest, paying China and others who hold our debt. But what will happen when interest rates rise? Under projections from the CBO, 10-year Treasury note rates are expected to rise from current levels to 5.3 percent in 2016.

What happens if interest rates rise to levels seen during the 1980s or the 1990s? During the 1980s, rates on 3-month Treasury bills and 10-year notes rose to over 8 percent and 10 percent, respectively. During the 1990s, rates on 3-month and 10-year notes rose to 5 percent and 6.6 percent, respectively.

Exactly like the housing bubble, as a nation, we are falling into a national debt bubble. We continue to spend on our national credit card while interest rates are low. Just as many purchased homes with adjustable rate mortgages, eventually the adjustment kicked in, the low-rate bubble popped, and many Americans found themselves facing higher mortgage payments that were unaffordable.

We are exposing ourselves to more debt than we should. The cost of that

decision is severely understated. That cost, as laid out by CBO, could be astronomical. Under President Obama's 2012 current budget, the CBO projects deficits for each of the next 10 years, resulting in an estimated \$10 trillion being added to the public debt, a 100-percent increase.

Under the scenario where interest rates rise to the historical average of the 1990s, the public debt is projected to grow an additional \$8 trillion or a 77-percent increase. Under the scenario where interest rates rise to the historical average of the 1980s, the public debt would grow to \$12.1 trillion, doubling in size.

It is right here on this chart. You can see it. This is a chart showing the public debt over the next 10 years, from 2011 to 2021. You can see the green on the far right of each column is the 1980s interest rate, the blue in the middle of each column is the 1990s interest rate, and the red happens to be the current baseline estimates, which almost everybody who looks at it seriously would say are too low.

If the interest rates return to the levels of the 1990s without any policy changes, the debt, as you can see, grows significantly, according to this chart. If we return to the 1980s interest rates, we will hit a 116-percent increase. If interest rates return to the 1980 levels, boy, are we in trouble.

Those who argue against spending restraints now are akin to the bubble inflators of the housing industry, encouraging more and more spending and consumption, never considering what will happen when the rates adjust.

This is why it is urgent, I would say imperative, that we cut spending now. Not after the next Presidential election. Not next year. Not next month. Immediately.

We cannot afford either the short or the long term effects of this dangerous spending addiction. American taxpayers understand what Washington has to do. It is time to cut the national credit card and stop this reckless spending.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and their liberal progressive base, keep urging for more taxes. I don't get this. I don't think Americans have been sitting at home thinking: You know what this debate over government spending has been missing? A proposal for a giant tax increase.

But to borrow from Bruce Dickinson, Democrats have a fever. And the only prescription is more taxation.

When it comes to dealing with our budget deficits and our exploding debt, Democrats have a one-track mind. They claim that they are serious about spending. The White House is touting reforms to Medicare and Medicaid to get spending under control. But ObamaCare is not Medicare reform. And real Medicare reform will entail repealing ObamaCare.

The health care bill took a half a trillion dollars out of Medicare to fi-

nance \$2.6 trillion in new government spending. And instead of taking responsibility to ensure the long-term viability of Medicare, the President did what he seems to do best. He punted decisionmaking to a board of unelected bureaucrats.

ObamaCare is not Medicaid reform either. States are already facing a crushing collective deficit of \$175 billion. But instead of helping the States to lift this burden, the President's health care bill larded on a \$118 billion Medicaid expansion on the States. That is about \$300 billion.

The White House has circulated a factsheet on the President's attempt at deficit reduction. It claims \$340 billion in savings over 10 years—"an amount sufficient to fully pay to reform the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate, SGR, physician payment formula while still reducing the deficit." However, the President's budget estimated the cost of a 10-year doc fix at \$380 billion. Assuming Congress utilizes the President's proposed savings to fund a doc fix, the net deficit increase from the White House's health proposals will be at least \$40 billion.

With due respect, when the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund, which our seniors depend on, is scheduled to be insolvent in 9 short years, that is totally inadequate.

So what are we really looking at in this vaunted deficit reduction plan? Yesterday, in anticipation of the President's remarks on deficit reduction, his spokesperson gave it away when he said, "[t]he president believes there has to be a balanced approach."

Translation: You better check your wallet.

The Wall Street Journal said that tax increases are on the table.

But Americans know that for Democrats tax increases are never off the table. Most Americans understand that they are the centerpiece of Democratic policy.

America was waiting for the President to propose something new today. Instead, he dusted off his proposal to end the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts for households and businesses earning over \$250,000 a year.

Citizens wanted something innovative—maybe a little hope and change for a change.

But instead they got the fiscal policy of Walter Mondale and Michael Dukakis.

Under the President's proposed failsafe for deficit reduction, taxpayers who use their own dollars to deduct mortgage interest, make contributions to charities, save for education, or save in a pension plan, will be treated the same as spending for Nevada's Cowboy Poetry Festival.

To me they are not the same. But to the President they are. David Plouffe, the President's senior adviser and former campaign manager, had this to say about the President's proposal:

People like him . . . who've been very fortunate in life, have the ability to pay a little bit more.

Well, that's big of him. We hear this quite a bit from rich Democrats: Please tax us more, they say.

Well, as the ranking member on the Senate Finance Committee, I feel obligated to inform Mr. Plouffe that the President, and all of those rich liberal Democrats who are eager to pay higher taxes, can do just that. They can write a check to the IRS and make an extra payment on their tax returns to pay down the Federal debt. The option is right there at the bottom of their tax return.

America awaits these checks. This might be a good talking point. I am sure it has polled well. But I have yet to hear the economic or fiscal rationale for raising taxes on small business creators and American families. It is certainly not deficit reduction.

Raising taxes might be politically necessary for Democrats. But it will do little to reduce the deficits and debt that are at their root spending problems.

An article from the Tax Policy Center shows just how delusional it is to try and balance the budget through tax increases. In an article titled, "Desperately Seeking Revenue," the authors laid out what types of tax increases would be necessary, absent spending changes, to reduce Federal deficits to 2 percent of GDP for the 2015 to 2019 period.

This is a remarkable article. Its authors concluded that tax increases consistent with the President's campaign pledge not to raise taxes on individuals making less than \$200,000 or families making less than \$250,000 would require the top two rates to go from 33 percent to 85.7 percent and 35 percent to 90.9 percent.

This article makes clear, yet again, that we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. We are not going to make meaningful deficit reduction—we are not going to get the debt under control—by taxing the so-called rich. Taxing citizens and businesses more is not going to fix what is essentially a spending problem.

Consider this chart. The top red line is the CBO baseline, the middle blue line is the President's budget plans. The bottom orange line is to extend the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts and index the AMT, the Alternative Minimum Tax.

You can see here that under the President's budget plans, under the CBO baseline, and under the Republican position, individual income tax revenues as a percentage of GDP are going up. Tax revenues are already going up, and they are not getting us where we need to be as a nation. Yet in his remarks today, the President's landmark proposal is little more than tax increases. I suppose we shouldn't be surprised.

When the Drudge report announced yesterday that the President was going to recommend tax increases, it did not even merit a flashing red light. Drudge just pushed it to the side, because it is really no longer news to anyone that Democrats want to raise taxes.

The real news would have been if the President stood up to his political base and made meaningful recommendations for entitlement reform.

The people of Utah, and taxpayers around the country, would have stood up and listened if the President backed a serious rollback of domestic non-defense discretionary spending, which has exploded on his watch.

Instead, they got the economic philosophy of President Carter. Maybe that statement isn't fair to President Carter. I don't know. It seems like it has all the elements of fairness.

Ultimately, this spending crisis cannot be ignored, and both voters and markets will respond to the leaders who take this issue on in a serious way.

One of the problems with our colleagues on the other side and their wonderful desire to increase taxes on everybody is that those tax increases would not go toward paying down the deficit. They would go for more spending. That has been the case for all my 34 years in the Senate. Every time we have raised taxes, over the long run it has not gone toward bringing down the deficit. It has gone for more spending.

We Members of Congress have all kinds of ways of spending money, and our Father in Heaven knows we get a lot more credit for spending in this country up through the years than we do for conserving. On the other hand, I don't think there is much credit coming today. I think most everybody in America, including all those Democratic millionaires who supported the President last time—maybe not all of them but a good percentage of them—are saying: Enough is enough.

I am hoping the President will give a speech someday that will make a difference on spending because that is clearly the problem. It is not tax revenues, it is spending. I think we have had enough of that. I think the American people, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, have had enough of that. Even though we wish we could do more, we wish we could help more people, we wish we could provide a new car for everybody in America, I am sure, but that is not reality. It is time to face up to reality and get this government spending under control.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period of morning business for debate only be extended until 6 p.m. this evening, with Senators during that period of time being allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and at 6 p.m. I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are continuing to work on an agreement to move ahead on small business. We have three main amendments—I should not say “main,” but I think they are the ones on which we are focused. One is an amendment by Senator CORNYN, one by Senator HUTCHISON, and one by Senator SANDERS. There are others who now have come into the fray, and it is making it very difficult to get votes on these three amendments, but that is where we are.

It is unfortunate. I think each of these amendments were offered in good faith. We should be able to have a vote on them even though they have virtually nothing to do with the small business bill, but I am going to continue to work to see if I can get universal agreement to get these amendments disposed of either by passing or bringing them up and moving toward completion of this bill. We should have been able to do something in the last 2 days, but that is where we are.

Overhanging all this is the continuing resolution which we need to work on tomorrow. If people have any feelings about that, I wish they would come to the Senate floor to discuss it.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I watched with great interest President Obama's speech about our spending and debt crisis. That is what I would call it. He did not use as stark terms, unfortunately, but it is a spending and debt crisis.

First of all, I am at least a little encouraged that he is finally beginning to enter the debate about this crisis. It is headed to a crisis. It is the greatest domestic threat we face as a nation. At least this speech acknowledges it is a huge threat and that his own budget submitted a few months ago was a pass on all of those big issues and he needed a redo.

This is a great threat to all of our futures and prosperity. Let me try to put it in a little bit of perspective.

Borrowing right now is at least 40 cents out of every \$1 we spend. So for every \$1 the Federal Government spends, 40 cents of that—over 40 cents—is borrowed money. We are spending \$3.7 trillion a year, but we are only taking in \$2.2 trillion. Because of that, we have recently been racking up over \$4 billion of new debt every day. So every day: new debt of \$4 billion a day. And a whole lot of that we owe to the

Chinese, more than \$1 trillion. That eventually has very serious consequences in terms of our prosperity, our future, the sort of country and vision and future we can leave for our kids.

As interest rates go up—which they inevitably will if we stay on this path—that downright costs jobs. When interest rates go up 1 percent, Federal debt goes up \$140 billion because the debt is so much. When those interest rates eventually go up, it makes it harder for all of us and our families to buy cars and homes, to pay tuition, to create jobs if we are a small business.

ADM Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said:

Our national debt is our biggest national security threat.

The highest ranking person in uniform in charge of our national security says our biggest security threat is not Iran or North Korea or anyone else; it is actually this domestic debt issue. Debt at current levels—which is 94 percent of GDP—economists say that is already costing us about a million jobs because our debt level is so great.

Again, at least the President, in his speech today—which is essentially a do-over of his budget from a few months ago—at least the President is beginning to acknowledge that fundamental threat, and that is good. But we need more than a speech, we need more than a vision. We need a real action plan, a detailed plan from the President, and we did not get that today.

So my first reaction to the speech was that it was just that: It was a speech. It was a nice sounding speech. It had a lot of nice themes. But it was a speech. If the President, who is so quick to criticize Congressman PAUL RYAN's budget—if he wants to enter the debate, he needs to enter it on a par with that level of detail, that level of specifics that Congressman RYAN and House Republicans gave. So the President needs to submit a new budget, a new detailed proposal, not just give a speech. Then we need to engage in a real debate and come up with a plan, an action plan, to tackle this spending and debt issue. And we need to do that before we vote on any debt limit increase.

Speaking for myself, I am not going to consider increasing the debt limit, which the President wants all of us to do, unless and until there is tied to it a real plan to deal with this spending and debt crisis. So this speech today, perhaps, was a start. But my general reaction is, we need more than a speech. We need specifics. We need a new budget submission. Then we need to engage in a bipartisan discussion and negotiation. But we shouldn't wait until May, as the President suggested. That should start immediately—tomorrow—because we need to hammer out meaningful details before any proposal comes to the floor for votes to increase the debt limit.

In terms of the general themes the President struck, I have to say I was

disappointed because, to my ears, it was the same-old same-old.

The first theme was increasing taxes. He has been at that theme over and over again, and that was absolutely the first theme he hit in his speech—increasing taxes. The problem is, if we look at the level of taxation we have, it is not extraordinarily low, it is not somehow way below normal historical averages. What is way above normal historical averages is spending. So if we just look at the data compared to history, we have a runaway spending problem; we don't have a taxation problem.

The second big theme the President hit was cutting defense spending. Again, coming from a liberal, this is just the same-old same-old—a traditional, predictable theme to cut defense. I don't think that is really a new approach or a new discussion from the President.

The third big theme was to cut tax expenditures. A lot of folks, at least in Louisiana, won't know what the heck that means, so let me translate. Cutting tax expenditures means increasing taxes. It means doing away with certain deductions and certain credits. It means your tax bill goes up. I am all for Tax Code simplification. I think we need an enormously simplified Tax Code. I do think we need to get rid of a lot of deductions and credits, but that should be used to lower the overall rate, particularly rates such as the corporate tax rate, which, in the United States, is the highest of any industrialized country in the world.

In terms of the theme of real cutting, that theme was very short on specifics but very long on general statements, including that entitlement spending—things such as Medicare—would not be covered in reform in any way.

So when we look at these broad themes—and that is all there was, broad themes, not specifics—it was, quite frankly, sorely disappointing. But perhaps at least it is a start. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I hope it is a meaningful start, but to be a meaningful start and to produce fruit, we need to go from a very broad, very general speech to a detailed submission.

The President needs to resubmit his entire budget. This is a do-over, so he needs to resubmit a detailed budget which matches Congressman RYAN's proposal in the level of detail, in the level of specifics the Budget Committee chairman in the House has provided. Then we need to immediately get to a bipartisan discussion and negotiation. We shouldn't wait until May. That should start immediately for one simple reason: I don't think there is any chance of passing any increase to the debt limit without having attached to it major reform, major structural reform that ensures we are on a new path of lowering spending and lowering debt. Of course, I can only control one vote, but speaking for myself, I will say that I won't even consider those

proposals to increase the debt limit unless and until there is a proposal that passes the Congress to actually decrease the debt.

Ultimately, the problem isn't the debt limit; the problem is the debt. When an individual has a spending problem or a credit card problem, the solution isn't getting a higher limit on his credit card; the solution is to deal with the spending and the debt problem, which is the underlying, core problem. The same here.

So we need to do that as we move forward in this debt-limit discussion. I hope we will all do that. I hope we will come together in a meaningful, bipartisan way to do that—to actually attack the problem, which is spending, which leads to the second problem, which is debt, and actually propose and pass real structural reform before we even have any vote on increasing the debt limit. I urge all of my colleagues to work constructively in that regard. I hope the President's speech is a start toward that, but, of course, time will tell, and actions versus words are what ultimately matter.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today more than 47 million Americans rely on Medicare for their health care. For more than 45 years, seniors have had access to the affordable, dependable health care Medicare provides.

We all recognize the cost of health care. We know it is growing and growing too rapidly. The landmark health reform law we passed recently took bold steps to rein in costs, and I am eager to work with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to further reduce health care costs, increase efficiency, and root out the fraud and waste.

Last week, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, Congressman PAUL RYAN, proposed a plan that would end Medicare as we know it. Rather than providing affordable health care paid for by Medicare, as is the case today, under the Ryan plan, seniors would receive a voucher to purchase private health insurance—again, not health care benefits provided for under Medicare but, rather, receive a voucher to purchase private health insurance from private health insurance companies.

Unfortunately, this voucher would fall far short of covering health care costs for seniors. According to the independent Congressional Budget Office, under the Ryan plan, "Most elderly people would pay more"—I might add, much more—"for their health care than they would pay under the current Medicare system." How much more? CBO says that under the Ryan plan, the average 65-year-old would have to pay \$12,000 a year to receive the same level of benefits Medicare offers today—\$12,000 a year. That is more than double what a senior would have to pay under today's Medicare. So the Ryan plan would double the payments seniors have to make and the benefits would be reduced.

Under the Ryan plan, there would be no guaranteed benefits, which are provided under Medicare today. As a result, private insurance companies would dictate what care a senior received, ending the current doctor-patient relationship.

Our deficit, of course, is serious. It is very serious. It must be addressed. While we need to look for more ways to reduce our deficit, we need to do so in a balanced and fair way. For starters, we shouldn't balance the budget on the backs of seniors. We will not allow Medicare to be dismantled—not on our watch. Yesterday, Senator BILL NELSON and I introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution stating that "Medicare should not be dismantled and turned into a voucher or premium-support program."

Deficit reduction should not simply shift costs to seniors, and that is exactly what the vouchers in the Ryan budget would do. A voucher system does nothing to lower health care costs. It does not guarantee the benefits Medicare offers today. It does not provide access to affordable health care. Seniors deserve much better.

I listened closely to my colleague from Louisiana a few moments ago. Frankly, I am somewhat heartened. I heard from him that he wants to move forward and that he would, he said indirectly, vote to increase the debt limit if there is a credible plan to reduce deficits and our national debt. I think that is a proposal with which the vast majority of Members of this body agree. Of course, the proof is in the pudding. It is, what is that credible plan, what is that mechanism, what is that assurance that we are going to reduce the budget deficits prior to a vote to increase the debt limit?

It is very important that a vote to increase the debt limit occur without brinksmanship. We had far too much brinksmanship in the lead-up to the continuing resolution. It was just a matter of \$2 billion or \$3 billion in the last eleventh hour.

The vote to increase the debt limit is a far more important vote. The stakes are much, much higher. The dollar amount is much greater. The financial markets will be watching very closely. And we, as Members of Congress, working with the President, must find a way to get the debt limit increased but with assurance that we are going to get deficits down and the debt down in a credible way, in a proper period of time so we don't have to push up to that final moment, the final minute before the vote on the debt limit occurs.

As I listened to my colleague from Louisiana, I sensed that he wants to find some way—and I think we all do; that is our challenge; that is our charge over the next couple of months—find that mechanism, find that process that is credible, that makes sense, and that both sides can buy into, not knowing exactly what the final result will be but knowing we are starting down a road to get the budget

deficit under control in a balanced and fair way.

I do not mean to sound critical, but I don't think the Ryan budget proposal is balanced. I don't think it is fair. But I do think the vast majority of the Members of the Senate do want to find a fair and balanced solution, and it is up to us to find that before a vote on the debt limit occurs.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, this afternoon, after a few days of great anticipation, the President laid out his version for long-term deficit reduction and dealing with our long-term debt. Now that we have heard from him, I am afraid we are left with more questions than answers.

Let me be clear. I welcome the President to the debate. I think it is a positive sign. There is no more pressing issue for us to address than our dire fiscal situation and our economic challenges; both are intertwined. We are not going to be able to move the economy until we deal with our impending debt crisis, and we cannot deal with fiscal problems without growing the economy.

There has been a lot of good discussion about the unique dangers we face if we don't address our massive deficits and our debt which has now accumulated to over \$14 trillion. That amount, by the way, is equal to the entire size of the U.S. economy, making this the first time since World War II that we have had a debt of that level. It is also a lot different now than it was then.

During World War II our debt was driven primarily by defense spending which would be quickly curtailed. We weren't looking at the incredible unfunded obligations, such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security that we have today. That is an unfunded obligation of over \$100 trillion. So we are in uncharted territory, unprecedented times. It is harming our economy today and, of course, it will devastate it in the future if we don't take action.

Economists tell us that with a debt of 90 percent of GDP we will typically lose 1 point of economic growth. Again, this year our gross debt is 100 percent of our GDP. By the way, a 1-percent reduction in our GDP in America means about 1 million jobs. So, already, with a gross debt of 100 percent of GDP, we have foregone jobs that we need in Ohio and around the country.

This high indebtedness also comes with significant interest payments. Of course, even with interest rates being near zero today, the magnitude of the U.S. debt still requires a debt service

this year of over \$200 billion. By the way, under the President's budget that number increases to almost \$1 trillion 10 years from now based on the CBO analysis. That is \$1 trillion a year just in interest payments on the debt.

What concerns me is that interest rates could well go up given this climate. A 1-percent increase in interest involves another \$130 billion of interest payments. Think about that. Just a 1-percent increase in interest rates means another \$130 billion in interest payments. Obviously, inflation would be causing additional damage to an already precarious budget situation, and that is another great risk that we face.

Our current deficits are also increasingly financed by foreign holders of U.S. debt. At present, nearly half of U.S. publicly held debt is held by foreign investors. As U.S. deficits are increasingly foreign-financed, of course, our interest payments are leaving the country. It is estimated that in 2010 interest payments to foreign entities and foreign individuals amounted to over \$140 billion. That is based on the new data from the Department of Commerce. It is not just about these high debt payments, it is the fact that a lot of it is going overseas.

Our persistent deficits and pending debt crisis also introduces a lot of uncertainty into our economy. Some immediate evidence of this effect appears on the balance sheets of America's businesses, which shows \$1.9 trillion in liquid holdings. That means money is sitting on the sidelines rather than being invested in jobs, plants, and equipment. Resolving the uncertainty surrounding future deficits will induce greater investment as companies can plan more effectively.

We are already seeing these concerns manifest themselves in our economy today. Capital markets are responding as investors, such as PIMCO, the largest holder of U.S. Treasuries, is out altogether, telling us they no longer trust U.S. debt. What will happen if we don't address these challenges is even more daunting.

According to the CBO, assuming the continuation of many current policies, debt held by the public as a share of our GDP is projected to reach an implausibly high 947 percent of GDP by 2084. Of course, that won't happen. The United States will face a debt crisis long before that, but that demonstrates the unsustainability of the current fiscal situation. No economic model could tell us what the economy would look like in the future because by then these models will essentially fall apart.

Over time the accumulation of debt increases the cost of debt service, consuming a greater share of revenues, limiting budgetary resources for other priorities or for meeting unforeseen emergencies, such as a natural disaster or a war.

As time progresses a fiscal crisis resulting from high indebtedness could occur rapidly as investors lose con-

fidence in U.S. Treasuries. Absent immediate policy changes, the United States would have to pay higher yields on its own debt to roll over existing debt and avoid default. We are going to have to pay higher interest rates to attract investors to our country. In addition to the cost of an increase in interest expense, higher interest rates, of course, would be devastating for American families. Think about it. As interest rates go up, because Treasury rates go up, this means home mortgages go up. This means college loan payments go up. This means interest rates on car loans go up and on credit card activity and other loans. The economy is tough enough. We don't need higher interest rates, but that is upon us unless we act now.

The magnitude of the debt crisis would escalate as higher interest costs require additional borrowing at high rates to continue to make interest payments, which would ultimately grind the economy to a halt as investors lose confidence in the ability of the United States to repay. The global impact of a U.S. debt crisis would be far reaching and truly unprecedented. We just went through a tough recession. We don't need to relive that.

All things being equal, debt financing of current consumption necessarily imposes future obligations on subsequent generations either in the form of higher taxes or reduced consumption of government services. To avoid a debt crisis, any policy changes must begin sooner rather than later to minimize those effects that are, unfortunately, likely to happen even if we act.

Given the threats and the crisis described, there is no doubt that America needs real leadership to address this fiscal threat. While we can debate some of the specifics in Congressman RYAN's budget, there is no doubt that the House Republican plan demonstrates necessary leadership on the severe fiscal challenges our country faces. This is in contrast to the plan President Obama sent to the Congress just 2 months ago. It not only rejects the serious recommendations from his own fiscal commission, but, unfortunately, as Erskine Bowles, the Democratic co-chair of the President's Commission said: "It goes nowhere near where they will have to go to resolve our fiscal nightmare."

Unfortunately, the President's speech today provides no specifics as how to resolve that fiscal nightmare.

More spending, more borrowing, and more taxes are not a prescription for spending constraint and economic growth. Since President Obama took office, we have seen trillions in new spending and record deficits. The February budget I talked about just locks that new spending in place, doing nothing to pull back from this dangerous spiral of debt.

Let us be clear, this is not just a budget issue, it is an economic issue, and it is definitely a jobs issue. Not only will debt and deficit have a long-

term impact on our children and grandchildren who will have to foot the bill for today's spending, but we are beginning to see this immediate impact on economic stability and job growth as the cost of our debt begins to crowd out private sector investment. We have to move quickly to substantially reduce the debt and deficit to strengthen our fiscal house and, in doing so, foster job creation in States such as mine—Ohio—and around the country.

The Commission's plan that the President rejected in December cuts deficits by about \$4.1 trillion compared to the baseline of current policy over a 10-year period. It brings our deficits to 1.2 percent of our economy by 2020. Compare that to today, where we are at almost 10 percent of our economy. So it sets a standard—over \$4 trillion in reductions in the deficit and an annual deficit that is 1.2 percent, which incidentally is where our budget deficit was about 4 years ago. Congressman RYAN's budget got there by bringing deficits down by about \$4.2 trillion by 2021, as compared to a comparable baseline, to the Commission's report—so \$4.1 trillion, \$4.2 trillion—and the deficit is about 1.5 percent of GDP.

The President's own budget, again submitted here to Congress about 2 months ago, is very different. His budget merely gets one-quarter of the way there—\$1.1 trillion—and that assumes all the administration's claimed savings occur and it assumes, frankly, there is a higher rate of economic growth than the Congressional Budget Office thinks there will be, which actually wipes out the deficit savings the President claims.

So we have very different visions, don't we? We have the fiscal commission on the one hand and the Ryan budget in the \$4 trillion range and then a plan by the President that does not get us moving forward in terms of deficit reduction—in effect, doubles the debt in the next 10 years.

Evidently, after seeing Republicans move forward last week and now this week in the House and after seeing how, on a bipartisan basis and around the country, people reacted to his budget, President Obama has realized he needs to move forward with a new proposal. In a sense, he is asking for a mulligan, and I think that is good. I think it is good he has acknowledged this problem is deeper and more serious than his budget proposal indicated, and we need to move forward together.

Unfortunately, again, the President did not offer specifics today, unlike the Ryan budget, which takes some bold and courageous and tough steps but does offer specifics. The President chose instead to squander his opportunity to offer a real way forward on tackling our structural fiscal problems. He did talk about \$4 trillion in deficit reduction—and I appreciate that—but again did not offer a way to get there. The national commission he formed, and which reported in December, told the President there was a way to get

there, and I hope the President will relook at his own Commission and other proposals, such as the Ryan proposal.

As the President made clear, we have been debating just 12 percent of the budget. He is right about that. There is some defense spending that is involved, but for the most part it is a very small part of the budget. So what does his proposal do to address these additional challenges? I didn't hear anything today about serious proposals to address the entitlement programs, which are incredibly important programs but on an unsustainable footing.

On Medicare, the President proposed delegating future unspecified savings to a government board—unelected and unaccountable. On Medicaid, the President seems to be delegating responsibility to the National Governors Association. On Social Security, the President told us today it doesn't contribute to our deficit, despite the fact the program is in cash deficit this year by \$45 billion—\$45 billion less in payroll taxes than the payments going out.

The President proposed \$4 trillion in deficit reduction. Yet he has shrunk, at this point, from the responsibility of telling us how he would achieve it, except that he would leave the challenge largely to others, while pursuing tax increases that I fear would harm the little recovery we see coming out of this deep recession.

So I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle and the President to address the serious challenges we have talked about today. I wish we had seen more specifics today, but I am encouraged to see that at least the President is engaging in the game. I welcome his involvement because it is too important for us not to have involvement from both sides of the aisle. Without White House leadership, we cannot move forward.

As the President so often says, let's get focused not on the next election but on the next generation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, the Senate will have before it today or tomorrow, depending upon the flow around here, two very misguided bills. This will come about when we have our budget come up for a vote. Under an agreement to get that budget up, we are going to have a vote on two separate bills. One bill would totally repeal and defund the affordable care act—the health care reform bill we passed—and the other one would prevent funding for Planned Parenthood. So I wish to take a few minutes on the floor of the Senate to speak about how misguided these two bills are.

First, let me talk about the bill that would defund the affordable care act. This bill we will be voting on will prohibit any funds appropriated this year and any funds appropriated in any prior year from being used to carry out the affordable care act. This would re-

move the engine from health care reform while the train is steaming down the track.

So, again, why are we voting on this? The reason is, Republicans have tried a frontal assault on the affordable care act—a debate on the merits—and they failed. This body voted down Senator MCCONNELL's amendment to the FAA authorization bill that would have repealed health reform in its entirety. But I guess what we can't do directly, we try to do indirectly. So now the Republicans are trying to undermine health reform by other means, such as defunding it.

Well, this strategy only makes sense if you are absolutely obsessed—obsessed—with tearing down health care reform. Make no mistake about it, this bill is the equivalent of repeal. By depriving the bill of all funding, it would turn back the clock on all we have accomplished over the past year.

It would take us back to the bad old days, when insurance companies were in the driver's seat, telling us what kinds of health care we are entitled to and when we are entitled to it.

Instead of protecting all Americans against arbitrary limits on coverage, repeal would take us back to the days when insurance companies could turn off our coverage just when we are the sickest. That would hurt families such as the Grasshoffs from Texas, who testified before my committee earlier this year. They were unable to find coverage that would pay for their son's hemophilia treatment until the affordable care act banned lifetime limits.

Instead of allowing young people starting a new job or a new business or going off to school to stay on their parents' insurance until age 26, repeal would make them fend for themselves in a chaotic market that offers too little coverage for too much money. That would hurt folks such as Emily Schlichting, who suffers from a rare autoimmune disorder that would make her uninsurable in the bad old days. But because of the affordable care act, she is able to stay on her parents' policy until she is 26. Yet at a HELP Committee hearing in January—this is Emily, a wonderful young woman—she said:

Young people are the future of this country and we are the most affected by the reform—we're the generation that is most uninsured. We need the Affordable Care Act because it is literally an investment in the future of this country.

It would also hurt folks such as Carol in Ankeny, IA, whose 19-year-old daughter was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes 9 years ago. Thanks to the affordable care act, Carol doesn't have to worry about her daughter's preexisting condition, disqualifying her for insurance coverage, and she can stay on her parents' health insurance coverage after college.

Carol also doesn't have to worry about the cost of her daughter's care running up against the lifetime cap that would be imposed by an insurance

company. Health care reform banned those limits. Carol wrote me a very nice letter to say thank you for doing the right thing.

Instead of protecting nearly half of nonelderly Americans who have pre-existing conditions—such as high blood pressure, diabetes or heart disease—from denial of coverage, repeal would put insurance companies back in the driver's seat, picking and choosing whom to cover.

Instead of helping small businesses, struggling in this recession with the cost of insurance premiums, repeal of the affordable care act would take away \$40 billion in tax credits that reduce premiums for small businesses.

Instead of helping all Americans prevent illness or disease by providing free preventive services such as mammograms and colonoscopies, repeal would allow insurers to charge expensive copays for these important services, thus discouraging people from getting their colonoscopies or mammogram screenings.

If we pass this bill—this bill to defund the affordable care act—Congress will turn its back on America's seniors, tossing our hard-won improvements in Medicare benefits and damaging the program's fiscal health. It would reopen the Medicare Part D doughnut hole, exposing millions of seniors to the full cost of drugs when they need the most assistance. Repealing the affordable care act would increase seniors' drug prices, on average, by more than \$800 this year and \$3,500 over the next 10 years.

Repeal would roll back the unprecedented investment the affordable care act makes in Medicare fraud prevention. Turning back the affordable care act would hurt seniors' access to health care in rural areas by eliminating incentive payments that are in the affordable care act paid to rural primary care providers.

Repealing—or defunding, as this bill would do—the affordable care act would roll back improvements to Medicare payment policy, coordination, and efficiency that extends the life of the Medicare trust fund by a decade. In addition, Secretary Sebelius has informed us that payments to Medicare providers would be significantly disrupted by this bill, which again will defund the affordable care act.

Finally, we come to the part of this debate even Alice in Wonderland would have a tough time understanding. The House Republicans have played the Washington stage for all it is worth over the last few weeks, making great solemn speeches to the balconies and to the audiences about the deficit and the debt. But as a condition for agreeing to fund the government for the remainder of this year, what are they demanding? They want to defund and, thus, repeal the affordable care act—one of the best and biggest deficit-reducing measures in decades.

The Affordable Care Act reduces the deficit by \$210 billion in the next 10

years, more than \$1 trillion in the next 10 years. Again, here is a chart that shows that. In the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Affordable Care Act will reduce the deficit by \$210 billion. Therefore, if you repeal it you would increase the deficit by \$210 billion.

Here is where the real savings come. In the next decade the Congressional Budget Office says the Affordable Care Act will reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion. So if you defund it, as this bill would do, you will increase the deficit by \$1 trillion. That is what the Republicans want, they want to absolutely increase the deficit. They must, because they want to do away with the Affordable Care Act.

Let me get this straight. The Republicans are proposing to reduce the deficit by—increasing the deficits? As I said, somehow I have a feeling when I hear that, we are not in Kansas any longer. This is “Alice in Wonderland” kind of thinking.

We have to stop the silly game. This debate is not about deficit reduction, it is about tearing down health reform, no matter what. No matter if it does increase the deficit, get rid of it, get rid of health reform. It is about giving control back to wealthy, powerful health insurance companies that can raise your rates, deny you benefits, and make increasingly more profit.

Nothing makes the nature of the agenda of my friends on the Republican side more clear than the 2012 proposed budget released by the Republican House Budget Committee chairman last week. The Republican budget plan is very simple: a massive transfer of wealth from low-and middle-income Americans to the wealthiest in our country. Two-thirds of the budget savings in the Republican budget proposal come from drastically cutting programs that serve those with modest means, while permanently extending President Bush's tax cuts for the rich.

How is this massive wealth shift paid for? They would repeal the majority of the Affordable Care Act, taking coverage away from more than 32 million Americans who would be covered under current law. Starting in 2022, the Republican budget proposal eliminates Medicare as we know it, turning over the program to private health insurance companies. Instead of enrolling seniors in Medicare, the Republicans' plan would give them a voucher to go out and buy private insurance coverage on the open market. Since the voucher would not keep up with rising medical costs, seniors would fall farther and farther behind.

The Congressional Budget Office has said this would more than double out-of-pocket costs for seniors entering the program in 2022; it would triple the costs by 2030. Where would that money go? To the private health insurance industry. That sounds kind of familiar, doesn't it?

The Republicans' obsession with repealing the new health reform law is

not based on budgetary considerations. It is based strictly on ideology. In 1965, President Johnson and this Congress passed Medicare, ensuring seniors access to decent health care. Republicans fought it bitterly then and 45 years later they are still trying to undo it. Here they go again. The choice before us is to go forward or to be dragged backward. Let us come together as a united American people, create a reformed health care system that works not just for the healthy and the wealthy but for all Americans.

There is a second bill we will be voting on in conjunction with the budget. The Republicans insisted on this in order to have a vote on the budget. It is equally as misguided and as dangerous, I think, as the other bill. This second bill would prohibit a law-abiding and extraordinarily successful organization from participating in fair competition for Federal funding. This entity would, of course, be Planned Parenthood.

Again, let's be clear what this bill is not about. It is not about the need to prevent Federal funds from being used to pay for abortions. Longstanding rules under the title X program already strictly prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. What is more, every appropriations bill for the last two decades has stated that no funds can be used for any abortion.

This bill is not about abortion. It is about banning a specific organization from even competing for Federal funds, simply because some people don't agree with that organization. This would create a very disturbing and dangerous precedent. When Congress creates a program, it typically specifies rules or criteria for participation in that program. Anyone who or any organization that agrees to play by these rules and criteria is eligible to compete. Planned Parenthood is playing by the rules. That is one reason it is one of the most widely respected health care providers in the United States.

Of 5.2 million women served every year by the title X program, 1 out of 3, 31 percent, receive care at Planned Parenthood health centers. If someone can show me a specific clinic that is not following the rules, by all means take away their funding. But that is not what this bill does. This bill says Planned Parenthood as an entity would be banned from even competing to provide services under title X, despite the fact that they conform to all of the rules of the program.

It doesn't only ban Planned Parenthood from offering family planning services. That is one aspect of what Planned Parenthood does. But this bill would turn away nearly 1 million women a year who receive cervical cancer screenings through Planned Parenthood clinical services, as well as 830,000 women every year who get breast exams at Planned Parenthood clinical services. They would turn away countless hundreds of thousands

of women and men who receive physical exams and immunizations at Planned Parenthood clinical services.

My office has been deluged by e-mails and phone calls from Iowans and other Americans who oppose this misguided effort to ban Planned Parenthood from receiving funding under title X. I stand with them in support of the important services these clinics provide to women and men throughout the country.

A constituent of mine writes:

Dear Senator Harkin,

I want to let you know that cutting funds to Planned Parenthood will jeopardize the lives of many of the women and some of the men who go there for basic reproductive health screenings. I say this with confidence, as Planned Parenthood was the only clinic I could afford 10 years ago, to obtain yearly Pap smears. It was Planned Parenthood that found my cervical cancer and referred me to a specialist for treatment. Due to the existence and actions of Planned Parenthood, I am alive today as a healthy and contributing member of society. I work with undergraduate and graduate students, and several of them have mentioned that Planned Parenthood was their only option for affordable screenings. . . . Please ensure that government funding will be allocated to Planned Parenthood. Please do not have young or socioeconomically strapped women potentially lose their life over a cancer that is remedied when caught in its early stages.

That was the end of her letter. We need to listen to voices such as this. We need to listen to the women of America who rely on Planned Parenthood.

Finally, I believe this bill goes to the heart of whether we can reach common ground on something on which we should all agree, the need to find ways to reduce the need for abortions in America. Let me say at the outset I strongly believe that we must preserve the right of every woman to her own reproductive choices that exist under the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*. But to reduce the number of abortions we must prevent unwanted pregnancies, just as we must also support women who want to carry their pregnancies to term. That is precisely what title X funding accomplishes. Family planning services at title X health centers, including Planned Parenthood, prevent an estimated 973,000 unintended pregnancies a year and this in turn obviates what a woman might turn to in desperation, for hundreds of thousands of abortions every year.

Unfortunately, during the debate on Planned Parenthood in recent days we have heard many wild and inaccurate claims about the work of this dedicated organization. On that score, I have always agreed with my former colleague, the late Senator Pat Moynihan, who said, "People are entitled to their own opinions but they are not entitled to their own facts." Last week our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona, stood here on the floor of the Senate and stated that abortion "is well over 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does." He stated it right here on the Senate floor, the junior Senator from Arizona.

Of course that is grossly inaccurate. Planned Parenthood spends the overwhelming majority of its resources keeping women healthy and preventing the need for abortion in the first place. The fact—the fact—is that just 3 percent of Planned Parenthood services are related to abortion.

When news organizations asked the office of the Senator from Arizona for evidence of his claim, a spokesperson bizarrely stated: "His remark was not intended to be a factual statement." What was it intended to be? The floor of the Senate is not the place for destructive and false assertions, especially when used to argue that an organization should be redlined and singled out for discrimination.

For the record, Planned Parenthood is one of the most respected women's health organizations in the United States. It courageously defends the right of women in America to make informed, independent decisions about their health and family planning. By providing women with counsel and contraception, Planned Parenthood prevents countless unwanted pregnancies and thereby reduces the number of abortions in this country. Lest there be any misunderstanding, I intend this as a factual statement.

Let me conclude by making clear that the one certain impact of this bill, if it were passed, would be to increase the number of abortions in America. This bill would dramatically erode the effectiveness of title X in preventing unintended pregnancies, preventing sexually transmitted infections, detecting cancers early, keeping people healthy through quality preventive care. It would have this impact because this misguided bill would ban an extraordinarily successful organization, Planned Parenthood, from providing these services.

On this bill we have to say no to unintended pregnancies and unnecessary abortions; say no to this misguided and counterproductive bill.

We will have this vote on the budget but then we have these two side votes, one that would defund the Affordable Care Act and send us back to the bad old days of health insurance companies deciding who gets what when at insanely big profits to them; second, it would ban Planned Parenthood from even applying to be a provider of health resources and services to 5.2 million women every year in this country.

I hope that Congress, the Senate, will rise above these misguided bills, will rise above unfactual assertions made on the floor of the Senate no matter how they were intended, and that we will make sure Planned Parenthood can continue to provide the vital services it does in this country.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. 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. McCAIN. Madam President, after much drama and anticipation late last Friday night, literally minutes before the government was scheduled to shut down, as we all know, a deal was struck to pass a weeklong continuing resolution and keep the government operating. That was the seventh continuing resolution we have passed since the start of the fiscal year last October.

Now we are appearing to consider the eighth and final continuing resolution to fund the government for the remaining 5 months of the fiscal year. Amazing. Eight continuing resolutions were necessary to fund the government for 1 year because my friends on the other side of the aisle neglected to bring a single one of the annual appropriations bills to the floor for consideration last year.

As my colleagues know, in addition to continued funding for all government operations, the measure we will consider tomorrow includes appropriations for the Department of Defense for the remainder of the fiscal year. Unfortunately, on top of the typical run-of-the-mill Washington budget gimmickry, this agreement also contains a gross misallocation of imperative defense resources.

The Defense Department funding portion of this bill proposes \$513 billion for the routine operations of the Department of Defense and approximately \$17 billion in military construction, for a total of \$530 billion. This amount is \$19 billion less than the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request for the Defense Department and its related military construction projects and \$10 billion less than the \$540 billion the Secretary of Defense had testified was the minimum amount the Department needed to execute its national defense mission.

In addition, this bill also funds an additional \$157.8 billion for overseas contingency operations, or war funding, to support our troops in combat, consistent with the President's budget request.

I might add that the amounts Secretary Gates described as essential in January did not foresee that the United States would expend more than \$650 million enforcing the no-fly zone in Libya, an amount that will most likely increase over the remaining months of the fiscal year.

While this may seem like a defense funding level that we can live with in a tough fiscal climate bill, the bill is not what it appears to be on the surface.

As the Secretary of Defense pointed out last week, funding to support the warfighter is degraded in this bill because billions in the war-funding accounts—my staff has estimated close to \$8 billion—have been allocated by the Appropriations Committee for new spending not requested by the administration or transferred to pay items

that were originally requested in the base budget for nonwar-related expenses. For instance, the bill shifts \$3.2 billion in nonwar funding to the war-funding account to artificially lower defense spending for day-to-day operations but by doing so reduces funds for the warfighter. Here is an example. The appropriators have added \$495 million for nine additional F-18s and funds them as part of the war-funding budget even though we have not lost any F-18s in the current conflicts.

Additionally, the appropriators added \$4.8 billion in unrequested funding to the war-funding part of the Defense bill for programs and activities that the President and Secretary Gates did not seek. For example, \$192 million was added for additional missile defense interceptors. There was no administration request for these funds. And missile defense expenses are in no way related to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So this bill uses gimmicks and shell games to artificially lower the defense base budget rather than playing by the rules and actually demonstrating our commitment to fiscal responsibility. By doing so, it takes away billions of dollars that were originally requested for ongoing combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan to support our troops where it is most needed.

Within the \$19 billion lower top line of the base defense budget, this bill continues business as usual with cuts exceeding \$5 billion to the amounts the President and Secretary Gates requested for critical defense programs in order to pay for over \$3.7 billion in unjustified and unexplained increases to other accounts.

In addition to these shifts away from the Department of Defense priorities, this bill also adds over \$1.4 billion for projects that were not requested by the Department and are not considered core activities of the Department of Defense.

Let me give you examples of those misallocated resources. It includes \$473 million in non-Department of Defense medical research not requested in the President's budget; \$227 million in other medical research related to Department of Defense fields but not requested by the Pentagon; \$550 million for local roads and schools not requested by the administration. It adds an additional \$3.7 billion in program increases not justified by an unfunded request by the service chiefs or by the administration; adds unrequested funds for the Red Cross, \$24 million; Special Olympics, \$1.2 million; youth mentoring programs, \$20 million. These are good programs, but they have no place in the Department of Defense. They should be in other areas. It cuts about \$1 billion in military construction requested in the President's budget, including \$258 million for projects in Bahrain, the headquarters of the Navy's Fifth Fleet. It adds a reporting provision designed to be the first step in forcing the National Guard to buy

firefighting aircraft rather than lease commercially available aircraft. It authorizes a multiyear procurement of Navy MH-60 helicopters.

I want to be clear here. I know that cancer research is a popular cause on a bipartisan basis and that it has value in the larger scheme of things. I am not against funding for medical research to fight the scourge of cancer and other diseases. I support funding for these programs that are requested by the administration for the Department of Health and Human Services. But this sort of general medical research funding has no place in a defense bill. Placing it there, which the appropriators have done year after year, undercuts the fiscal responsibility and prioritization process we expect our Federal agencies to undertake when allocating scarce resources.

So the Department of Defense is not only getting a significantly lower amount in its 2011 budget—\$19 billion below what it asked for to support its routine operations and carry out its day-to-day national security mission and \$10 billion below what Secretary Gates said in January was essential for the Department's ability to continue to function, but it is also being directed to spend about \$8 billion in funding for items that do not directly support the men and women in the military.

Let me point out one more disturbing aspect of the DOD portion of this bill. I understand from an exchange between my staff and the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the committee is appropriating only "top-line dollar amounts" in this bill and not providing the customary tables, which is the description for each account, which outline the specifics of what is being funded. Instead, I have learned that the committee plans to communicate directly with the Office of the Secretary of Defense on funding levels in specific items.

I do not have a problem with the Appropriations Committee providing a top-line dollar amount to the Pentagon and allowing the Secretary of Defense to fund our national security priorities as he sees fit. I am deeply concerned about the lack of transparency associated with this plan. I hope it is not a way to get around the earmark moratorium currently in place in both Houses. If a Member of Congress is dictating, through the Appropriations Committee, the use of scarce defense funds, it is an earmark, even if it was done over the phone. I urge the Department of Defense to not view such communications as law or a mandate.

As I noted earlier, in addition to the misallocation of defense resources, this so-called deal uses typical Washington smoke-and-mirror tactics to achieve savings. According to expert analysis and numerous press reports, the agreement reached by negotiators last week used some of the same budget tricks and gimmickry that have helped us to accumulate our current deficit of \$1.4 trillion and a debt of over \$14.3 trillion.

Yesterday, in an article by Andrew Taylor of the Associated Press, it was reported that details of last week's hard-won agreement to avoid a government shutdown and cut Federal spending by \$38 billion were released Tuesday morning. They reveal that the budget cuts, while historic, were significantly eased by pruning money left over from previous years using accounting sleight of hand and going after programs President Obama had targeted anyway. The article also noted that details of the agreement "reveal a lot of one-time savings and cuts that officially score as cuts to pay for spending elsewhere, but often have little or no impact on the deficit."

Additionally, an editorial appeared in today's Wall Street Journal titled "Spending Cut Hokus: GOP leaders hyped their budget savings." In part, the editorial states:

After separating out the accounting gimmicks and one-year savings, the actual cuts look to be closer to \$20 billion than to the \$38 billion that both sides advertized. But the continuing resolution also saves money on paper through phantom cuts. The whopper is declaring \$6.2 billion in savings by not spending money left from the 2010 Census. Congress also cuts \$4.9 billion from the Justice Department's Crime Victims Fund, but much of that money was tucked away in a reserve fund that would not have been spent this year in any event.

The budgeteers claim \$630 million in cuts from what are called "orphan earmarks," or construction that never started, and \$2 billion more for transportation projects, some of which were likely to be canceled. The Associated Press reports that \$350 million in savings comes from a 2009 program to pay dairy farmers to compensate for low milk prices. Milk prices are higher this year, so some of that money also would never have been spent.

An estimated \$17 billion comes from one-time savings in mandatory programs. The cuts are real, but the funding gets restored by law the next year, which means Republicans will have to refight the same battles. States lose some \$3.5 billion in bonus money to enroll more kids in the Children's Health Insurance Program, but many states failed to qualify for that extra funding. These cuts don't reduce the spending baseline, so there are no compound savings over time.

None of this is enough to defeat the budget at this point, but it is infuriating given the GOP leadership's flogging of that \$38 billion top-line figure.

Is that the best we can offer the American people right now? In these tough economic times, with record debt and deficits and 8.8 percent unemployment, we give them smoke and mirrors, budget gimmickry, and accounting sleight of hand. Our government is bloated and precious taxpayer dollars are squandered in nearly every agency. You can't pick up a newspaper or go online without seeing reports of waste and duplication throughout Federal bureaucracies. I am pleased some real cuts have been made, but we need to do much more. This deal does little to address the very serious fiscal issues we face as a nation.

I hope as we address the next crisis, which will be, obviously, as we reach the debt limit, that we will have more

serious plans. I also believe it is vitally important, before we raise the debt limit, that we can put this Nation on a path to a balanced budget. We cannot afford to continue to borrow 40 cents out of every dollar we spend in Washington. We cannot afford, as the commercial that many of us have seen on television, to have the Chinese own America's money, and the United States be in such debt that China has an increasing and unhealthy influence on the United States.

I intend to vote for this agreement. I believe we could have done a lot better, but it is a step in the right direction. It is the first time we have made serious efforts to reduce spending in quite a number of years around here. I hope it will serve as something that the American people can support and spur us on to greater efforts in the coming weeks and months.

I notice the presence of the majority leader, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I say to my good friend from Arizona, we came to the House of Representatives together, came to the Senate together. When we came here, we both had the same service except the State of Arizona had more people than the State of Nevada, so he is one step ahead of me in seniority. I appreciate my friend's statement.

Mr. MCCAIN. That is in the eye of the beholder. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REID. I appreciate my friend's statement. He and I are both going to vote for this piece of legislation for different reasons, but as I have said publicly and privately, there have been very few people in the history of our country who have served our country so valiantly in battle and in the government than JOHN MCCAIN. Even though we have disagreed on a number of issues over the years, my admiration for him will always be there.

(Mr. WHITEHOUSE assumed the chair.)

RENO AIRPORT INCIDENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the country learned today, certainly we learned in Nevada, there was a terrifying close call at the Reno airport last night. It is a miracle that everyone is OK today, and we are grateful they are.

This is what happened. Only one air traffic controller was in the tower during last night's overnight shift. Medical aircraft carrying a critically ill passenger couldn't land because the controller fell asleep on the job. We now know that the pilot circled several times. We now know that he tried to call the tower not once, not twice, but seven times. The controller slept through every one of the calls. He slept through the circling of the aircraft.

More than 15 minutes later, with the passenger critically ill in the airplane, minutes during which no one could reach the air traffic controller while

this critically ill passenger suffered in that aircraft, the pilot landed without any guidance from the airport.

The Reno airport is situated right below the great Sierra Nevada Mountains. It is an extremely difficult place to land. Those of us who have been landing there for all these years know how terribly rough it is many times coming out of there with the winds coming off the Sierras. To think this pilot was forced to land without any control on the land is very scary.

This should not happen in Nevada. It should not happen anywhere in the country. It shouldn't happen in any airplane, and it certainly shouldn't happen to an air ambulance.

Just a short time ago, I spoke with Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood. I am very happy he is acting, and acting quickly, to make sure this never happens again in Reno or anywhere else. We know we had an experience a few weeks ago right here in Washington, DC, the same type of situation.

Why did it happen? Reno was one of 27 airports across the country that sometimes had only one air traffic controller on the overnight shift. Because of Secretary LaHood's quick action, there will now be zero—effective immediately, every airport will have at least two air traffic controllers in the tower at any given time.

As I indicated, I have flown into and out of that airport many times. In October I was there for a celebration. We were opening a new control tower. It was very badly needed. From the old one, you couldn't see parts of the runway. When Reno's old control tower was built, Dwight Eisenhower was President and the Dodgers were in Brooklyn. In the half century since, the area's population has more than tripled. So it was fitting, we said at the time, that the airport open a control tower three times as tall as the old one.

Last night's near tragedy reminds us that state-of-the-art structures and the best technology work only as well as the people operating them. If these people fall asleep on the job, literally, they risk the lives of millions of Americans flying into and out of airports every day.

Secretary LaHood and Randy Babbitt, FAA Administrator, are doing their jobs. I appreciate their responsiveness and share their outrage that this ever happened, but Congress also has a key role to play. We have to do our jobs.

The Senate passed a bill in February to modernize America's air travel. With that legislation we created or saved 280,000 jobs. It would improve aviation safety and protect travelers, and that is an understatement. It would even help reduce delays, improve access to rural communities, and it would do all this while creating jobs.

The Republican House also passed a companion bill a few days ago, but the House bill is almost the opposite of

ours. It is dangerous. It doesn't protect passengers, it imperils passengers. The Republican bill would cut the modern navigation systems at our Nation's airports. It is hard to comprehend—an FAA bill, to which we have had to give short-term extensions—I don't know exactly the number of times but like 14 different times—now we are going to try to pass a bill that doesn't modernize our navigation systems at our airports. That would be wrong.

The FAA said the House bill would force it to furlough safety-related employees—not just any employees but those whose primary job is keeping air travel safe. That doesn't make any sense. It would also keep airports from making the infrastructure improvements they need and would completely end the program that ensures rural communities—in small towns such as Ely, NV—have air service.

The Senate-passed bill and the House-passed bill are now in conference to work out the differences. Clearly, there are a lot of differences. The conferees have some choices to make, and they are important, but they need to make them quickly so that both Houses can pass this bill and send it to the President, and do it quickly.

This bill passed on a huge bipartisan vote. Again, we are grateful everyone in Reno is OK, but the next time we may not be so fortunate. Let's make our airports and our travel as safe as possible as soon as possible so the next time we don't have to rely on luck. That is what it was.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suppose I and a lot of my colleagues had an opportunity to hear the President's speech this afternoon. It is very nice that the President is being engaged for the first time in the budget debate and the long-term fiscal problems of this country, and the deficit problems of this country. It is good he is following on with some of the recommendations of his own deficit reduction commission. We have to remember a little less than a year ago he appointed a deficit reduction commission. They reported on December 5. It seems as though they had broad bipartisan support because the four Senators on the commission—two Democrats and two Republicans with probably very different political philosophies of the four—have endorsed it. Then, all of a sudden, since December 5 until today, there has been a lot of quiet on the part of the President of the United States about whether he

likes what his deficit commission suggested.

I don't know the details of where he is coming from, whether he agrees with every detail that is in the deficit reduction commission recommendations, but at least he is getting on board along the lines of what 64 Senators—32 Republicans and 32 Democrats—said in a letter about a month ago to the President: We are ready to start tackling some of these big problems, but we need leadership. Maybe this speech today is an answer to that leadership. Or, if I want to be cynical about it, I could say maybe the President gave his speech today because of the very positive comments that Congressman and Chairman PAUL RYAN got for his budget ideas that he released last week.

But the President also took advantage to renew the class warfare—the demagoguery of taxing the wealthy. It doesn't contribute much to the debate. In fact, I think it makes it very difficult to bring people together. Or, if I want to be cynical, I could say this is maybe the President's first speech about his reelection. But either way, I think there is analysis that we have to look at very carefully and see if it does the economic good that is intended in the speech, even though it is welcome that the President is being engaged at this time.

So I would give some reaction to some of the things the President said, but I want this as background: From World War II through 2009, every dollar of new Federal tax revenue coming into this Treasury resulted in \$1.17 of new spending. Think of that: Every new dollar coming in wasn't a dollar that reduced the deficit, it was a dollar that resulted in \$1.17 of additional spending. That is like a dog that chases its tail and never catches it. So we are sending a new dollar to Washington to do something about the budget deficit and nothing happens as a result of that, except more deficit.

The President made the point that tax reductions in 2001 and 2003 added tremendously to the deficit he inherited or the part of the deficit that now exists. But, in fact, the tax reductions of 2001 and 2003 resulted in more revenue to the Federal Treasury. The expanding economy, spurred by the Tax Relief Acts of 2001 and 2003, helped to reduce the annual budget deficit from \$412 billion in 2004 to \$160 billion in 2007, not because we taxed more but because we taxed less and we had more economic activity as a result. That brings me around to the principle of deficit reduction. Obviously, when I say a dollar of additional taxes doesn't go to the bottom line, that doesn't do anything about the deficit. But on the expenditure side, reducing that and the economic growth that comes from it is what reduces the deficit—more economic activity.

Even the most sincere arguments that raising taxes would reduce the deficit and the debt do not have history to back them up. Outside of Wash-

ington, it is obvious to people the problem is not that people are undertaxed but Washington overspends. The voters said this so loudly and clearly in the last election, and elections are supposed to have consequences. I think the budget agreement of midnight Friday night is evidence of words from the grassroots of America getting through to Washington, DC. I think most people at the grassroots are cynical whatever happened, and I suppose we have to do a lot more to prove to them there might be a different day in Washington. But it was pretty loud and clear the results of the last election and the message sent to Washington.

Government spending increased by 22 percent during the last 2 years, a non-sustainable level of increased expenditures. If we follow the budget proposed this year by President Obama, we would add another \$13 trillion to our national debt over the next decade. This debt gets in the way of economic activity that creates jobs, and it is a terrible burden to leave to future generations. We talk dollars and cents when we talk about the deficit and the debt, but it is a moral issue of whether those of us of our generation ought to live high on the hog and leave the bill to young people such as these pages here who have to pay for it. It is a moral issue as much as it is an economic issue.

This trillions of dollars of debt gets in the way of economic activity that creates jobs, and it is a terrible burden on future generations. Washington needs to get behind policies that clamp down on spending and, as a result, we will grow the economy. Increased economic activity increases revenue to the Federal Treasury, enabling deficit and debt reduction. We know that to be a fact, because from 1997 to the year 2000, we actually, because of the growth of the economy, paid down \$568 billion on the national debt during that period of time. The answer is not ways to grow government. We need to grow the economy, but we don't grow the economy by growing government.

Getting back to the issue of the President making a big deal in his speech about the 2001 tax cuts being a major cause of the budget deficit, and probably the implication of the unfairness of it because there weren't higher taxes on higher income people, I would suggest that the President is wrong in both regards.

In 2001, the tax cut included an across-the-board income tax reduction and reduced the tax rates on the lowest income people from 15 percent to 10 percent. It resulted in removing millions of low-income people from the Federal income tax rolls entirely. It increased the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000. The legislation included marriage penalty relief and the first-ever tax deduction for tuition.

Two years later, after 9/11, the 2003 dividends and capital gains tax rate cuts spurred economic growth and created jobs.

The result was more revenue to the Federal Treasury, not less. The expanding economy helped reduce the annual budget deficit—and I am repeating these numbers because they are significant—from \$412 billion in 2004 to \$160 billion in 2007.

I know it is counterintuitive to a lot of people to hear a Member of the Senate say if you reduce marginal tax rates, you are going to bring revenue into the Federal Treasury, because the obvious common sense tells people that if you increase taxes, you are going to bring in more revenue. As I said earlier in a speech today, it doesn't work out that way because some people in this country can decide I have paid enough taxes, I am not going to pay any more. So they disincentivize to be productive, probably do leisure or invest in non-productive activity. When you lower marginal tax rates, it encourages those people to be productive and, at the same time, creating jobs, growing the economy, and bringing more money into the Federal Treasury.

When you look at the sources of the deficit, contrary to the President's claim, tax relief has been a small part. Unprecedented spending contributed much more to the deficit than the tax relief did and particularly in the last 2 years—a 22-percent increase in expenditures on top of the \$814 billion stimulus.

Here is something that probably is counterintuitive as well and probably something the President misses from his analysis of the 2001 and 2003 tax relief bills, which he blames the big budget deficit on. Those reductions actually ended up with taxes being more progressive. The effective Federal tax rate on the top 1 percent of households is more than seven times the rate paid by the bottom 20 percent of households. That is up from less than five times as much in the year 1979.

If tax relief enacted since 2001 is allowed to expire in a little more than a year and a half—because last December we only extended the existing tax policy until December 31, 2012—if that happens at that time, a family of four with two kids who earns \$50,000 today would see a \$2,155 increase in their tax bill. More than 6 million low-income people who currently have no Federal income tax liability would be subject to the individual income tax, and that would be at a rate of 15 percent instead of the current 10 percent.

Washington needs to learn that leaving more money in the pockets of the taxpayers unleashes a positive chain reaction in our economy. On the other hand, government spending doesn't create wealth because government is not an institution that can create wealth. Government is an institution that can only provide an environment for people outside the government to create wealth. In fact, what the government does is it consumes wealth and, as a result, doesn't generate a stronger economy.

Instead of growing the government, Washington needs to focus on helping

create private sector jobs. The President's new plan will reduce the deficit by \$4 trillion over 12 years. He does that by reducing spending by \$2 trillion but raising taxes by \$1 trillion, and, thus, lowering interest payments by \$1 trillion. The President has again failed to realize that we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem.

At least a couple times since I have been in the Senate, I have heard this argument: Let's increase taxes \$1, and we will reduce expenditures \$2 or \$3 or \$4—sometimes it is \$2, sometimes \$3, and sometimes \$4 behind those ideas. That sounds very good, doesn't it? But here is why it doesn't work and why bringing in \$1 in new taxes actually leads to spending of \$1.17. I often quote Professor Dave Vedder of Ohio University, who has studied tax increases and spending for a long period of time. In fact, you increase taxes until you decide to do something else with the taxes. But appropriations are reviewed annually and, for some reason or other, after that first year, appropriations tend to creep up and up and up. Consequently, the well-intentioned raising of taxes \$1 and reducing expenditures by \$3 or \$4—as well intended as it is, it gradually is eroded on the expenditure side—that half of that proposition—so you end up not reducing expenditures as you have originally indicated.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, may I address the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, we have come through a crisis. It is not over yet because we don't have a law that has been passed by both Houses averting the shutdown of the government, and once it has passed both Houses—which we anticipate tomorrow—then it will be signed into law by the President, and we will avert the shutdown.

Had there been a shutdown or, in the alternative, had a law proposed in the House of Representatives, H.R. 1, been law, what we would have seen is a number of the hunger programs we have been savaged. There would have been a huge savaging of the feeding programs around the world—USAID, an arm of the State Department, which saves untold thousands, if not millions, of lives, particularly of children. They have a program right now in Africa, for example, of just providing mosquito netting, which cuts malaria by 30 percent. But also, USAID uses a lot of American agriculture to help feed hungry populations. Those programs would have

been cut significantly had H.R. 1, the House of Representatives' appropriations bill, been the final decision.

Fortunately, it wasn't and, fortunately, for the hunger programs, both abroad and at home, the least among us will not have to suffer those cutbacks to the budget for the duration of this fiscal year—for the next 6 months.

Even so, there were some significant cuts in what has been agreed to in the funding for hunger programs here in America. There was a \$500 million cut in the Women, Infants, and Children Program, otherwise known as WIC, the Federal health and nutrition program for women, infants, and children. We will have to deal with this, as we are now putting together the mathematics in building the next budget for 2012.

I decided to come over and talk because I wish to talk about one of my closest personal friends, former Congressman and former Ambassador, Tony Hall of Ohio, who started a fast 16 days ago. That fast he is going to continue, only having water. He is going all the way through Easter, which is another week and a half away. The duration of that fast will be somewhere around a month.

You can imagine what happens to your body when you don't take in any nourishment other than water for 30 days. That is what Tony Hall is doing. It is very interesting that people are joining him. Some 35,000 people nationwide have joined Tony in a fast. It may not be a complete fast such as he is doing, with only water, and it may be just that they are doing a fast 1 day a week. It is interesting that 30 Members of the House of Representatives have joined their former colleague, Congressman Tony Hall, in this fast, and that includes—as just announced—14 U.S. women lawmakers who plan to protest the deep cuts in the programs that help the poor and battle hunger in the United States and overseas.

In conclusion, you can tell a great nation by how it takes care of the least of those among us. It is certainly a part of our Judeo-Christian heritage, throughout the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament, that, over and over, the most referenced part of the Scriptures is the obligation of a society to take care of the least privileged among us.

Back in the old days, some 2,000 years ago—and even before—they had a social security system in that agricultural economy of the time called gleaning. Those who owned the wheat fields would go in and reap the wheat, but it was the standard practice of the day that they would leave enough wheat on the stalks so the poor could come in and glean the fields in order that they would have sustenance. That was their social security system of the day. Our systems of aiding the poor are much more sophisticated and include the programs of USAID, and here at home a lot through the Department of Agriculture. But as we have to cut the budget, we must constantly remind

ourselves, as Ambassador Tony Hall is reminding us right now with his fast for a month, that it is an obligation of all of us to take care of the least among us.

I will close by quoting that passage from Matthew 25: When you did it for the least of these, my brothers and sisters, you were doing it for me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Before my friend leaves the floor, I had the good fortune to serve in the House, as my friend did, with Tony Hall, a very dedicated, thoughtful man. I wasn't aware of his doing this fast. That is a real fast. It shows how strongly he feels and has felt for many years about this. So it is nice my friend from Florida brought this to the attention of the American people.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business for debate only be extended until 7 p.m. tonight, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and that at 7 p.m. I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 14, following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each until the Senate receives the papers from the House with respect to the following items:

H.R. 1473, the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2011; H. Con. Res. 35, a correcting resolution relative to a prohibition of Federal funds for health care reform; and H. Con. Res. 36, a correcting resolution relative to a prohibition of Federal funds for Planned Parenthood; that when the Senate receives the papers from the House, the Senate proceed to votes on the two concurrent resolutions and passage of the bill in the following order: H. Con. Res. 35, H. Con. Res. 36, and H.R. 1473; that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote; that there be no amendment in order to the bill or the concurrent resolutions prior to the votes; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the correcting resolutions and the bill be subject to a 60-vote threshold; that the only points of order and motions in order be budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; further,

that the Secretary of the Senate immediately notify the House of Representatives of the results of the Senate's action on the House measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

I withhold that. My friend from Rhode Island is here. I apologize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, later this week, we will consider a spending measure to fund the United States Government through the remaining 6 months of this fiscal year. While the majority leader is on the Senate floor, I want to thank him, as well as Appropriations Chairman INOUE and Senator PATTY MURRAY, for their hard work in negotiating an end to the budget stalemate and preventing the threatened government shutdown.

The battle over that spending measure brightly illuminated the contrast between the priorities of the two parties. The priorities of the House Republicans, I believe, are completely upside-down. In the debate over the spending bill, they fought to cut programs that helped the middle class and for extreme tea party policy riders that had nothing to do with the budget. These included a prohibition on funding for women's health and eliminating the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to protect us against carbon and other pollution.

At the same time, the House Republicans refused to even consider raising revenue by closing tax loopholes, for instance—not one. They refused to entertain ending even one corporate tax giveaway or one special treatment for wealthy taxpayers.

If that debate didn't make the contrast between the two parties crystal clear, the House Republican budget for 2012—the so-called Ryan budget—sure did. In his budget, Congressman RYAN proposes privatizing Medicare and requiring seniors to pay the majority of their health expenses with their own money. They would get a voucher, which actually would go to the insurance company, and the difference would be up to them. In the same document in which Congressman RYAN would decimate Medicare, he would cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires by trillions of dollars.

Now, one major factor that contributed to our budget deficit is the economic crisis that we recently weathered. It is amazing the amnesia we can have in Washington. We are not even through the recession that has been so painful for so many families in Rhode Island, and yet we seem to have forgotten that economic crisis. Well, those of us who were here ought to remember the desperate urgency that was displayed by Treasury Secretary Hank

Paulson and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke as they, having looked into the economic abyss, came to this building—to the LBJ Room right here in the Senate—to plead with us for help to save the world economy. These are not two easy men to frighten, and they were very frightened.

We are now past the worst depths of the financial and economic crises, and as this chart shows, the economic recovery measured in jobs is proceeding, although all too tentatively and all too slowly in Rhode Island. We are still at 12 percent unemployment in the Providence metropolitan area and over 11 percent statewide. Now that we are finally creating jobs—but very few compared to the job losses of the crisis—now that we are finally at least on the good side of the equation, House Republicans have proposed yanking government support for the recovery and jeopardizing many of the jobs that are on this chart.

Their spending proposal, H.R. 1, would have cut spending so severely that former McCain Presidential campaign economic adviser Mark Zandi estimated it would cost as many as 700,000 jobs.

Just look at our job gains: For February, 222,000; for January, 68,000; for December, 167,000; and for November, 128,000. We would wipe out months and months of job gains with a 700,000 job loss.

Goldman Sachs, the Wall Street investment bank, said this bill—H.R. 1—could reduce the growth in our annual gross domestic product by two full percentage points over the rest of the year. We were only expecting about three percentage points of growth, so to knock off two of them is a big hit on jobs.

So I will begin by pointing out that as we deal with the debt and deficit, we cannot forget about jobs. It is growth, ultimately, and a recovering economy that will help reduce our national debt.

As you will recall, the Republicans also resisted any efforts to close any corporate tax loopholes. Corporations, our Republican friends contend, are overtaxed, and any closing of a loophole would amount to an unacceptable tax hike. So let's look for a minute at the actual state of things. Let's look at the facts for a minute.

This is the actual state of corporate tax payments in America. In 1935, for every \$1 an American individual contributed to our revenues, American corporations also contributed \$1. By 1948, American individuals were contributing \$2 for every \$1 that corporate America contributed. By 1971, it broke through 3 to 1. In 1981, it broke through 4 to 1. And in 2009, we broke through 6 to 1, with American individual taxpayers contributing every year to our annual revenues six times as much as American corporations.

So we have gone, in a lot of people's lifetimes—you have to be pretty old, but there are plenty of people who remember 1935—from, basically, even-

Steven between corporate America and individual Americans, with individual Americans carrying six times the tax burden of corporate America. So when people say how overtaxed corporate America is, it is worth looking at this history of ever-diminishing corporate contributions to our Nation's revenues.

Let's look now at one of the factors that is driving the erosion of corporate tax revenues. This is an interesting house—a building located down in the Cayman Islands. It is not particularly large, kind of nondescript. Our Budget Committee chairman, KENT CONRAD, uses this photograph quite often.

This building may not look like a beehive of economic activity, but over 18,000 corporations claim they are doing business in this building. That is correct; 18,000 corporations claim to be doing business in that little building. It gives a whole new meaning to the phrase "small business" when you think of trying to pack 18,000 corporations into that little structure.

Well, as Chairman CONRAD has pointed out, the only business being done in that building is funny business or monkey business with the Tax Code. Tax gimmickry. This nonsense is estimated to cost America as much as \$100 billion every year. For every one of those dollars lost to the tax cheaters, honest taxpaying Americans and honest taxpaying corporations have to pay an extra dollar or more to make up the difference.

Now, let's go to another building that has a tax story to tell. This is the Helmsley Building in New York City. It is a nice-looking place. The building is big enough to have its own Zip Code. That means the IRS reports of tax information by Zip Code can tell us a lot about this building. Here is what this building tells us from actual tax filings and actual tax payments.

The well-off and very successful, indeed, admirable occupants of that building paid a lower tax rate than the average New York City janitor. The average tax rate of a New York City janitor is 24.9 percent. The average tax rate of a New York City security guard—I am sure the Helmsley Building has security guards—is 23.8 percent. But the average tax rate actually paid by the occupants, the successful, capable, but well-compensated occupants of that building, is 14.7 percent, about three-fifths of the rate that their janitors and security guards are likely paying.

So that seems as though it must be extraordinary, but, believe it or not, that is no fluke. The IRS reports the tax rate that is actually paid by the highest earning 400 Americans. They have to go back a few years to do the calculations, but here is their most recent information, and the story is the same. The highest earning 400 Americans each earned on average more than \$344 million—more than \$1/3 billion in 1 year—and the average tax rate those 400 high-income earners actually paid was 16.7 percent.

I applaud their success. It is the American dream writ large when somebody can make \$1/3 billion in a single year. But when they only pay 16.7 percent, it makes you wonder. You might wonder, for instance, at what wage level does a regular single working person start paying 16.7 percent in total Federal taxes? If you are a single filer without deductions, you hit 16.7 percent of your salary going to the Federal Government in taxes at \$18,650 in salary.

So what does that equate to for jobs? The Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates that in my home State, in the Providence labor market, a hospital orderly is paid on average \$29,000 a year. That means that the 400 biggest income earners in America, each earning on average \$1/3 billion, are paying the same tax rate as the hospital orderly pushing that cart down the linoleum hallways of the Rhode Island Hospital at 2 o'clock in the morning. That is the way the code actually works. There are a lot of people in between that and making what a hospital orderly makes, and they pay a lot more in taxes than 16.7 percent. But when you get to the very high end, when you get to the occupants of the Helmsley Building, when you get to the people making \$1/3 billion a year, those tax rates actually paid go down to the point where they are paying the same rate as the janitor—less than the janitor—and the same rate as the hospital orderly.

I have heard my colleagues say that rates go up the higher income you pay, and nominally they do. But when you look at what is actually paid, when you look at what goes through our contorted Tax Code system, out the back end come these extraordinarily low actual tax payment rates for the most well-off and well-compensated Americans.

If you go to the corporate Tax Code, that makes little more sense. Decades of lobbyists have carved our corporate Tax Code into a Swiss cheese of tax loopholes, of tax earmarks for the rich and powerful. The result? We have a nominal corporate tax rate of 35 percent. But here is what the New York Times reported recently. General Electric, one of the Nation's largest corporations, made profits of over \$14 billion last year and paid no U.S. taxes—none. Indeed, it actually received a \$3.2 billion refund from the American taxpayer.

I read recently that Goldman Sachs in 2008 reportedly paid income tax, Federal tax, of 1 percent. Maybe those were 1-year anomalies, but if you look at a previous analysis by the New York Times, of 5 years of corporate tax returns, consolidated, that analysis found that Prudential Financial only paid 7.6 percent—less than our hospital orderly; Yahoo, 7 percent; Southwest Airlines, 6.3 percent; Boeing, 4.5 percent; and what looks to be our tax avoidance champion, on \$11.3 billion of income, the Carnival Cruise Corporation paid less than 1.1 percent in Fed-

eral taxes averaged over those 5 years. One recent paper actually calculated Carnival Cruise Lines' effective tax rate at 0.7 percent on \$11.3 billion in income. Carnival Lines doesn't just take you for a cruise, they are taking all of us for a ride. Good, honest CVS, a corporation in my home State, pays full freight. Why should they pay 30 times the tax rate of Carnival Cruise Lines? It makes no sense.

But wait, there is more. Don't forget that we make the American taxpayer subsidize big oil to the tune of at least \$3 trillion a year, and big oil has made \$1 trillion in profits this decade. They hardly need to raid the pockets of the American taxpayer, but on an effective tax rate basis, the petroleum-gas industry pays the lowest rate of any industry.

I think these are all noteworthy landmarks of where we are in our budget and debt and deficit discussion. But the big landmark, what I call the Mount Everest of landmarks that casts its shadow over the entire budget discussion, is health care. Representative RYAN's health care budget proposal is radical and would create terrible harm for seniors. But I do agree with Representative RYAN on his statement that says the following:

If you want to be honest with the fiscal problem and the debt, it really is a health care problem.

He is right, and the landmark feature of this landmark problem is this: The health care cost problem is a health care system problem. Our national health care costs are exploding. The health care system is driving up the costs of Medicare. The health care system is driving up the costs of Medicaid. The health care system is driving up the costs of private insurance—of BlueCross, of United. The health care system is driving up the cost of the military's TRICARE system and the VA system. No one is exempt. It doesn't matter who your insurer is, the health care system is what is driving the costs in public and in private programs alike.

We have to address the health care system problem if we are going to get our health care costs under control. Simply going after one manner of payment, such as the Medicare system, misses the real target and will cause us to fail at our endeavor.

Instead of tackling this vital problem of the underlying growth in health care costs, the Ryan budget would end Medicare as we know it. Just look at these numbers. I was born in 1955. It was at \$12 billion, the entire national health care system. By 1979, it was up to \$219 billion; by 1987, \$512 billion; by 1992, \$849 billion; and from 1992 to 2009, it has soared to \$2.5 trillion. This is a rocket every insurer is on, and you can't just throw the Medicare people off of their health care and pretend you are going to do anything about bringing down that accelerating curve. But instead of tackling the underlying growth, the Ryan budget would end

Medicare as we know it. That would be a tragedy and a mistake.

Medicare, along with Social Security, is one of the most successful programs for human well-being in the history of the world. It allows tens of millions of older Americans to enjoy their golden years with minimal concern about paying for health care. Paired with Social Security, Medicare guarantees American seniors the freedom to retire without fear of privation or destitution. As with Social Security, American workers pay for this privilege through payroll taxes, and they have a right to the retirement benefits that they have been promised and that they have earned.

The House Republican budget drafted by Mr. RYAN would break our pledge with Americans who have been paying Medicare payroll taxes by ending Medicare as we know it and replacing the single-payer system with vouchers for private care that will not come close to paying the full cost of insurance. Indeed, that may be an understatement. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the Ryan plan would leave the average senior with over \$12,500 in out-of-pocket expenditures that they would have to pay by 2022. That is nearly as much as the average Rhode Islander gets from Social Security now.

The current Medicare system is projected to cover 68 percent of a senior's health care costs in 2012, and the Ryan plan would only cover 25 percent. Three-quarters of a senior's health care responsibility would be on them, and Medicare would only pick up 25 percent. That is an unaffordable and a indefensible burden that destroys the freedom and the security Medicare provides to seniors and provides to their children as well.

Don't forget that we all enjoy the freedom of knowing our parents will be taken care of no matter how dread the disease they suffer, and we do not have to compromise our choices in life in order to hedge against the fear that our parents will suffer such an indignity, such a terrible result. It helps all Americans to have that freedom in our seniors' hands, to have that fear lifted from their and our hearts.

The Ryan plan is 180 degrees from where we should be on health care reform. It would greatly increase costs. Costs go up because of how inefficient private insurance is—for the average senior, from a projected \$14,770 under current policy to \$20,510, a 39-percent increase in the underlying cost—in other words, a huge giveaway to the private health insurance industry that would get these vouchers. It would ignore the potential for tremendous savings in delivery system reform and saddle seniors with enormous out-of-pocket expenses.

As I said, rising Medicare costs are not driven by Medicare. Every insurer has their costs going up like a rocket on that chart I showed. We have to get at the problem of the underlying cause.

How do we do this? We actually have a pretty good health care toolbox that has five major tools in it. One is quality improvement. Quality improvement saves the cost of errors, of missed diagnosis, of disjointed care, and so forth. For example, hospital-acquired infections alone cost about \$2.5 billion every year, and they are virtually entirely avoidable. They should be and could be “never” events. That alone would save \$2.5 billion, and quality improvement can extend far beyond just the realm of hospital-acquired infections.

Two is prevention programs. Prevention programs avoid the cost of getting sick in the first place. More than 90 percent of cervical cancer is curable if the disease is detected early through Pap smears. Three, you pay doctors for better outcomes rather than for ordering more and more tests and procedures. That will save money while improving outcomes for Americans.

Four is a robust health information infrastructure which will save billions of dollars a year and open exciting new industries once it takes life. We are approaching that tipping point now, I am glad to say.

Finally, five, the administrative costs of our health care system are grotesque. The insurance industry has developed a massive bureaucracy to delay and deny payments to doctors and hospitals. So the doctors and the hospitals have had to fight back and hire their own billing departments and their own consultants.

I visited, a little while ago, our little Cranston, RI, community health center. They told me there that half their staff is dedicated not to providing health care but to fighting to get paid. On top of dedicating 50 percent of their staff to trying to get paid, they have to spend another \$200,000 a year on fancy consultants. All of that, the entire war over payments between insurers and hospitals, adds zero health care value.

We have heard that on the private insurance side, anywhere from 15 to 30 percent of the health insurance dollar gets burned up in administrative costs. We know we can do better because the cost of administering Medicare is closer to 2 percent of program expenditures.

So you add up all of this, all those five strategies, the numbers are enormous. The President's Council of Economic Advisers has stated that 5 percent of GDP can be taken out of our health care system costs without hurting the health care we receive. That is about \$700 billion a year.

The New England Health Care Institute says it is \$850 billion a year. The well-regarded Lewin Group has estimated the probable savings at \$1 trillion a year, a figure that is echoed by former Bush Treasury Secretary O'Neill.

Those are very big numbers, but not only are they big numbers, they represent results that are a win-win. Remember the five strategies: higher

quality care with less errors and infections; prevented illnesses so you do not get sick in the first place; secure, complete health records that are there when you need them electronically, so your doctors, your lab, your pharmacy, your hospital, your specialists all know what everybody else is doing; payments to doctors and hospitals based on keeping you well and getting you well, rather than on giving you more procedures and more tests; and, finally, not so much of that infuriating insurance company bureaucracy hassling both patients and doctors.

Those are not bad outcomes even without the savings. So what do we draw from this if we keep all these landmarks in mind, landmarks of where we are as we approach this budget debate? Well, our colleagues on the other side, particularly our House Republican colleagues, say they are determined to reduce our annual deficit on our national debt. That is their top priority.

But they only want to seem to address 12 percent of the budget, the non-security discretionary spending, and examine no savings at all on the revenue side. If we are serious about deficit and debt reduction, why risk destroying 700,000 jobs, when job destruction only adds to the deficit and to our debt through lost economic activity and lost revenue?

If we are serious about deficit and debt reduction, why is there not one corporate tax loophole—not one—on the chopping block? Why is the entire Tax Code off limits in this discussion as it burns up 6 billion hours that Americans spend every year—6 billion hours that Americans spend every year—complying with its contorted requirements.

Why must that hospital orderly, pushing his or her cart down the linoleum hallway at midnight, pay a higher tax rate than some of the most fortunate and able Americans making hundreds of millions of dollars each in a single year? If we are serious about this, if deficits and debt are the most important thing we face, why no discussion of corporate America's ever-diminishing contribution as a share of our Nation's revenue? Should that not be something we at least consider?

If we are serious, why is there no plan for even one of the 18,000 corporations in that phony-baloney headquarters in the Cayman Islands to pay its proper taxes? If we are serious, why is there so much pure political nonsense about ObamaCare and socialized medicine, instead of a mature discussion about using and improving the tools in the health care bill to address our grave national health care system problem.

Why has Representative RYAN proposed taking a sledgehammer to Medicare, instead of making thoughtful and efficient investments to improve the way we deliver health care?

It seems to me that until one corporate tax loophole is on the table,

until one subsidy to big oil is on the table, until one subsidy to big agribusiness is on the table, until we are even beginning to talk about billionaires contributing Federal revenue beyond the share of their income that hospital orderlies contribute, until we are not so casual about threatening 700,000 jobs and perhaps \$20 billion in related tax revenue that job loss would cause, until then, it is still politics as usual and it is not a sincere desire to tackle our debt.

I have always found that you get a better read looking what people actually do, rather than just believing whatever they say. If you look at what Republicans made their priorities on the CR debate and in the Ryan budget, look at what they do. It is the same old Republican agenda: attacking programs that help the poor, attacking women's right to choose, attacking national voluntary service, helping polluters get around public health measures, reducing the share of revenues paid by corporations, and very high-income individuals. It is the same old song.

Most important, the problem is that if you go that road, it is not adequate to meet the serious problems at hand. We need to look throughout the budget and across all our opportunities to bring down our Nation's deficits and to bring down our Nation's debt. Everyone needs to participate, including our corporate community, including our wealthiest, most talented and most fortunate, everyone. We cannot—we simply will not—get out of the debt and deficit problem we have if we put the whole load of that on the backs of the American middle class.

I look forward in the months ahead to a serious, fair, and sensible discussion, a mature discussion of how to reduce our deficits and our debt.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak to the war on women's health and Planned Parenthood.

To be clear, to end Federal funding for Planned Parenthood is to stop providing critical health care to millions of Americans, the majority of them who are poor and simply cannot afford services anywhere else.

This effort will strip the poor and middle classes of their right to preventive healthcare.

Through 800 nationwide locations, Planned Parenthood provides cancer screening, HIV and STD tests, contraceptives, education and empowerment.

Planned Parenthood estimates it prevents over 620,000 unintended pregnancies and 220,000 abortions each year.

Seventy-five percent of its clients are at or below the poverty line. Abortions account for just 3 percent of its overall activities.

What House Republicans seem to have forgotten is that by existing law, taxpayer funding cannot be used for abortions except in cases of rape, incest, or if the woman's life is in danger.

A ban on Federal spending for abortions has been in place since 1976. That is 35 years this ban has been in place.

Yet today House Republicans continue to try to strip Planned Parenthood of its Federal funding and continue to use this issue as a bargaining chip in a debate over the budget.

But the vote the Senate will have to take is clearly not about the budget, it is a war on women's health. This effort would essentially turn back the clock on women's health.

I said this last week, and I will say it again. This is simply an opportunity for the right wing in the House to really sock it to American women.

Let's talk about the facts.

Over 90 percent of care provided by Planned Parenthood is preventive. Planned Parenthood provides care to almost 3 million patients nationwide every year, many of whom have no other place to go.

Only 3 percent of Planned Parenthood's total services are abortion services. And that 3 percent is not made up of Federal funds.

Every year, Planned Parenthood provides affordable contraception for nearly 2.5 million patients, nearly 1 million cervical cancer screens, 830,000 breast exams, and 4 million tests and treatments for sexually transmitted infections, including half a million HIV tests.

These critical preventive services include annual exams, flu vaccines, smoking cessation, and well baby care.

Planned Parenthood helped to prevent 612,000 unintended pregnancies in 2009 alone. Every dollar invested in helping women avoid unintended pregnancies saves \$4 in public funds.

And House Republicans want to eliminate Federal funding for this program?

These cuts are biased, politically motivated, and hurts women—particularly low-income women.

Seventy-five percent of Planned Parenthood's clients have incomes at or below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level.

In California alone, Planned Parenthood serves over 750,000 patients, over 680,000 of them through federal funds.

This program is necessary, effective, and oftentimes a last resort.

Let me share a story from one woman from my home State of California.

Mary couldn't afford annual visits to her regular OB/GYN office during college. So a friend suggested she visit Planned Parenthood for a free exam.

Mary said, "After some hesitation I went. Thank god that I did. During my visit they found that I had the first signs of cervical cancer. I was 19 and terrified.

"The staff at Planned Parenthood was so supportive and understanding. One doctor in particular was amazing, I wish I could find her and thank her personally. She went out of her way to call and check up on me once a week until I had recovered completely from the procedure that got rid of the cancerous cells."

Six years later, Mary is still healthy and still so grateful for the excellent

and compassionate care she received at Planned Parenthood.

There are thousands of other stories like Mary's. I have heard from these young women who went to Planned Parenthood for STD screening and birth control, when they had no other place to go.

I have heard from women pleading with me to preserve Federal funding to Planned Parenthood; telling me that the cancer screenings they received saved their lives.

The House Republicans also want to defund the Affordable Care Act, and block critical consumer protections in the law.

This too targets women. House Republicans want to go back to the days where women could be denied insurance coverage for the "preexisting condition" of being pregnant.

They want to reinstate gender rating, where insurance companies charge women higher premiums simply because of gender.

House Republicans want to remove maternity care as an essential health benefit. Currently only 12 percent of health plans in the individual market offer any maternity coverage.

So you see, defunding Planned Parenthood and the Affordable Care Act is not about reducing the deficit or balancing the budget. It is about harming women.

We need to look carefully at our spending and we need to make cuts, but not at the expense of the women in our country.

It is a shame that the budget debate has turned into an ideological war.

It is a shame that funding for health care and family planning is considered "government waste" by some Republicans.

When in reality, it is an ideological assault on women's health. I do not support any cuts that harm women and children.

I urge my colleagues return to the issue at hand so we can seriously discuss the Federal deficit, absent an ideological agenda.

REMEMBERING SIDNEY HARMAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I first received word of the passing of a remarkable man and friend, Sidney Harman. Sidney Harman led a life of passion and commitment, the kind of existence that most of us aspire to. His interests were vast and varied and his sense of possibility unparalleled. With business acumen equal to his mastery of the sciences and his love of the arts, Sidney embraced challenges and faced life head on.

I had the pleasure of knowing Sidney throughout his career as a businessman, entrepreneur, public servant, and philanthropist. He left his distinctive mark on every project he involved himself with and brought his progressive ideas to bear at a critical time in our nation's history. His ability to inno-

vate never waned, creative solutions were a forte of his and he applied them with confidence. His most recent endeavor, to purchase Newsweek and merge it with the online publication the Daily Beast less than a year ago, was initially met with trepidation by print news professionals but has since led to growth for both publications, a typical outcome for a venture championed by Sidney.

Sidney's commitment to the betterment of young lives and society as a whole was evident in his philanthropic pursuits and his involvement with institutions of higher education. In recent years he taught classes in medicine, law, economics, and various other disciplines at the college level. Over the course of his life he supported educational organizations with generous donations. He understood that education is the foundation of a prosperous society and that the enlightenment of young minds is crucial to the success of a nation such as ours.

Along with his wife Jane, Sidney made a home and life here in Washington, DC, and devoted himself to the city and its legacy. A generous supporter of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Shakespeare Theatre Company, Sidney had a significant impact on the vibrant cultural and artistic scene in the Nation's Capital.

My greatest sympathies are with Jane, his children Barbara, Daniel, and Justine, and all of Sidney's extended family. Sidney touched the lives of many and there is no doubt he will be long-remembered for his innovative mind, his good humor, his energetic outlook, and his years of service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE EAT'N PARK HOSPITALITY GROUP

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I extend my congratulations to the Eat'n Park Hospitality Group upon receiving the prestigious 2011 Restaurant Neighbor Award from the National Restaurant Association. Every year, the National Restaurant Association honors restaurant companies that have gone above and beyond in giving back to their communities through philanthropy and service. This year, Eat'n Park has been deservedly recognized for their charitable efforts on behalf of local children's hospitals.

Eat'n Park restaurants have been a staple in my home State of Pennsylvania for over 50 years. From their humble beginnings as a single carhop restaurant in Pittsburgh, the Eat'n Park chain has grown to include 76 restaurants throughout Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia, employing over 8,000 hardworking people, many of whom are my constituents. Over the past six decades, their delicious food and friendly service have soothed many

a weary traveler along the Pennsylvania turnpike; and today, their iconic Smiley Cookies can be found in my front office every Wednesday, a welcome offering from home for visiting Pennsylvanians.

Eat'n Park does more than provide an endless supply of delicious Smiley Cookies for my constituents, however. More importantly, they have made taking care of their community the centerpiece of their corporate culture through philanthropy and service. Since 1979, Eat'n Park has raised more than \$7.5 million through their annual Caring for Kids Campaign, which benefits local children's hospitals in the tri-state area. In 2010, the 32nd Annual Caring for Kids Campaign raised \$341,365 for 13 area children's hospitals. This money is used for everything from pre- and neo-natal care, toys and events for the sick children and, in some cases, even a fund for families who would otherwise be unable to afford to stay in the area during their child's treatment. These charitable efforts have allowed Eat'n Park to touch thousands of lives, and make a positive impact on children and families, throughout Pennsylvania through more than just their food.

It is hard to imagine an organization enjoying such remarkable and sustained philanthropic success without the hard work and dedication of the individuals it employs. Eat'n Park is a case in point. While it would be impossible to detail the individual contributions of the more than 8,000 members of the Eat'n Park family, today I would like to specifically recognize two important contributors to this year's Caring for Kids Campaign: Linda Mayou and Gloria Rack.

Linda Mayou has been a team member of the Monogahela Eat'n Park for 24 years, and has been Chairwoman of the Monogahela Caring for Kids Campaign for the past nineteen. Under Linda's leadership the Monogahela Eat'n Park has reigned as the top fundraising restaurant in the chain for the past 13 years, alone raising more than \$400,000 for the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh.

Gloria Rack has been part of the Eat'n Park team for an impressive 41 years and has been an important part of the Caring for Kids Campaign since its inception. Currently a server at the Library Road restaurant, she is Eat'n Park's all-time Top Car Raffle Ticket Seller, having individually sold an estimated 30,000 car raffle tickets, raising \$60,000 for the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh. Linda and Gloria's accomplishments are a testament to the hard work and dedication they have shown throughout their careers to Eat'n Park's philanthropic efforts.

Again, I congratulate Eat'n Park Hospitality Group on receiving this award. Their commitment to local communities truly serves as an exemplary model for all Pennsylvanians. I applaud their efforts and wish them another six decades of continued success in all their endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN DAVID LANG

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Captain David Lang for his outstanding service to the people of Hampton, NH.

For the past 30 years, Dave has worked to protect his community through his faithful service with the Hampton Fire Department. As he retires from the department, I applaud him for his longstanding service and dedication to the people of Hampton.

Captain Lang first joined the Hampton Fire Department in December 1979 as an on-call firefighter. Due to his eagerness, hard work, and reliability, Dave rose through the ranks from permanent firefighter, to EMT, to lieutenant, and for the last 4 years has served as captain.

During his tenure, Captain Lang consistently prioritized the needs of the community over his own, in particular during the Old Salt fire in 1999 and the A Street block fire in 2009. He has been credited with the successful resuscitation of a patient in cardiac arrest and the rescue of several trapped civilians. For this outstanding service, Captain Lang has been recognized by the New Hampshire Association of Chiefs of Police as Law Officer of the Year for Fire Service and has received the New Hampshire Fire Academy's prestigious Academy Award.

Dave's commitment to fire safety in Hampton did not stop with his service in the field but carried over into professional leadership roles. Throughout his career, he participated in the Professional Fire Fighters Association of New Hampshire and for the past 16 years has served as its president. I am pleased that even as Dave retires from the Hampton Fire Department, he continues to serve as President of the Professional Fire Fighters.

Dave is a native of New Hampshire and has lived in Hampton for over 30 years. I have known him personally and professionally for over 20 years and can attest to his commitment to public service, to his community, and to his family. Dave has been married to his wife Karen for 35 years and they have two beautiful daughters, Emily and Molly. His strong character and generous spirit touch upon all aspects of his work and family life, and his dedication and leadership in the community distinguishes him as an extraordinary public servant. New Hampshire is truly lucky to have him as a native son.

On a personal note, I am grateful to Dave for his support and counsel during my years in public office. I could always count on Dave's advice about issues ranging from firefighting and emergency response to collective bargaining. Whenever I needed Dave's assistance in any capacity, he was always there, willing to help.

As Captain Lang prepares for a well-deserved retirement, I wish to thank and honor him for his service to the people of Hampton.●

REMEMBERING RUTH HUMPHREYS BROWN

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, today we recognize the life of Ruth Humphreys Brown, a remarkable Coloradan who dedicated herself to a life of service and good will and a woman who was deeply tied to the American West. Ruth passed away on December 30, 2010, at the age of 90.

Ruth led a life full of courage and giving, and our country is indebted to her for her service. In 1943, at the age of 22, she answered our nation's call and was among the first women accepted to fly American military aircraft in the Women Airforce Service Pilots. As a young pilot stationed in Texas, her efforts prepared our bombardiers and ground artillery units to fight and win in World War II, and Congress rightfully acknowledged her heroic contributions by awarding her a Congressional Gold Medal in 2010.

I knew Ruth to often work behind the scenes, but she never lacked in ambition. Ruth's service extended to countless projects that continue to improve the health and activity of Colorado's communities. She took part in starting the first Outward Bound Program in the country. I am personally grateful to Ruth for her efforts to start this program, having made it my career for 20 years. Coloradans and adventurers across the continent benefit from Outward Bound's strength in training leaders and building community—two ideals to which Ruth contributed tremendously. Her love for the outdoors, from whitewater rafting and picnicking to swimming and skiing, carries on through the mission of Outward Bound.

Ruth gave to improve her community and never asked for the credit. But many agree she deserved it. One of her well-known and early contributions was committing the money to clear a new run on Aspen Mountain in 1949. Skiers have since come to love Ruthie's Run, aptly named after its originator, in much the same way that so many of us admire Ruth.

She grew up in Denver, worked and played on her family's Wagon Wheel Ranch in Southern Colorado, and was fundamental in making Aspen a thriving mountain town and wonderful place to live. Ruth's touch spanned the State and never failed to reach a person or community in need.

A veteran, entrepreneur, philanthropist, and mother, Ruth was a truly accomplished and inspirational Coloradan. Today we pause to honor her legacy and her welcomed contribution to Colorado's rich heritage.●

REMEMBERING DAVE GENOVA

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, last year we lost a great man and leader whom I knew well, Dave Genova. On March 28, 2010, Dave passed away at the age of 67.

From my days as an educator and guide in the Outward Bound Program, I

knew Dave to be a remarkably talented and committed individual with a gift for leadership.

Dave spent 32 years with Outward Bound, a program that uses the outdoors as a classroom to inspire service to others and to coach leadership skills, oftentimes to underprivileged youth. Having taught some 2,000 students, he had an incredible enthusiasm for bringing people together to overcome challenges in ways they never thought possible.

Throughout his tenure in the North Carolina Outward Bound, Dave played an invaluable role as an educator, but he was also an innovator. In 1999, he started the Unity Project, which is designed to break down barriers of social and economic inequality. His efforts have enabled nearly 1,000 young leaders to become agents of social change in their local schools and communities, and the program continues to educate and train future leaders today.

Dave once said of the Outward Bound School, "Compassion is the well-spring from which we derive our relevance." These words should serve as a guiding compass for us all. Dave taught from a place of understanding, and he sought to ensure every one of his students came away with a greater appreciation for others and the knowledge that, in his words, "We're all in this together." He used the great outdoors to build a sense of community among adventurers, but more important, he taught them how to carry on his work to build bridges between people. Neighborhoods, cities, and States have been touched by Dave's work, and we can all be grateful for his contribution.

A longtime outdoorsman myself, I appreciate and admire Dave's passion for our wild lands and the lessons they can teach us. Always a bold leader, scaling the toughest of life's mountains, Dave's extraordinary character exemplifies an ideal to which we all should strive. He is missed by many, but his memory continues to guide me and all his students.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:57 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, without amendment:

S. 307. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to ex-

tend the termination date for the Commission, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 33. A concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 197 resolving that the following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee on Printing, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration: Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GONZALEZ. The following Members are hereby elected to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, to serve with the chair of the Committee on House Administration and the chair of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 5:48 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 307. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Stephen M. Case as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices.

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-1322. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9279-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1323. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Utah State Implementation Plan Revision" (FRL No. 9294-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1324. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Prevention of Significant Deterioration" (FRL No. 9293-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1325. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana" (FRL No. 9295-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1326. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Stage I Vapor Recovery Rule" (FRL No. 9295-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1327. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List; Deletion of the Spiegelberg Landfill Superfund Site" (FRL No. 9291-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1328. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, to include technical data, and defense services to the United Kingdom for the Heads-up Display (HUD) for the C-17 Globemaster III transport aircraft in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1329. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, to include technical data, and defense services to Saudi Arabia related to the sale of S-434, S-70i, and S-76D helicopters in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1330. A communication from the Director, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updating Regulations Issued Under the Fair Labor Standards Act" (RIN1215-AB13 and RIN1235-AA00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1331. A communication from the Deputy 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 "Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food; Confirmation of Effective Date" ((21 CFR Part 179) (Docket No. FDA-1999-F-0056)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1332. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of the Treasury's drug-free workplace plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1333. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Food and Drug Administration's annual report to Congress relative to efforts to coordinate and cooperate with other Federal agencies with responsibilities for food inspections; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1334. A communication from the Chairman of the National Healthcare Workforce Commission, transmitting a report relative to the status of the Commission; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1335. A communication from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1336. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report on the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002: Fiscal 2010 (March 2011)"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1337. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1338. A communication from the Director of Civil Rights, Broadcasting Board of Governors, International Broadcasting Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1339. A communication from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Credit Union Administration's fiscal year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1340. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Fiscal Year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1341. A communication from the Associate Special Counsel, Office of Special Coun-

sel, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Special Counsel's Fiscal Year 2010 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1342. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1343. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Cerrillos Dam; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1344. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to four projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1345. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities Issued at a Premium" (Notice 2011-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 12, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1346. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Relief and Procedures Under Notice 2010-30 for Spouses of U.S. Servicemembers who are Working in or Claiming Residence or Domicile in a U.S. Territory Under the Military Spouses Residency Relief Act" (Notice 2011-16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 12, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1347. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Supplemental Notice to Notice 2010-60 Providing Further Guidance and Requesting Comments on Certain Priority Issues Under Chapter 4 of Subtitle A of the Code" (Notice 2011-34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 12, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1348. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of Controlled Group Qualification Rules" (RIN1545-BG94) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 12, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1349. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1350. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, to include technical data, and defense services to support the Proton launch of the SATMEX 8 Commercial Communications Satellite from the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1351. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the

Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2011-0041-2011-0052); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1352. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an order that would cancel construction debt assessed against Indian-owned lands within the Flathead Indian Irrigation Project; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-1353. A communication from the General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reorganization of Regulations on Control of Employment of Aliens" (RIN1125-AA64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1354. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department's activities during Calendar Year 2010 relative to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-9. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio requesting the National Museum of the United States Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base be selected to display one of the space shuttle orbiters at the conclusion of the space shuttle program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Whereas, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) intends to select a limited number of museums for the display of the space shuttle orbiters that will be retired at the conclusion of the space shuttle program. The National Museum of the United States Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio, would be an excellent choice for the display of a space shuttle orbiter; and

Whereas, the Museum, the world's oldest and largest museum of aviation, is the depository for the Air Force's National Historical Collection and features more than 400 aerospace vehicles, including Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo space capsules. With 1.3 million visitors each year, the Museum is the most visited free tourist destination in Ohio and is one of the most visited in the country; and

Whereas, the Museum is ready to accommodate a space shuttle orbiter with one million square feet of climate-controlled exhibit space and an adjacent runway that is approved for a landing of the shuttle carrier aircraft with a shuttle. In addition, the Museum employs professional aerospace vehicle restoration staff who are experienced in working with hazardous aerospace materials such as those found on the shuttle and who will ensure the preservation of the shuttle to the highest museum standards; and

Whereas, the Museum is located near Dayton, Ohio, the birthplace of aviation and in the National Aviation Heritage Area, an area designated by Congress that includes the Armstrong Air and Space Museum, Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, and National Aviation Hall of Fame. Finally, the Museum is easily accessible from major population centers and is within a 600-mile radius of 61% of the United States population; and

Whereas, the Department of Defense, especially the Department of the Air Force, collaborated extensively with NASA's space shuttle program, including influencing the basic shuttle design, providing many highly skilled shuttle astronauts, and saving the program in lean budget years during its development; and

Whereas, The Secretary of the Air Force has requested that the NASA Administrator transfer a space shuttle orbiter to the Air Force for placement in the Air Force's National Historical Collection through interagency transfer using existing statutes and regulations. This transfer will ensure that a taxpayer-funded space shuttle orbiter will be kept under the ownership and stewardship of the United States government and the American people; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the 129th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, conclude that it is in the interest of the American people for a retired space shuttle orbiter to be preserved and exhibited at the National Museum of the United States Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the 129th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, urge the President of the United States and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to honor the request of the Department of the Air Force, for an interagency transfer of an operational space shuttle orbiter so that it can be displayed at the National Museum of the United States Air Force as a national tribute to the American spirit of space exploration and to the indelible partnership between NASA and the Department of the Air Force which helped make the space shuttle program possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the Ohio Congressional delegation, and the news media of Ohio.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. LIEBERMAN for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. *Rafael Borrás, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. INHOFE:

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the storage and conveyance of nonproject water at the Norman project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 803. A bill to implement a comprehensive border security plan to combat illegal immigration, drug and alien smuggling, and violent activity in the southwest border of the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. LEE):

S. 804. A bill to adjust the normal and early retirement ages for receipts of benefits under the Social Security program, increase the maximum age for delayed retirement credit, and provide for progressive price indexing of benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 805. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the business and industry direct and guaranteed loan program of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 806. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to conduct levee system evaluations and certifications on receipt of requests from non-Federal interests; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 807. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program and to expand the program to include more small businesses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 808. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Uintah Water Conservancy District; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 809. A bill to provide high-quality public charter school options for students by enabling such public charter schools to expand and replicate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 810. A bill to prohibit the conducting of invasive research on great apes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 811. A bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. 812. A bill to build capacity and provide support at the leadership level for successful school turnaround efforts; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 813. A bill to promote public awareness of cyber security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 814. A bill to require the public disclosure of audits conducted with respect to entities receiving funds under title X of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PRYOR, Mrs.

GILLIBRAND, Mr. COATS, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. JOHANNNS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. REID, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 815. A bill to guarantee that military funerals are conducted with dignity and respect; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. Res. 144. A resolution supporting early detection for breast cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 17, a bill to repeal the job-killing tax on medical devices to ensure continued access to life-saving medical devices for patients and maintain the standing of the United States as the world leader in medical device innovation.

S. 22

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the additional standard deduction for real property taxes for nonitemizers.

S. 44

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 44, 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.

S. 137

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 137, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for consumers against excessive, unjustified, or unfairly discriminatory increases in premium rates.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 325

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 325, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the provision of behavioral health services to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces necessary to meet pre-deployment and post-deployment readiness and fitness standards, and for other purposes.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 366

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require disclosure to the Securities and Exchange Commission of certain sanctionable activities, and for other purposes.

S. 393

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 393, a bill to aid and support pediatric involvement in reading and education.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 431, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 225th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first Federal law enforcement agency, the United States Marshals Service.

S. 484

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to pay to Fort Lewis College in the State of Colorado an amount equal to the tuition charges for Indian students who are not residents of the State of Colorado.

S. 506

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 506, a bill to amend the Elementary

and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. BEGICH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available travel on military aircraft for members of the reserve components, a member or former member of a reserve component who is eligible for retired pay but for age, widows and widowers of retired members, and dependents.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to ensure that the courts of the United States may provide an impartial forum for claims brought by United States citizens and others against any railroad organized as a separate legal entity, arising from the deportation of United States citizens and others to Nazi concentration camps on trains owned or operated by such railroad, and by the heirs and survivors of such persons.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 668, a bill to remove unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats from seniors' personal health decisions by repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 696

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 696, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat Vet Centers as Department of Veterans Affairs facilities for purposes of payments or allowances for beneficiary travel to Department facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 705, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a hazardous waste electronic manifest system.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 718, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve the use of certain registered pesticides.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to repeal provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 788

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 788, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes.

S. 797

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 797, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to establish a regulatory framework for the comprehensive protection of personal data for individuals under the aegis of the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate site on Chaplains Hill in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of the Jewish chaplains who died while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 27, a resolution designating January 26, 2011, as "National Kawasaki Disease Awareness Day".

S. RES. 135

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 135, a resolution remembering the 1 year anniversary of

the April 10, 2010, plane crash that claimed the lives of the President of Poland Lech Kaczynski, his wife, and 94 others, while they were en route to memorialize those Polish officers, officials, and civilians who were massacred by the Soviet Union in 1940.

S. RES. 138

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 138, a resolution calling on the United Nations to rescind the Goldstone report, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 289

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 289 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the storage and conveyance of nonproject water at the Norman project in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the Senate's attention The Lake Thunderbird Efficient Use Act of 2011.

This bill allows the Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District to import and store non-project water into Lake Thunderbird, if the Secretary of the Interior determines there is enough capacity to do so. Allowing additional water to be stored at Lake Thunderbird would help increase municipal and industrial supplies for the cities served by the District, which include Norman, Midwest City, and Del City.

There is no cost associated with this bill. Any additional infrastructure needs will be the responsibility of the non-Federal establishment contracting with the Secretary.

This legislation does not change the capacity of Lake Thunderbird and will help increase water supplies in a growing metropolitan area. Over the last decade, the Norman area grew by 15 percent making it one of the fastest

growing areas in the State. As the area continues to grow, and as Tinker Air Force Base requires a growing water supply, there will be a greater need for access to the water supplies of the Lake Thunderbird reservoir.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 806. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to conduct levee system evaluations and certifications on receipt of requests from non-Federal interests; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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. 806

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 "Rural Community Flood Protection Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. RURAL COMMUNITY FLOOD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of a request from a non-Federal interest, the Secretary of the Army (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall conduct a levee system evaluation and certification of a federally authorized levee or a non-federally authorized levee for purposes of the National Flood Insurance Program established under chapter 1 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4011 et seq.).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—A levee system evaluation and certification under subsection (a) shall—

(1) at a minimum, comply with the requirements of section 65.10 of title 44, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act); and

(2) be carried out in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, may establish.

(c) COST SHARING.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Subject to paragraph (2), the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out a levee system evaluation and certification under this section shall be 35 percent.

(2) ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall adjust the non-Federal share under paragraph (1) to zero if—

(A) the non-Federal interest is located in an area with a population of 10,000 or fewer individuals; or

(B) the division of the non-Federal interest with responsibility for the applicable levee is staffed by individuals operating on a volunteer basis.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. COBURN):

S. 807. A bill to authorize the Department of Labor's voluntary protection program and to expand the program to include more small businesses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with Senator LANDRIEU known as the Voluntary Protection Program Act. This bill will codify the Voluntary Protection Programs, or VPP, expand it to include more small businesses, and incorporate

recent GAO recommendations for program improvements.

No program has been more successful in creating such a culture of safety in the workplace than VPP. Since it was created in 1982, Republican and Democrat administrations alike have fostered its growth to more than 2,500 worksites, a quarter of which are unionized, and it covers approximately one million employees. The bipartisan support for VPP continues into this Congress. Last year, the Senate Budget Committee unanimously approved an amendment to preserve VPP budget authority and I have been pleased to work with the Chair of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator LANDRIEU, on this bill again this Congress. Our bill is also drawing bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. Congressmen TOM PETRI and GENE GREEN are introducing companion legislation today and I thank them for their strong support on this important issue.

Worksites that pass the rigorous evaluation process and become VPP sites have an average Days Away Restricted or Transferred, DART, case rate of 52 percent below the average for its industry. In recent years, smaller worksites have made significant strides in VPP, increasing from 28 percent of VPP sites in 2003 to 44 percent in 2010.

The innovative program doesn't just keep employees safer; as I have noted, it also saves both the VPP companies and the taxpayer's money. In 2007, Federal Agency VPP participants saved the government more than \$59 million by avoiding injuries and private sector VPP participants saved more than \$300 million. The Department of Defense has estimated that it saves between \$73,000 and \$8.8 million per site because of VPP. Additionally, when workplaces make the significant commitment to safety required by VPP, it allows OSHA to focus its resources where they are most needed. VPP Participant employers contribute a great deal to the VPP program expenditures. VPP participants have assigned approximately 1,200 of their own employees to act as OSHA Special Government Employees, SGEs, who conduct onsite evaluations for OSHA.

Despite the strong bipartisan support for VPP and its very positive results, the need for this legislation has become painfully clear. Last year, the administration's fiscal year 2011 Budget Request proposed eliminating the small amount it takes to administer VPP—\$3.125 million—and sought to transfer the 35 FTE it takes to run the program to other functions. The failure to complete the appropriations process last year thwarted that plan, and the administration did not renew the request in their fiscal year 2012 budget proposal. I hope that Department of Labor officials will note the bipartisan support VPP has and maintain support for the program. Surely, this proven life and cost-saving program is something we can all get behind.

I would like to thank Senator LANDRIEU for working with me on this important legislation and add the following Senators as original cosponsors: Sen. LANDRIEU, Sen. ISAKSON and Sen. COBURN.

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. 807

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 "Voluntary Protection Program Act".

SEC. 2. VOLUNTARY PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a program of entering into cooperative agreements with employers to encourage the establishment of comprehensive safety and health management systems that include—

(1) requirements for systematic assessment of hazards;

(2) comprehensive hazard prevention, mitigation, and control programs;

(3) active and meaningful management and employee participation in the voluntary program described in subsection (b); and

(4) employee safety and health training.

(b) **VOLUNTARY PROTECTION PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Labor shall establish and carry out a voluntary protection program (consistent with subsection (a)) to encourage excellence and recognize the achievement of excellence in both the technical and managerial protection of employees from occupational hazards.

(2) **PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.**—The voluntary protection program shall include the following:

(A) **APPLICATION.**—Employers who volunteer under the program shall be required to submit an application to the Secretary of Labor demonstrating that the worksite with respect to which the application is made meets such requirements as the Secretary of Labor may require for participation in the program.

(B) **ONSITE EVALUATIONS.**—There shall be onsite evaluations by representatives of the Secretary of Labor to ensure a high level of protection of employees. The onsite visits shall not result in enforcement of citations under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.).

(C) **INFORMATION.**—Employers who are approved by the Secretary of Labor for participation in the program shall assure the Secretary of Labor that information about the safety and health program shall be made readily available to the Secretary of Labor to share with employees.

(D) **REEVALUATIONS.**—Periodic reevaluations by the Secretary of Labor of the employers shall be required for continued participation in the program.

(3) **MONITORING.**—To ensure proper controls and measurement of program performance for the voluntary protection program under this section, the Secretary of Labor shall direct the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Occupational Safety and Health to take the following actions:

(A) Develop a documentation policy regarding information on follow-up actions taken by the regional offices of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in response to fatalities and serious injuries at worksites participating in the voluntary protection program.

(B) Establish internal controls that ensure consistent compliance by the regional offices of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration with the voluntary protection program policies of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration for conducting onsite reviews and monitoring injury and illness rates, to ensure that only qualified worksites participate in the program.

(C) Establish a system for monitoring the performance of the voluntary protection program by developing specific performance goals and measures for the program.

(4) **EXEMPTIONS.**—A site with respect to which a voluntary protection program has been approved shall, during participation in the program, be exempt from inspections or investigations and certain paperwork requirements to be determined by the Secretary of Labor, except that this paragraph shall not apply to inspections or investigations arising from employee complaints, fatalities, catastrophes, or significant toxic releases.

(5) **NO PAYMENTS REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Labor shall not require any form of payment for an employer to qualify or participate in the voluntary protection program.

(c) **TRANSITION.**—The Secretary of Labor shall take such steps as may be necessary for the orderly transition from the cooperative agreements and voluntary protection programs carried out by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as of the day before the date of enactment of this Act, to the cooperative agreements and voluntary protection program authorized under this section. In making such transition, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) the voluntary protection program authorized under this section is based upon and consistent with the voluntary protection programs carried out on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) each employer that, as of the day before the date of enactment of this Act, had an active cooperative agreement under the voluntary protection programs carried out by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and was in good standing with respect to the duties and responsibilities under such agreement, shall have the option to continue participating in the voluntary protection program authorized under this section.

(d) **REGULATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall issue final regulations for the voluntary protection program authorized under this section and shall begin implementation of the program.

SEC. 3. EXPANDED ACCESS TO VOLUNTARY PROTECTION PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

The Secretary of Labor shall establish and implement, by regulation, a program to increase participation by small businesses (as the term is defined by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration) in the voluntary protection program established under section 2 through outreach and assistance initiatives and the development of program requirements that address the needs of small businesses.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as may be necessary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 809. A bill to provide high-quality charter school options for students by enabling such public charter schools to expand and replicate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation designed to improve educational opportunities for struggling students. The All Students Achieving Through Reform Act, or All-STAR Act, would provide Federal resources to the most successful charter schools to help them grow and replicate.

Across the nation, public charter schools are achieving extraordinary results in low-income communities. I have been particularly impressed by the Noble Street schools in Chicago. Since opening its first campus in 1999, Noble Street has expanded to 10 charter high schools educating over 13,000 students in some of Chicago's most difficult neighborhoods. Noble Street has achieved phenomenal results. Even though more than 75 percent of students enter the schools below grade level, Noble students have the highest ACT scores among Chicago open-enrollment schools. Every year, more than 99 percent of Noble Street's seniors graduate and more than 85 percent go on to college. I see this success in action when I visit Noble Street schools. As soon as you walk in the door, you can tell that everyone in the building is focused on academic success. The students are actively engaged in their learning. Their teachers and principals are demanding and inspiring. Noble Street would like to continue to grow and educate more students in Chicago.

Not all charter schools are excellent. Poor-performing charter schools should be closed. But we also need to replicate and expand the ones that are beating the odds, and we need to learn from their lessons. We need more excellent charters, like the Noble Street schools, in Illinois and around the country.

The bill I am introducing today would help make that possible. Currently, Federal funding for charter schools can only be used to create new schools, not expand or replicate existing schools. My bill would create new grants within the existing charter school program to fund the expansion and replication of the most successful charter schools. Schools that have achieved results with their students will be able to apply for Federal grants to expand their schools to include additional grades or to replicate the model to a new school. Successful charters across the country will be able to grow, providing better educational opportunities to thousands of students.

The bill also incentivizes the adoption of strong charter school policies by states. We know that successful charter schools thrive when they have autonomy, freedom to grow, and strong accountability based on meeting performance targets. The bill would give grant priority to states that provide that environment. The bill also requires new levels of charter school authorizer reporting and accountability to ensure that good charter schools are able to succeed while bad charter schools are improved or shut down.

This bill will improve educational opportunities for students across the nation. Charter schools represent some of the brightest spots in urban education today, and successful models have the full support of the President and Secretary Duncan. We need to help these schools grow and bring their best lessons into our regular public schools so that all students can benefit. Supporting the growth of successful charter schools should be a part of the conversation when we take up reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I thank Senator KIRK, Senator LANDRIEU, and Representative POLIS in the House for joining me in this effort.

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. 809

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 “All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2011” or “All-STAR Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. CHARTER SCHOOL EXPANSION AND REPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 1 of part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 5211;

(2) by redesignating section 5210 as section 5211; and

(3) by inserting after section 5209 the following:

“SEC. 5210. CHARTER SCHOOL EXPANSION AND REPLICATION.

“(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to support State efforts to expand and replicate high-quality public charter schools to enable such schools to serve additional students, with a priority to serve those students who attend identified schools or schools with a low graduation rate.

“(b) SUPPORT FOR PROVEN CHARTER SCHOOLS AND INCREASING THE SUPPLY OF HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS.—

“(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated under section 5200 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to enable the eligible entities to make subgrants to eligible public charter schools under subsection (e)(1) and carry out the other activities described in subsection (e), in order to allow the eligible public charter schools to serve additional students through the expansion and replication of such schools.

“(2) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—In determining the grant amount to be awarded under this subsection to an eligible entity, the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the number of eligible public charter schools under the jurisdiction or in the service area of the eligible entity that are operating;

“(B) the number of openings for new students that could be created in such schools with such grant;

“(C) the number of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) who are on waiting lists for charter schools under the jurisdiction or in the service area of the eligible entity, and

other information with respect to charter schools in such jurisdiction or service area that suggest the interest of parents in charter school enrollment for their children;

“(D) the number of students attending identified schools or schools with a low graduation rate in the State or area where an eligible entity intends to replicate or expand eligible public charter schools; and

“(E) the success of the eligible entity in overseeing public charter schools and the likelihood of continued or increased success because of the grant under this section.

“(3) DURATION OF GRANTS.—A grant under this section shall be for a period of not more than 3 years, except that an eligible entity receiving such grant may, at the discretion of the Secretary, continue to expend grant funds after the end of the grant period. An eligible entity that has received a grant under this section may receive subsequent grants under this section.

“(c) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—To be considered for a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The application described in paragraph (1) shall include, at a minimum, the following:

“(A) RECORD OF SUCCESS.—Documentation of the record of success of the eligible entity in overseeing or operating public charter schools, including—

“(i) the performance of the students of such public charter schools on the student academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3) of the State where such school is located (including a measurement of the students’ average academic longitudinal growth at each such school, if such measurement is required by a Federal or State law applicable to the entity), disaggregated by—

“(I) economic disadvantage;

“(II) race and ethnicity;

“(III) disability status; and

“(IV) status as a student with limited English proficiency;

“(ii) the status of such schools under section 1116 in making adequate yearly progress or as identified schools;

“(iii) documentation of demonstrated success by such public charter schools in closing historic achievement gaps between groups of students; and

“(iv) in the case of such public charter schools that are secondary schools, the graduation rates and rates of student acceptance, enrollment, and persistence in institutions of higher education, where possible.

“(B) PLAN.—A plan for—

“(i) replicating and expanding eligible public charter schools operated or overseen by the eligible entity;

“(ii) identifying eligible public charter schools, or networks of eligible public charter schools, to receive subgrants under this section;

“(iii) increasing the number of openings in eligible public charter schools for students attending identified schools and schools with a low graduation rate;

“(iv) ensuring that eligible public charter schools receiving a subgrant under this section enroll students through a random lottery for admission, unless the charter school is using the subgrant to expand the school to serve additional grades, in which case such school may reserve seats in the additional grades for—

“(I) each student enrolled in the grade preceding each such additional grade;

“(II) siblings of students enrolled in the charter school, if such siblings desire to enroll in such grade; and

“(III) children of the charter school’s founders, staff, or employees;

“(v)(I) in the case of an eligible entity described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of subsection (k)(4), the manner in which the eligible entity will work with identified schools and schools with a low graduation rate that are eligible to enroll students in a public charter school receiving a subgrant under this section and that are under the eligible entity’s jurisdiction, and the local educational agencies serving such schools, to—

“(aa) engage in community outreach, provide information in a language that the parents can understand, and communicate with parents of students at identified schools and schools with a low graduation rate who are eligible to attend a public charter school receiving a subgrant under this section about the opportunity to enroll in or transfer to such school, in a manner consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the ‘Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974’); and

“(bb) ensure that a student can transfer to an eligible public charter school if the public charter school such student was attending in the previous school year is no longer an eligible public charter school; and

“(II) in the case of an eligible entity described in subparagraph (B) or (D) of subsection (k)(4), the manner in which the eligible entity will work with the local educational agency to carry out the activities described in items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I);

“(vi) disseminating to public schools under the jurisdiction or in the service area of the eligible entity, in a manner consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly known as the ‘Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974’), the best practices, programs, or strategies learned by awarding subgrants to eligible public charter schools under this section, with particular emphasis on the best practices with respect to—

“(I) focusing on closing the achievement gap; or

“(II) successfully addressing the education needs of low-income students; and

“(vii) in the case of an eligible entity described in subsection (k)(4)(D)—

“(I) supporting the short-term and long-term success of the proposed project, by—

“(aa) developing a multi-year financial and operating model for the eligible entity; and

“(bb) including, with the plan, evidence of the demonstrated commitment of current partners, as of the time of the application, for the proposed project and of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project’s long-term success;

“(II) closing public charter schools that do not meet acceptable standards of performance; and

“(III) achieving the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, which shall include the use of clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

“(C) CHARTER SCHOOL INFORMATION.—The number of—

“(i) eligible public charter schools that are operating in the State in which the eligible entity intends to award subgrants under this section;

“(ii) public charter schools approved to open or likely to open during the grant period in such State;

“(iii) available openings in eligible public charter schools in such State that could be created through the replication or expansion of such schools if the grant is awarded to the eligible entity;

“(iv) students on public charter school waiting lists (if such lists are available) in—

“(I) the State in which the eligible entity intends to award subgrants under this section; and

“(II) each local educational agency serving an eligible public charter school that may receive a subgrant under this section from the eligible entity; and

“(v) students, and the percentage of students, in a local educational agency who are attending eligible public charter schools that may receive a subgrant under this section from the eligible entity.

“(D) TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL INFORMATION.—In the case of an eligible entity described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of subsection (k)(4), a list of the following schools under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity, including the name and location of each such school, the number and percentage of students under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity who are attending such school, and such demographic and socioeconomic information as the Secretary may require:

“(i) Identified schools.

“(ii) Schools with a low graduation rate.

“(E) ASSURANCE.—In the case of an eligible entity described in subsection (k)(4)(A), an assurance that the eligible entity will include in the notifications provided under section 1116(c)(6) to parents of each student enrolled in a school served by a local educational agency identified for school improvement or corrective action under paragraph (1) or (7) of section 1116(c), information (in a language that the parents can understand) about the eligible public charter schools receiving subgrants under this section.

“(3) MODIFICATIONS.—The Secretary may modify or waive any information requirement under paragraph (2)(C) for an eligible entity that demonstrates that the eligible entity cannot reasonably obtain the information.

“(d) PRIORITIES FOR AWARDED GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to an eligible entity that—

“(A) serves or plans to serve a large percentage of low-income students from identified schools or public schools with a low graduation rate;

“(B) oversees or plans to oversee one or more eligible public charter schools;

“(C) provides evidence of effective monitoring of the academic success of students who attend public charter schools under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity;

“(D) has established goals, objectives, and outcomes for the proposed project that are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable;

“(E) in the case of an eligible entity that is a local educational agency under State law, has a cooperative agreement under section 1116(b)(11); and

“(F) is under the jurisdiction of, or plans to award subgrants under this section in, a State that—

“(i) ensures that all public charter schools (including such schools served by a local educational agency and such schools considered to be a local educational agency under State law) receive, in a timely manner, the Federal, State, and local funds to which such schools are entitled under applicable law;

“(ii) does not have a cap that restricts the growth of public charter schools in the State;

“(iii) provides funding (such as capital aid distributed through a formula or access to revenue generated bonds, and including funding for school facilities) on a per-pupil basis to public charter schools commensurate with the amount of funding (including funding for school facilities) provided to traditional public schools;

“(iv) provides strong evidence of support for public charter schools and has in place innovative policies that support academically successful charter school growth;

“(v) authorizes public charter schools to offer early childhood education programs, including prekindergarten, in accordance with State law;

“(vi) authorizes or allows public charter schools to serve as school food authorities;

“(vii) ensures that each public charter school in the State—

“(I) has a high degree of autonomy over the public charter school’s budget and expenditures;

“(II) has a written performance contract with an authorized public chartering agency that ensures that the school has an independent governing board with a high degree of autonomy; and

“(III) in the case of an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this section, amends its charter to reflect the growth activities described in subsection (e);

“(viii) has an appeals process for the denial of an application for a public charter school;

“(ix) provides that an authorized public chartering agency that is not a local educational agency, such as a State chartering board, is available for each individual or entity seeking to operate a public charter school pursuant to such State law;

“(x) allows any public charter school to be a local educational agency in accordance with State law;

“(xi) ensures that each authorized public chartering agency in the State submits annual reports to the State educational agency, and makes such reports available to the public, on the performance of the schools authorized or approved by such public chartering agency, which reports shall include—

“(I) the authorized public chartering agency’s strategic plan for authorizing or approving public charter schools and any progress toward achieving the objectives of the strategic plan;

“(II) the authorized public chartering agency’s policies for authorizing or approving public charter schools, including how such policies examine a school’s—

“(aa) financial plan and policies, including financial controls and audit requirements;

“(bb) plan for identifying and successfully (in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations) serving students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, students who are academically behind their peers, and gifted students; and

“(cc) capacity and capability to successfully launch and subsequently operate a public charter school, including the backgrounds of the individuals applying to the agency to operate such school and any record of such individuals operating a school;

“(III) the authorized public chartering agency’s policies for renewing, not renewing, and revoking a public charter school’s charter, including the role of student academic achievement in such decisions;

“(IV) the authorized public chartering agency’s transparent, timely, and effective process for closing down academically unsuccessful public charter schools;

“(V) the academic performance of each operating public charter school authorized or approved by the authorized public chartering agency, including the information reported by the State in the State annual report card under section 1111(h)(1)(C) for such school;

“(VI) the status of the authorized public chartering agency’s charter school portfolio, by identifying all charter schools served by the public chartering agency in each of the following categories: approved (but not yet open), operating, renewed, transferred, revoked, not renewed, voluntarily closed, or never opened;

“(VII) the authorizing functions provided by the authorized public chartering agency to the public charter schools under its purview, including such agency’s operating costs and expenses as detailed through annual auditing of financial statements that conform with general accepted accounting principles; and

“(VIII) the services purchased (such as accounting, transportation, and data management and analysis) from the authorized public chartering agency by the public charter schools authorized or approved by such agency, including an itemized accounting of the actual costs of such services; and

“(xii) has or will have (within 1 year after receiving a grant under this section) a State policy and process for overseeing and reviewing the effectiveness and quality of the State’s authorized public chartering agencies, including—

“(I) a process for reviewing and evaluating the performance of the authorized public chartering agencies in authorizing or approving public charter schools, including a process that enables the authorized public chartering agencies to respond to any State concerns; and

“(II) any other necessary policies to ensure effective charter school authorizing in the State in accordance with the principles of quality charter school authorizing, as determined by the State in consultation with the charter school community and stakeholders.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary may determine how the priorities described in paragraph (1) will apply to the different types of eligible entities defined in subsection (k)(4).

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use the grant funds for the following:

“(1) SUBGRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—To award subgrants, in such amount as the eligible entity determines is appropriate, to eligible public charter schools to replicate or expand such schools.

“(B) APPLICATION.—An eligible public charter school desiring to receive a subgrant under this subsection shall submit an application to the eligible entity at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the eligible entity may require.

“(C) USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection shall use the subgrant funds to provide for an increase in the school’s enrollment of students through the replication or expansion of the school, which may include use of funds to—

“(i) support the physical expansion of school buildings, including financing the development of new buildings and campuses to meet increased enrollment needs;

“(ii) pay costs associated with hiring additional teachers to serve additional students;

“(iii) provide transportation to additional students to and from the school, including providing transportation to students who transfer to the school under a cooperative agreement established under section 1116(b)(11);

“(iv) purchase instructional materials, implement teacher and principal professional development programs, and hire additional non-teaching staff; and

“(v) support any necessary activities associated with the school carrying out the purposes of this section.

“(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding subgrants under this subsection, an eligible entity shall give priority to an eligible public charter school—

“(i) that has significantly closed any achievement gap on the State academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(3)

among the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) by improving scores;

“(ii) that—

“(I)(aa) ranks in at least the top 25th percentile of the schools in the State, as ranked by the percentage of students in the proficient or advanced level of achievement on the State academic assessments in mathematics and reading or language arts described in section 1111(b)(3); or

“(bb) has an average student score on an examination (chosen by the Secretary) that is at least in the 60th percentile in reading and at least in the 75th percentile in mathematics; and

“(II) serves a high-need student population and is eligible to participate in a schoolwide program under section 1114, with additional priority given to schools that serve, as compared to other schools that have submitted an application under this subsection—

“(aa) a greater percentage of low-income students; and

“(bb) a greater percentage of not less than 2 groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); and

“(iii) that meets the criteria described in clause (i) and serves low-income students who have transferred to such school under a cooperative agreement described in section 1116(b)(11).

“(E) DURATION OF SUBGRANT.—A subgrant under this subsection shall be awarded for a period of not more than 3 years, except that an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection may, at the discretion of the eligible entity, continue to expend subgrant funds after the end of the subgrant period.

“(2) FACILITY FINANCING AND REVOLVING LOAN FUND.—An eligible entity may use not more than 25 percent of the amount of the grant funds received under this section to establish a reserve account described in subsection (f) to facilitate public charter school facility acquisition and development by—

“(A) conducting credit enhancement initiatives (as referred to in subpart 2) in support of the development of facilities for eligible public charter schools serving students;

“(B) establishing a revolving loan fund for use by an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection from the eligible entity under such terms as may be determined by the eligible entity to allow such school to expand to serve additional students;

“(C) facilitating, through direct expenditure or financing, the acquisition or development of public charter school buildings by the eligible entity or an eligible public charter school receiving a subgrant under this subsection from the eligible entity, which may be used as both permanent locations for eligible public charter schools or incubators for growing charter schools; or

“(D) establishing a partnership with 1 or more community development financial institutions (as defined in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702)) or other mission-based financial institutions to carry out the activities described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C).

“(3) ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS, DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES, AND OUTREACH.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity may use not more than 7.5 percent of the grant funds awarded under this section to cover administrative tasks, dissemination activities, and outreach.

“(B) NONPROFIT ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the administrative tasks, dissemination activities, and outreach described in subparagraph (A), an eligible entity may contract with an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and exempt from tax

under section 501(a) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

“(f) RESERVE ACCOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To assist eligible entities in the development of new public charter school buildings or facilities for eligible public charter schools, an eligible entity receiving a grant under this section may, in accordance with State and local law, directly or indirectly, alone or in collaboration with others, deposit the amount of funds described in subsection (e)(2) in a reserve account established and maintained by the eligible entity.

“(2) INVESTMENT.—Funds received under this section and deposited in the reserve account established under this subsection shall be invested in obligations issued or guaranteed by the United States or a State, or in other similarly low-risk securities.

“(3) REINVESTMENT OF EARNINGS.—Any earnings on funds received under this subsection shall be deposited in the reserve account established under this section and used in accordance with the purpose described in subsection (a).

“(4) RECOVERY OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in accordance with chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code, shall collect—

“(i) all funds in a reserve account established by an eligible entity under this subsection if the Secretary determines, not earlier than 2 years after the date the eligible entity first received funds under this section, that the eligible entity has failed to make substantial progress carrying out the purpose described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) all or a portion of the funds in a reserve account established by an eligible entity under this subsection if the Secretary determines that the eligible entity has permanently ceased to use all or a portion of funds in such account to accomplish the purpose described in paragraph (1).

“(B) EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall not exercise the authority provided under subparagraph (A) to collect from any eligible entity any funds that are being properly used to achieve such purpose.

“(C) PROCEDURES.—Sections 451, 452, and 458 of the General Education Provisions Act shall apply to the recovery of funds under subparagraph (A).

“(D) CONSTRUCTION.—This paragraph shall not be construed to impair or affect the authority of the Secretary to recover funds under part D of the General Education Provisions Act.

“(5) REALLOCATION.—Any funds collected by the Secretary under paragraph (4) shall be awarded to eligible entities receiving grants under this section in the next fiscal year.

“(g) FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The financial records of each eligible entity and eligible public charter school receiving a grant or subgrant, respectively, under this section shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and shall be subject to an annual audit by an independent public accountant.

“(h) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—

“(1) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—From the amounts appropriated under section 5200, the Secretary shall conduct an independent, comprehensive, and scientifically sound evaluation, by grant or contract and using the highest quality research design available, of the impact of the activities carried out under this section on—

“(A) student achievement, including State standardized assessment scores and, if available, student academic longitudinal growth (as described in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i)) based on such assessments; and

“(B) other areas, as determined by the Secretary.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2011, and biannually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation described in paragraph (1).

“(i) REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall prepare and submit to the Secretary the following:

“(1) REPORT.—A report that contains such information as the Secretary may require concerning use of the grant funds by the eligible entity, including the academic achievement of the students attending eligible public charter schools as a result of the grant. Such report shall be submitted before the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the All Students Achieving through Reform Act of 2011 and every 2 years thereafter.

“(2) PERFORMANCE INFORMATION.—Such performance information as the Secretary may require for the national evaluation conducted under subsection (h)(1).

“(j) INAPPLICABILITY.—The provisions of sections 5201 through 5209 shall not apply to the program under this section.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS.—The term ‘adequate yearly progress’ has the meaning given such term in a State’s plan in accordance with section 1111(b)(2)(C).

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS, DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES, AND OUTREACH.—The term ‘administrative tasks, dissemination activities, and outreach’ includes costs and activities associated with—

“(A) recruiting and selecting students to attend eligible public charter schools;

“(B) outreach to parents of students enrolled in identified schools or schools with low graduation rates;

“(C) providing information to such parents and school officials at such schools regarding eligible public charter schools receiving subgrants under this section;

“(D) necessary oversight of the grant program under this section; and

“(E) initiatives and activities to disseminate the best practices, programs, or strategies learned in eligible public charter schools to other public schools operating in the State where the eligible entity intends to award subgrants under this section.

“(3) CHARTER SCHOOL.—The term ‘charter school’ means—

“(A) a charter school, as defined in section 5211(1); or

“(B) a school that meets the requirements of such section, except for subparagraph (D) of the section, and provides prekindergarten or adult education services.

“(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(A) a State educational agency;

“(B) an authorized public chartering agency;

“(C) a local educational agency that has authorized or is planning to authorize a public charter school; or

“(D) an organization, including a nonprofit charter management organization, that has an organizational mission and record of success supporting the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools and is—

“(i) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)); and

“(ii) exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

“(5) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL.—The term ‘eligible public charter school’ means a charter school, including a public charter school that is being developed by a developer, that—

“(A) has made adequate yearly progress for 2 of the last 3 consecutive school years; and

“(B) in the case of a public charter school that is a secondary school, has, for the most recent school year for which data is available, met or exceeded the graduation rate required by the State in order to make adequate yearly progress for such year.

“(6) GRADUATION RATE.—The term ‘graduation rate’ has the meaning given the term in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi), as clarified in section 200.19(b)(1) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(7) IDENTIFIED SCHOOL.—The term ‘identified school’ means a school identified for school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under paragraph (1), (7), or (8) of section 1116(b).

“(8) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘local educational agency’ includes any charter school that is a local educational agency, as determined by State law.

“(9) LOW-INCOME STUDENT.—The term ‘low-income student’ means a student eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

“(10) SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITY.—The term ‘school food authority’ has the meaning given the term in section 250.3 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

“(11) SCHOOL YEAR.—The term ‘school year’ has the meaning given such term in section 12(d) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)).

“(12) TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL.—The term ‘traditional public school’ does not include any charter school, as defined in section 5211.”

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7221 et seq.) is amended—

- (1) by striking section 5231; and
- (2) by inserting before subpart 1 the following:

“SEC. 5200. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUBPARTS 1 AND 2.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subparts 1 and 2, \$700,000,000 for fiscal year 2012 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

“(b) ALLOCATION.—In allocating funds appropriated under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall consider—

- “(1) the relative need among the programs carried out under sections 5202, 5205, 5210, and subpart 2; and
- “(2) the quality of the applications submitted for such programs.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended—

- (1) in section 2102(2) (20 U.S.C. 6602(2)), by striking “5210” and inserting “5211”;
- (2) in section 5204(e) (20 U.S.C. 7221c(e)), by striking “5210(1)” and inserting “5211(1)”;
- (3) in section 5211(1) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) (20 U.S.C. 7221(i)), by striking “The term” and inserting “Except as otherwise provided, the term”;
- (4) in section 5230(1) (20 U.S.C. 7223i(1)), by striking “5210” and inserting “5211”;
- (5) in section 5247(1) (20 U.S.C. 7225f(1)), by striking “5210” and inserting “5211”.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended—

- (1) by inserting before the item relating to subpart 1 of part B of title V the following: “Sec. 5200. Authorization of appropriations for subparts 1 and 2.”;
- (2) by striking the items relating to sections 5210 and 5211;
- (3) by inserting after the item relating to section 5209 the following:

“Sec. 5210. Charter school expansion and replication.

“Sec. 5211. Definitions.”; and
(4) by striking the item relating to section 5231.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 810. A bill to prohibit the conducting of invasive research on great apes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to end the use of Great Apes in invasive research and urge my Senate colleagues to support the Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act.

The Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act would prohibit invasive research on all Great Apes, including gorillas, orangutans, and chimpanzees—who are the primary Great Apes used in research today. The bill would also require the immediate retirement of 500 federally-owned chimpanzees to great ape sanctuaries.

Today about 1,000 chimpanzees—half of them federally owned—languish at great taxpayer expense in eight research laboratories across the Nation.

These chimpanzees are being held or used for invasive biomedical research, research that may cause death, bodily injury, pain, distress, fear, and trauma. Invasive research practices include techniques such as injecting a chimpanzee with a drug that would be detrimental to its health, infecting a chimp with a disease, cutting a chimp or removing body parts, and isolation or social deprivation.

The vast majority of these animals—between 80 and 90 percent—aren’t actually being used in research, but instead are warehoused, simply wasting away in these facilities. For example, approximately half of the government-owned chimpanzees are being held in a facility in New Mexico where no research is being conducted.

Some chimpanzees have been in labs for more than 50 years, confined in steel cages for most of their lives and enduring sometimes painful and distressing experimental procedures.

The fact that the vast majority of federally-owned chimpanzees are not being used in active research, but instead are warehoused in labs at the taxpayer expense, underlines the futility of their continued confinement.

For a single chimpanzee, lifetime care in a research facility can cost over \$1 million, compared with \$340,000 for superior care in a sanctuary. Ending invasive research will mean a savings of more than \$25 million per year for the American people.

Chimpanzees are poor research models for human illness, and they have been of limited use in the study of human disease. Despite how similar they are to us, significant differences in their immunology and disease progression make them ineffective models

for human diseases like HIV, cancer, and heart disease research.

For example, research published in the Journal of Medical Primatology in 2009, on hepatitis C indicates that use of chimpanzees has produced poor results. And the National Center for Research Resources under the National Institutes of Health has prohibited breeding of government-owned chimpanzees for research. In effect, NIH has already decided that the chimpanzee is not an essential animal model for human medical research.

Significant genetic and physiological differences between great apes and humans also make chimpanzees a poor research model for human diseases. We have spent millions of dollars over several decades on chimpanzee-based HIV and Hepatitis C research with no resulting vaccines for those diseases. Chimpanzees largely failed as a model for HIV because the virus does not cause illness in chimpanzees as it does to humans.

These are very social, highly intelligent animals—with the ability, for example, to learn American Sign Language. Their intelligence and ability to experience emotions so similar to humans underscores how chimpanzees suffer intensely under laboratory conditions.

Their psychological suffering in laboratories produces human-like symptoms of stress, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder after decades of living in isolation in small cages.

Given their social nature and capacity for suffering and boredom due to lack of stimulation, the 500 privately-owned chimpanzees and 500 federally-owned chimpanzees being held in research laboratories would be better off in sanctuaries. And by doing so we would save more than \$25 million taxpayer dollars each year. This is because the cost of caring for a chimpanzee in a sanctuary is a fraction of the cost of their housing and maintenance in a laboratory. And many in the scientific community believe this money could be allocated to more effective research.

In my home State of Washington, I am proud that we have Chimpanzee Sanctuary Northwest. Chimpanzee Sanctuary Northwest provides sustainable sanctuary for seven chimpanzees retired in 2008 from decades in research facilities.

The United States is currently behind the rest of the world in outlawing this sad practice.

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, and the United Kingdom have all banned or severely limited experiments on great apes. And several other countries and the European Union are considering similar bans as well.

We are the only country—besides Gabon in West Africa—that is still holding or using chimpanzees for invasive research. It’s past time for the United States to catch up with the rest of the world by ending this antiquated use of this endangered species.

We are lagging behind in action, but the desire to end invasive research on Great Apes has been present for more than a decade. In 1997, the National Research Council concluded that there should be a moratorium on further chimpanzee breeding. And the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has already announced an end to funding for the breeding of federally-owned chimpanzees for research, but this should be codified.

Government needs to take action to make invasive research on chimpanzees illegal.

That is why today I am introducing the bipartisan Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, along with my colleagues Senators SUSAN COLLINS, BERNIE SANDERS and JOE LIEBERMAN.

The Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act is a commonsense policy reform to protect our closest living relatives in the animal kingdom from physical and psychological harm, and help reduce government spending and our federal deficit.

Specifically, this bill will phase out the use of chimpanzees in invasive research over a three-year period, require permanent retirement to suitable sanctuaries for the 500 federally-owned chimpanzees currently being warehoused in research laboratories, and codifies the current administrative moratorium on government-funded breeding of chimpanzees.

We have been delaying this action for too long. It is time to get this done and end this type of harmful research and end this wasteful government spending.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 144—SUPPORTING EARLY DETECTION FOR BREAST CANCER

Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 144

Whereas the 5-year relative survival rate for breast cancer has increased from 74 percent in 1979 to 90 percent in 2011;

Whereas when breast cancer is detected early and confined to the breast, the 5-year relative survival rate is 98 percent;

Whereas the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program (referred to in this preamble as the "NBCCEDP") was established by the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Prevention Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 300k et seq.) to provide early detection services for low-income women who are uninsured or underinsured and do not qualify for Medicaid;

Whereas the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-354; 114 Stat. 1381) allows for breast cancer treatment assistance to be provided through Medicaid to eligible women who were screened through the NBCCEDP;

Whereas NBCCEDP and the provisions of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-354; 114 Stat. 1381) have effectively reduced mortality among low-income uninsured and

medically underserved women with breast cancer;

Whereas early detection of breast cancer increases survival rates for the disease, as evidenced by a 5-year relative survival rate of 98 percent for breast cancers that are discovered before the cancer spreads beyond the breast, compared to 23 percent for stage IV breast cancers;

Whereas the cost of treating stage IV breast cancers is more than 5 times more expensive than the cost of treating stage I breast cancers;

Whereas as of the date of agreement to this resolution, the economy has placed a strain on State budgets while increasing the demand for safety-net services;

Whereas significant disparities in breast cancer outcomes persist across racial and ethnic groups;

Whereas breast cancer is the most frequently diagnosed cancer and is the leading cause of cancer death among women worldwide;

Whereas in 2011, more than 200,000 women and men will be diagnosed with breast cancer and more than 40,000 will die of breast cancer in the United States;

Whereas every woman should have access to life-saving screening and treatment that is not dependent on where she lives;

Whereas investments in cancer research have improved the understanding of the different types of breast cancer and led to more effective, personalized treatments; and

Whereas organizations such as Susan G. Komen for the Cure® empower women with knowledge and awareness, ensure access to quality care, and energize science to discover and deliver cures for breast cancer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remains committed to ensuring access to life-saving breast cancer screening, diagnostic, and treatment services, particularly for medically underserved women;

(2) supports increasing awareness and improving education about breast cancer, the importance of early detection, and the availability of screening services for women in need; and

(3) remains committed to discovering and delivering cures for breast cancer and encouraging the development of screening tools that are more accurate and less costly.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 294. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 294. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 493, to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE —REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Regulatory Flexibility Improvement Act of 2011".

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS.

Section 601 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) the term ‘rule’—

“(A) has the meaning given that term in section 551(4);

“(B) includes any rule of general applicability governing Federal grants to State and local governments for which the agency provides an opportunity for notice and public comment; and

“(C) does not include—

“(i) a rule of particular applicability relating to rates, wages, corporate or financial structures or reorganizations thereof, prices, facilities, appliances, services, or allowances therefor or to valuations, costs or accounting, or practices relating to such rates, wages, structures, prices, appliances, services, or allowances; or

“(ii) an interpretative rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States, published in the Federal Register, that does not impose a collection of information requirement;”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by inserting after “special districts,” the following: “or tribal organizations (as defined in section 4(l) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(1));”;

(3) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end; and

(4) by striking paragraphs (7) and (8) and inserting the following:

“(7) the term ‘collection of information’ has the meaning given that term in section 3502(3) of title 44;

“(8) the term ‘recordkeeping requirement’ has the meaning given that term in section 3502(13) of title 44;

“(9) the term ‘interim final rule’ means a rule which will become effective without prior notice and comment, including a rule for which the agency makes a finding under section 553(b)(3)(B) of this title; and

“(10) the term ‘impact’, when used to describe the effect of a rule, means—

“(A) the economic effects on small entities directly regulated by the rule; and

“(B) the reasonably foreseeable economic effects of the rule on small entities that—

“(i) purchase products or services from, sell products or services to, or otherwise conduct business with entities directly regulated by the rule;

“(ii) are directly regulated by other governmental entities as a result of the rule; or

“(iii) are not directly regulated by the agency as a result of the rule but are otherwise subject to other agency regulations as a result of the rule.”.

SEC. 03. REGULATORY AGENDA.

Section 602(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “, and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) the list of rules required to be published under section 610(c).”.

SEC. 04. INITIAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.

Section 603 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 1100G of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2112), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “or publishes a notice of proposed rulemaking for an interpretative rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States” and inserting “publishes a notice of proposed rulemaking for an interpretative rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States, or publishes an interim final rule”; and

(B) by striking “The initial regulatory” and all that follows through the period at the end;

(2) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b)(1) An agency shall notify the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration electronically of any draft rule (including a proposed rule, an interpretive rule involving the internal revenue laws of the United States, and an interim final rule) that may have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities—

“(A) on the date on which the agency submits the draft rule to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget under Executive Order 12866, if that order requires the submission; or

“(B) if no submission to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs is required, at a reasonable time before publication of the draft rule by the agency.

“(2) Each notice under paragraph (1) shall include the draft rule and a draft of the initial regulatory flexibility analysis.”;

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “proposed” each place that term appears;

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) a description of the economic impact of the rule on small entities; and

“(7) a description of the cumulative economic impact on small entities of the rules—

“(A) promulgated by the agency during the 10-year period ending on the date of the initial regulatory flexibility analysis; and

“(B) proposed, but not promulgated, by the agency before the date of the initial regulatory flexibility analysis.”;

(5) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “proposed” each place that term appears;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) the establishment of less stringent requirements for all entities covered by the rule, including small entities.”;

(6) in subsection (e), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “proposed” each place that term appears;

(B) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(C) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) Except as provided in section 608, not later than the date of publication of a notice of proposed rulemaking or an interim final rule, an agency shall—

“(1) make the initial regulatory flexibility analysis required under subsection (a) available electronically to the public; and

“(2) publish the initial regulatory flexibility analysis, or a summary of the initial regulatory flexibility analysis, in the Federal Register.”.

SEC. 05. FINAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS.

Section 604 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “proposed” each place that term appears;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “as described in section 603(a)”;

(B) by redesignating the second paragraph designated as paragraph (6) (relating to cov-

ered agencies), as added by section 1100G(c)(3) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111-203; 124 Stat. 2113), as paragraph (8);

(C) in paragraph (6) (relating to a description of steps taken to minimize significant economic impact), as added by section 1601 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-240; 124 Stat. 2251), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6) (relating to a description of steps taken to minimize significant economic impact), as added by section 1601 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-240; 124 Stat. 2251), the following:

“(7) a description of the cumulative impact on small entities of the rules—

“(A) promulgated by the agency during the 10-year period ending on the date of the final regulatory flexibility analysis; and

“(B) proposed, but not promulgated, by the agency before the date of the final regulatory flexibility analysis; and”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “The agency shall make copies of” and inserting “Not later than the date of publication of a final rule, the agency shall make”;

(B) by striking “available to members of the public” and inserting “for the final rule available electronically to the public”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) If an agency publishes an interim final rule, the agency shall prepare a final regulatory flexibility analysis that contains the information required to be included in a final regulatory flexibility analysis under subsection (a).

“(2) The agency shall prepare and make available to members of the public the final regulatory flexibility analysis not later than the earlier of—

“(A) 180 days after the end of the period for comment on the initial regulatory flexibility analysis prepared under section 603 of this title; and

“(B) the date of publication of a final rule following the interim final rule.

“(d) An agency may not fulfill the requirements of this section until the agency has complied with the requirements of section 603.”.

SEC. 06. AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATIVE OR UNNECESSARY ANALYSIS.

Section 605(b) of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “, interim final,” before “or final”;

(2) in the second sentence by inserting “interim final or” before “final rule”;

(3) in the third sentence, by inserting before the period at the end the following: “electronically, at a reasonable time before the publication of the notice, interim final rule, or final rule”.

SEC. 07. PROCEDURE FOR DELAY OF COMPLETION.

Section 608 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “WAIVER OR”;

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) An agency head may delay the completion of some or all of the requirements of section 603 for a period of not more than 180 days after the date of publication in the Federal Register of a notice of proposed rulemaking or interim final rule by publishing in the Federal Register, not later than the date of publication of the notice of proposed rulemaking or interim final rule, a written finding, with reasons therefor, that the notice of proposed rulemaking, interim final rule, or final rule is being promulgated in response

to an emergency that makes timely compliance with section 603 impracticable.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking the first sentence; and

(B) by striking “If the agency has not prepared a final regulatory analysis pursuant to section 604 of this title within one hundred and eighty days from the date of publication of the final rule” and inserting the following:

“(c) If the agency has not prepared an initial regulatory flexibility analysis under section 603 or a final regulatory flexibility analysis under section 604 before the date that is 180 days after the date of publication of the interim final rule”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 605, an agency head may not waive the requirements of section 603 or 604.”.

SEC. 08. PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING COMMENTS.

Section 609 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively;

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

“(4) not later than 60 days before the date on which a covered agency convenes a review panel under paragraph (3), the covered agency shall submit written notification and a statement to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration and the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs within the Office of Management and Budget that includes—

“(A) the earliest date the review panel may convene;

“(B) the most recent draft regulatory text (if available) and economic analysis;

“(C) a description of the most significant regulatory components of the rule, with significant regulatory alternatives, accompanied by a discussion of the costs, cost-effectiveness, benefits, advantages, and disadvantages of the alternatives;

“(D) a description of the number and type of small entities affected, related State and Federal regulatory requirements, and the technical and legal bases for the rule;

“(E) a full description of the methodology that underlies the analysis in subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), including any key assumptions; and

“(F) any other materials necessary for the individuals identified under paragraph (2) and the members of the review panel to make informed recommendations to the review panel and the covered agency.”;

(C) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated, by striking “subsections 603(b), paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) and 603(c)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) through (7) of subsection (c) and subsection (d) of section 603”;

(D) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated, by striking “subsections 603(b), paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) and 603(c)” and inserting “paragraphs (3) through (7) of subsection (c) and subsection (d) of section 603”;

(2) in subsection (e), by striking “subsections (b)(3), (b)(4), and (b)(5)” and inserting “paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6) of subsection (b)”.

SEC. 09. PERIODIC REVIEW OF RULES.

Section 610 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “Within”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Each agency shall allow an interested person to petition the agency for the review of a rule of the agency then in effect, if—

“(A) the head of the agency made a certification under section 605(b) with respect to the rule;

“(B) evidence that is not in the rulemaking record exists showing that the rule has a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities; and

“(C) there are reasonable alternatives to the requirements under the rule that would reduce the economic impact on small entities.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c)(1) Each agency shall publish in the regulatory flexibility agenda required under section 602 a list of the rules of the agency that have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, that the agency will review under this section during the 6-month period following the date of publication of the regulatory flexibility agenda.

“(2) The list required under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) for a rule that is the subject of a petition under subsection (a)(2) that the agency receives not later than 60 days before the date of publication of the list—

“(i) a statement that the agency will review the rule under this section; or

“(ii) a detailed explanation of how the petition failed to meet the requirements under subsection (a)(2), if the agency determines it will not review the rule under this section;

“(B) for each rule, a brief description of the rule, the need for the rule, and the legal basis of the rule; and

“(C) an invitation for public comment on the rules to be reviewed.

“(d) Upon review of any rule under this section, an agency shall publish notice of and accept comment on an initial regulatory review with respect to the rule that contains—

“(1) an evaluation of the factors described in subsection (b);

“(2) a statement of the objectives of and legal basis for the rule;

“(3) a description of, and, if feasible, an estimate of the number of, small entities to which the rule applies;

“(4) a description of the reporting, record-keeping, and other compliance requirements of the rule, including the classes of small entities that are subject to the requirements and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of any report or record required under the rule;

“(5) a description of any significant alternatives to the rule that accomplish the stated objectives of applicable statutes and minimize any significant economic impact of the rule on small entities, including, as applicable—

“(A) the establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to the small entities;

“(B) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance and reporting requirement under the rule for the small entities;

“(C) the use of performance standards rather than design standards;

“(D) an exemption from application of the rule, or any part thereof, for the small entities; and

“(E) any significant alternative proposed by a person that submits a petition for review under subsection (a)(2) of this section.

“(e)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 180 days after the end of the comment period specified by an agency under subsection (d), the agency shall publish in the Federal Register and make available to the public a final regulatory review that contains—

“(A) a statement of the need for, and objectives of, the rule;

“(B) a description of any significant issues raised by public comment in response to the

initial regulatory review, and a statement of the assessment of the agency of the issues;

“(C) the response of the agency to any comment filed by the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration in response to the initial regulatory review;

“(D) a description, and an estimate of the number, of small entities to which the rule applies, or an explanation of why no such estimate is available;

“(E) a description of the reporting, record-keeping, and other compliance requirements of the rule, including the classes of small entities that are subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of any report or record required under the rule; and

“(F) a description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for not selecting any significant alternative to the rule considered by the agency that would affect the impact on small entities.

“(2) An agency is not required to publish a final regulatory review under paragraph (1) if, not later than 180 days after the end of the comment period specified by the agency under subsection (d), the agency initiates a rulemaking for the purpose of proposing the adoption of a significant alternative to the rule under review.”.

SEC. 10. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Section 611(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “608(b)” and inserting “608”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “608(b)” and inserting “608”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(B), by inserting after “the issuance of” the following: “an initial regulatory flexibility analysis on an interim final rule pursuant to section 608(a) or”.

SEC. 11. SMALL ENTITY COMPLIANCE GUIDES.

(a) SMALL ENTITY COMPLIANCE GUIDES.—Chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 613. Small entity compliance guides

“(a)(1) For each rule or group of related rules for which an agency is required to prepare a final regulatory flexibility analysis under section 604, the agency shall publish 1 or more guides to assist small entities in complying with the rule and shall entitle such publications ‘small entity compliance guides’ (referred to in this section as a ‘guide’).

“(2) The publication of each guide under this subsection shall include—

“(A) the posting of the guide in an easily identified location on the website of the agency; and

“(B) distribution of the guide to known contacts representing regulated small entities, including trade associations and business organizations.

“(3) An agency shall publish each guide (including the posting and distribution of the guide as described under paragraph (2))—

“(A) on the same date as the date of publication of the final rule (or as soon as possible after that date); and

“(B) not later than the date on which the requirements of that rule become effective.

“(4)(A) Each guide shall explain the actions a small entity is required to take to comply with a rule.

“(B) The explanation under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall include a description of actions needed to meet the requirements of a rule, to enable a small entity to know when such requirements are met; and

“(ii) if determined appropriate by the agency, may include a description of possible

procedures, such as conducting tests, that may assist a small entity in meeting such requirements, except that, compliance with any procedures described pursuant to this section does not establish compliance with the rule, or establish a presumption or inference of such compliance.

“(C) Procedures described under subparagraph (B)(ii)—

“(i) shall be suggestions to assist small entities; and

“(ii) shall not be additional requirements, or diminish requirements, relating to the rule.

“(5) An agency shall, in its sole discretion, taking into account the subject matter of the rule and the language of relevant statutes, ensure that the guide is written using sufficiently plain language likely to be understood by affected small entities. Agencies may prepare separate guides covering groups or classes of similarly affected small entities and may cooperate with trade associations and business representatives of small entities to develop and distribute such guides. An agency may prepare guides and apply this section with respect to a rule or a group of related rules.

“(6) The head of each agency shall submit an annual report to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and any other committee of relevant jurisdiction describing the status of the agency’s compliance with paragraphs (1) through (5).

“(b) Agencies shall cooperate to make available to small entities through comprehensive sources of information, the small entity compliance guides and all other available information on statutory and regulatory requirements affecting small entities.

“(c) An agency’s small entity compliance guide shall not be subject to judicial review, except that in any civil or administrative action against a small entity for a violation occurring after the effective date of section 212 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note), the content of the small entity compliance guide may be considered as evidence of the reasonableness or appropriateness of any proposed fines, penalties or damages.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note) is amended by striking section 212.

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—On and after the date of enactment of this Act, an agency may use a small entity compliance guide published under section 212 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note) before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

The table of sections for chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 608 and inserting the following:

“608. Procedure for delay of completion.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“613. Small entity compliance guides.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Perspectives on Deficit Reduction."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing entitled "International Development Policy Priorities in the FY 2012 International Affairs Budget."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Fulfilling Our Commitment to Support Victims of Crime."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 3 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial and Executive Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room 418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND THE COAST GUARD

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and the Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 13, 2011, from 2-4 p.m. in Dirksen 562.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Ian Koski of my staff for the duration of the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Adam Rohloff of my staff be granted floor privileges during this period of time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff be allowed on the Senate floor for the duration of the debate on S. 493: Lucy Emerson and Shannon Olberding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Megan Cheney, Nicole Miya Ogawa, and Jan Spreitzenbarth of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING THE 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE 2010 POLAND PRESIDENTIAL PLANE CRASH

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the For-

eign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 135) remembering the 1-year anniversary of the April 10, 2010, plane crash that claimed the lives of the President of Poland Lech Kaczynski, his wife, and 94 others, while they were en route to memorialize those Polish officers, officials, and civilians who were massacred by the Soviet Union in 1940.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 135

Whereas, on April 10, 2010, the President of the Republic of Poland Lech Kaczynski, his wife Maria, and a cadre of current and former Polish statesmen, military officers, family members, and others departed Warsaw by plane to travel to the Russian region of Smolensk;

Whereas the purpose of the delegation's visit was to hold a ceremony in solemn remembrance of the more than 22,000 Polish military officers, police officers, judges, other government officials, and civilians who were executed by the Soviet secret police, the "NKVD", between April 3 and the end of May 1940;

Whereas more than 14,500 Polish victims of such executions have been documented at 3 sites in Katyn (in present day Belarus), in Miednoye (in present day Russia), and in Kharkiv (in present day Ukraine), while the remains of an estimated 7,000 such Polish victims have yet to be precisely located;

Whereas the plane carrying the Polish delegation on April 10, 2010, crashed in Smolensk, tragically killing all 96 persons on board;

Whereas Poland has been a leading member of the transatlantic community and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), an Alliance vital to the interests of the United States, and Poland's membership in the Alliance has strengthened NATO;

Whereas the Polish armed forces have stood shoulder-to-shoulder and sacrificed with airmen, marines, sailors, and soldiers of the United States in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Balkans, and around the world;

Whereas Poland has been a leader in the promotion of human rights, not just in Central Europe, but elsewhere around the world; and

Whereas the deep friendship between the governments and people of Poland and the United States is grounded in our mutual respect, shared values, and common priorities on nuclear nonproliferation, counterterrorism, human rights, regional cooperation in Eastern Europe, democratization, and international development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remembers the terrible tragedy that took place on April 10, 2010, when an aircraft

carrying a delegation of current and former Polish officials, family members, and others crashed en route from Warsaw to Smolensk to memorialize the 1940 Katyn massacres, killing all 96 passengers;

(2) honors the memories of all Poles executed by the NKVD at Katyn, Miednoye, Khakriv, and elsewhere and those who perished in the April 10, 2010, plane crash;

(3) expresses continuing sympathy for the surviving family members of those who perished in the tragic plane crash of April 10, 2010;

(4) recognizes and respects the resilience of Poland's constitution, as demonstrated by the smooth and stable transfer of constitutional authority that occurred in the immediate aftermath of the April 10, 2010, tragedy; and

(5) requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Ambassador of Poland to the United States.

NOMINATION OF DAVID COHEN

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, shortly a UC request will be made to ask that the nomination of David Cohen to be Under Secretary for Terrorism, and Financial Crimes, U.S. Department of Treasury, be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs after that nomination is reported by the Committee on Finance. I want to make it clear this action in no way should be taken to negate or diminish the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance over this nomination. The Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence is a very important part of the Treasury Department, and the Committee on Finance has a fundamental interest to conduct oversight over that office, along with the entire department. I respect the interest my col-

leagues have in this important position, and in the interest of thorough oversight do not plan to object to the UC request. However, I want to stress that this UC request will only cover the specific nomination of David Cohen currently before the Committee on Finance, and does not apply to any other nomination of Mr. Cohen or of any person, including Mr. Cohen, to the Office of Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Mr. HATCH. I second my chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. We thank the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and agree that this unanimous consent agreement is designed only to apply to this nomination, and not to future nominees for this position.

Mr. SHELBY. I agree with Chairman JOHNSON.

SEQUENTIAL REFERRAL— EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee on Finance reports the nomination of David Cohen to serve as Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, U.S. Department of the Treasury, the nomination be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2011

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, April 14; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with the time until 2 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with all other provisions under the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am informed that we will debate the long-term CR tomorrow morning and vote as soon as we receive the papers from the House. There will be three votes which will be in relation to the two correcting resolutions regarding health care reform and Planned Parenthood and passage of the long-term CR. We hope the votes will be sometime in the afternoon.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:41 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 14, 2011, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DISAPPROVING FCC INTERNET AND BROADBAND REGULATIONS

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 8, 2011

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of net neutrality, I oppose H.J. Res. 37. The Internet has revolutionized the way the world learns, interacts, and does business. It has remained a dynamic and rich platform because it has been open and accessible to all, from start-up businesses, school groups, and individuals, to news organizations and government. I am using Twitter and Facebook regularly to help me keep in touch with Oregonians.

This resolution would disapprove the FCC's open Internet ruling and undermine the enforceable policy for keeping the Internet free from discrimination. Americans have the right to access to the legal content of their choice. H.J. Res. 37 denies this freedom and eliminates consumer protections in favor of corporate interests. Internet service providers would be able to act as gatekeepers, blocking legal content like Netflix and picking winners and losers among applications and services.

H.J. Res. 37 puts into question whether innovation will be allowed to flourish on the Internet. It would stifle start-up businesses and slow economic growth. Congress should protect the free and open Internet to strengthen our economy and create jobs. Instead, H.J. Res. 37 undermines these principles and puts the power to choose which content you can access in the hands of corporate interests.

Maintaining a free and open Internet is critical to a vibrant democracy and economic development. I hope my colleagues will join me in opposition to this harmful resolution.

NATIONAL MEDICAL LABORATORY PROFESSIONALS WEEK, APRIL 24-30, 2011

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer this on behalf of my colleague, Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, and her constituents in Arizona's 8th congressional district. This year, more than 10 billion laboratory tests are being performed—tests that are important to the health and, often, the very lives of our family members, our friends, and ourselves.

Thirteen percent of the U.S. population is already over the age of 65 and every seven seconds one of us turns 50. Combine these facts with the steadily lengthening life expectancy of the average American, and today's emphasis on preventive medicine and early detection of disease conditions. The result is

an exponentially growing, almost overwhelming demand for medical laboratory services across the nation.

The American Society for Clinical Pathology advises that among the highly trained and dedicated professionals who work in medical laboratories are histotechnologists, histologic technicians, pathologists, medical technologists, cytotechnologists, medical laboratory technicians, and phlebotomists who engage in life-saving work every day.

Given the critical nature of their work, laboratory professionals require state-of-the-art technological support. Take, for example, the preparation of microscope slides for biopsies. Three hundred million tissue slides—most of them key to detecting cancer—are processed in U.S. histology labs each year. Actively working to eliminate patient identification errors and cross-contamination, the nation's top lab professionals have replaced outdated labeling and slide preparation processes with smart solutions—fully automated, integrated individual slide staining systems and workflow management platforms that offer confidence in their ability to deliver the right patient results.

I am proud to note that the leading global provider of such patient-focused, tissue-based cancer diagnostics is Ventana Medical Systems, Inc., headquartered in southern Arizona's eighth congressional district. Their mantra underscores the mission of every medical laboratory: deliver the right patient results in a timely manner.

With the approach of National Medical Laboratory Professionals Week (April 24–30), I join Ventana's 1,300 employees in saluting our nation's medical laboratorians. Their dedication, professionalism and hard work, combined with state-of-the-art technology, are essential to prolonging the healthy lives of millions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 253 Senate amendment to H.R. 1363, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

HONORING OUR NATION'S NURSES

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the vital contributions made by our nation's nurses and call attention to the quality healthcare services that nurses provide to patients within my district and across the nation. As the largest group of health professionals, nurses serve among healthcare providers on the front lines of our delivery system.

Whether in a school, a physician's office, or a hospital setting, nurses provide the personal attention that is necessary for their patients.

I commend the great commitment that these educated and qualified nurses consistently give to their profession and to their patients, despite the challenges they face. Recently, I had the opportunity to meet with a registered school nurse, Susan Voss, from Elk Grove Village, Illinois. She came to our nation's Capitol as part of the Nurse in Washington Internship Program to share her own experiences in the healthcare field.

In our meeting, Ms. Voss spoke passionately about her work and the students she serves. The devotion she has towards her profession is extraordinary. Every day, Susan drives over one hundred miles to help students and faculty with their routine treatments. In addition to her daily duties, she assists and monitors students with special needs. Her love for nursing and her dedication make her a powerful advocate for the nursing profession.

I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Ms. Voss and nurses throughout the U.S. that help deliver quality healthcare services to American families.

IN HONOR OF PATROLMAN JAMES SIMONE

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of James Simone, a police officer with the City of Cleveland, who has announced his retirement from the Cleveland Police Department after 38 years of service.

Mr. James "Supercop" Simone has served with the Cleveland Police Department for 38 years. He is well known for some of the more dramatic duties he has performed as an officer of the law, such as chasing down and stopping a bank robber, or jumping into the frozen Cuyahoga River to save a woman's life.

His commander, Keith Sulzer, stated that "In his 38 years of police service he has been a shining example of a crime fighter, a man unwavering by public opinion and politics, a man whose honor and integrity has always been above reproach. Officer Jim Simone's name will forever be spoken with reverence and the utmost respect by his fellow police officers and good citizens of the City of Cleveland."

Mr. Simone graduated from Lakewood High School in 1966 and went on to join the United States Army's 101st Airborne Division. He served as a sergeant and received the Bronze Star for Valor, the Bronze Star for Meritorious Services, two Purple Hearts for wounds received in combat, and various other medals and ribbons commemorating his service in the military.

In 1973, Mr. Simone joined the Cleveland Police Department where he has served in

• 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.

various districts under various roles, including basic patrol, detective, SWAT, and Senior Traffic Enforcement Officer. He has been awarded countless accommodations and honors which include 2010's Police Officer of the Year, and a Medal of Valor for his service. In addition, he was honored by Mothers Against Drunk Driving for issuing dozens of citations and working to keep the streets clear of reckless and intoxicated drivers.

Mr. Simone has also been an avid lecturer and instructor at various Cleveland schools and universities, including John Marshall Law School, Cuyahoga Community College, Case Western Reserve University, Lorain Community College Police Academy and SEALE Police Shooting Warrior Mind Set.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Mr. James "Supercop" Simone, as he retires after 38 years from a long and distinguished career as a protector and hero of Cleveland.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the start of the American Civil War and an important piece of journalism by Ken Burns entitled "A Conflict's Acoustic Shadows." Mr. Burns' article in the New York Times reminds us all of the importance of reflecting upon this pivotal moment in our nation's history.

[April 11, 2011]

A CONFLICT'S ACOUSTIC SHADOWS

(By Ken Burns)

More than once during the Civil War, newspapers reported a strange phenomenon. From only a few miles away, a battle sometimes made no sound—despite the flash and smoke of cannon and the fact that more distant observers could hear it clearly.

These eerie silences were called "acoustic shadows."

Tuesday, the 150th anniversary of the first engagement of the Civil War, the Confederacy's attack on Fort Sumter, we ask again whether in our supposedly post-racial, globalized, 21st-century world those now seemingly distant battles of the mid-19th century still have any relevance. But it is clear that the further we get from those four horrible years in our national existence—when, paradoxically, in order to become one we tore ourselves in two—the more central and defining that war becomes.

In our less civil society of this moment we are reminded of the full consequences of our failure to compromise in that moment.

In our smug insistence that race is no longer a factor in our society, we are continually brought up short by the old code words and disguised prejudice of a tribalism beneath the thin surface of our "civilized" selves.

And in our dialectically preoccupied media culture, where everything is pigeonholed into categories—red state/blue state, black/white, North/South, young/old, gay/straight—we are confronted again with more nuanced realities and the complicated leadership of that hero of all American heroes, Abraham Lincoln. He was at once an infuriatingly pragmatic politician, tardy on the

issue of slavery, and at the same time a transcendent figure—poetic, resonant, appealing to better angels we 21st-century Americans still find painfully hard to invoke.

The acoustic shadows of the Civil War remind us that the more it recedes, the more important it becomes. Its lessons are as fresh today as they were for those young men who were simply trying to survive its daily horrors.

And horrors there were: 620,000 Americans, more than 2 percent of our population, died of gunshot and disease, starvation and massacre in places like Shiloh and Antietam and Cold Harbor, Fort Pillow and Fort Wagner and Palmito Ranch, Andersonville and Chickamauga and Ford's Theater.

Yet in the years immediately after the South's surrender at Appomattox we conspired to cloak the Civil War in bloodless, gallant myth, obscuring its causes and its great ennobling outcome—the survival of the union and the freeing of four million Americans and their descendants from bondage. We struggled, in our addiction to the idea of American exceptionalism, to rewrite our history to emphasize the gallantry of the war's top-down heroes, while ignoring the equally important bottom-up stories of privates and slaves. We changed the irredeemable, as the historian David Blight argues, into positive, inspiring stories.

The result has been to blur the reality that slavery was at the heart of the matter, ignore the baser realities of the brutal fighting, romanticize our own home-grown terrorist organization, the Ku Klux Klan, and distort the consequences of the Civil War that still intrude on our national life.

The centennial of the Civil War in 1961 was for many of us a wholly unsatisfying experience. It preferred, as the nation reluctantly embraced a new, long-deferred civil rights movement, to excavate only the dry dates and facts and events of that past; we were drawn back then, it seemed, more to regiments and battle flags, Minié balls and Gatling guns, sentimentality and nostalgia and mythology, than to anything that suggested the harsh realities of the real war.

Subsequently, our hunger for something more substantial materialized in James McPherson's remarkable "Battle Cry of Freedom" and many other superb histories, in the popular Hollywood movie "Glory," and in my brother Ric's and my 1990 documentary series "The Civil War."

It was an emotional archaeology we were all after, less concerned with troop movements than with trying to represent the full fury of that war; we were attracted to its psychological disturbances and conflicted personalities, its persistent dissonance as well as its inspirational moments. We wanted to tell a more accurate story of African-Americans, not as the passive bystanders of conventional wisdom, but as active soldiers in an intensely personal drama of self-liberation.

We wished to tell bottom-up stories of so-called ordinary soldiers, North as well as South, to note women's changing roles, to understand the Radical Republicans in Congress, to revel in the inconvenient truths of nearly every aspect of the Civil War.

Today, the war's centrality in American history seems both assured and tenuous. Each generation, the social critic Lewis Mumford once said, re-examines and re-interprets that part of the past that gives the present new meanings and new possibilities. That also means that for a time an event, any event, even one as perpetually important as the Civil War, can face the specter of being out of historical fashion.

Explore multimedia from the series and navigate through past posts, as well as photos and articles from the Times archive.

But in the end, it seems that the War of the Rebellion, the formal name our government once gave to the struggle, always invades our consciousness like the childhood traumatic event it was—and still is.

Maybe Walt Whitman, the poet and sometime journalist who had worked as a nurse in the appalling Union hospitals, understood and saw it best. "Future years," he said, "will never know the seething hell, the black infernal background of the countless minor scenes and interiors . . . of the Secession War, and it is best they should not."

"The real war," Whitman admonished us, "will never get in the books." We are, nonetheless, obligated to try.

RECOGNIZING THE CONCERNS OF THE SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COPTIC CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

HON. GARY C. PETERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, last month, 13 Coptic Christians in Egypt were murdered by Muslim extremists. More recently, a Coptic church—rich in culture and architecture—was destroyed, forcing many innocent Christians to flee their home communities in order to protect their lives. This comes only months after 24 Christians were killed in yet another church bombing.

I am proud to represent a vibrant Coptic community in southeast Michigan and privileged to consider the clergy of St. Mark's Church in Troy, Michigan as my friends. I rise today to share their concerns about the future of their community and the desire to preserve their ancestral homeland. For millennia, Coptic Christians have lived and worshipped in Egypt but some extremists are attempting to capitalize on the political vacuum created by the uncertainty in the country to drive them out of their homes and places of worship.

While we are hopeful for democratic change in Egypt, it is imperative that we maintain support for religious minority communities such as the Copts and seek to preserve and allow for the continuity of their community. As a member of the Religious Minorities in the Middle East Caucus, I ask my colleagues to join me in being mindful of these Christian minorities that need a voice.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSASSINATION OF THE REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was struck down by an assassin's bullet as he stood on the balcony outside his room at the Lorraine Hotel in Memphis, Tennessee.

He was in Memphis to march in solidarity with African American sanitation workers during their 1968 strike for better working conditions.

Despite the shock and sorrow of losing the country's most celebrated civil rights leader, the march went on and the strike proved ultimately successful.

We are here today to remember Dr. King, the workers in Memphis that he stood with, and the victory they achieved for themselves and working people everywhere.

Over the last 40 years, this country has seen more than its share of tragedies: assassinations, bombings, terrorist attacks, and all manner of natural disasters.

It is easy to become desensitized to evil and some of us may drift away from the lessons of the past. We should remember that in 1968 Dr. King's murder threw the country into chaos and threatened the civil rights movement he had labored to build through peaceful protest. But it was not to be, as Dr. King's message was too powerful for hate, and today we remember that nothing eclipses his message that all humanity has dignity and worth.

Dr. King, Jr., recognized that the struggle for civil rights and workers' rights were inextricably linked. Both required that the basic rights of all people are equal and ought to be honored equally, whether by an employer or by the United States government. Organized labor is a cornerstone of our democracy and a guiding force in our nation's history. It is the natural right of a free people, as workers rightly expect a degree of safety, security, and just compensation for the work that they do. We should not sacrifice their quality of life to fuel the myth that doing so will somehow balance the budget.

In closing, I urge my colleagues and my fellow Americans to always remember the significance of this day. Dr. King received criticism from all sides, some saying he was too soft; others saying he was too radical, and many fearing widespread violence and social upheaval in the wake of his death.

It was human nature, some argued, that violence is a more effective means to effect change than passive resistance. They were wrong. Dr. King understood that the moral force of non-violent direct action was so powerful that it could bring down the modern-day walls of Jericho.

And he was right; it brought change to America. And to Poland and the nations of eastern and central Europe. And we saw it at work in Tunisia and Egypt. As Dr. King said: "The moral arc of the universe is long, but it bends toward justice."

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today, our nation mourned the loss of one of the greats of the age. But while an assassin may have felled the Dreamer; the Dream of Dr. King still lives in the hearts and minds of people of goodwill everywhere in the world.

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF
JERZY J. MACIUSZKO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Jerzy J. Maciuszko, a loving father, husband, friend and scholar. His passion for literature and Polish history will benefit the world and those that knew him.

A librarian and historian, Mr. Maciuszko served as the head librarian of the Baldwin-Wallace College's Ritter Library and the Cleveland Public Library's special collections department. He was a devoted educator and

chaired the Slavic and Modern Languages department at the Alliance College in Cambridge Springs, Pennsylvania.

In 1913, Mr. Maciuszko was born in Warsaw, Poland, where he graduated from the University of Warsaw with a bachelor's degree in English. He taught English at a high school in Warsaw until 1939. Upon Germany's occupation of Poland, Jerzy was captured and spent six years in a prisoner's camp. He made the best of his situation by playing violin in the camp orchestra and writing a short story, which took top honors in a contest held by the International YMCA.

Mr. Maciuszko escaped the camp and became a liaison officer for the U.S. Army, where he helped Poles find homes outside their occupied country. When the war ended, he moved to England, where he inspected Polish schools for the British government.

In 1951, he moved to Pennsylvania and began teaching at Alliance College. Although he moved to Cleveland soon after, he returned to Pennsylvania in 1969 and became the chair of the Slavic and Modern Languages department and created an exchange program between Alliance College and Jagiellonian University in Krakow.

When he moved to Cleveland, he joined the Public Library's Foreign Language department, rising in the ranks to direct all of the library's special collections. While he was in Cleveland, he also earned a doctoral degree in library sciences at Case Western Reserve University and taught there as a professor. With his collaborative efforts, Case Western Reserve started their ethnic collection. In 1974, he moved to Berea, where he led Baldwin Wallace College's Ritter Library.

In addition to all of his achievements throughout his long career, Mr. Maciuszko was awarded many honors, including an Officers' Cross of the Order of Merit from the Polish President Lech Walesa; a Polish Heritage Award from the Cleveland Society of Poles; an Eagle Trophy from the American Nationalities Movement; and a "Man of the Year" award from the American Biographical Institute.

Mr. Maciuszko was also a prolific writer, and wrote many pieces on Polish history, including "The Polish Short Story in English: A Guide and Critical Bibliography," a monograph on the Polish Institute of America as well as chapters for various encyclopedias. He recently finished a manuscript entitled "Poles Apart: The Tragic Fate of Poles During World War II."

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in remembering Mr. Jerzy J. Maciuszko, whose passion for history and sharing knowledge will live on for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING MR. REYNAULD WIL-
LIAMS ON THE OCCASION OF
TESTIFYING BEFORE THE NA-
TIONAL PRESS CLUB

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in appreciation of Mr. Reynauld Merrimon Williams, Jr.'s testimony given to the National Press Club on April 4th, 2011, in support of Historically Black Colleges and Universities,

HBCU, and Predominately Black Institutions, PBI.

Mr. Williams is a native of Ahoskie, North Carolina, and a 2007 graduate of Hertford County High School. While at Hertford County High School Mr. Williams was deeply involved in school activities and took great pride in high academic achievement. Mr. Williams was a Beta Club National Honor Society member, captain of the varsity soccer team, member of Earth Club, participant of teen court, and third place finisher in the Regional North Carolina Math Fair. Mr. Williams, an AP Honor Student, completed his high school career at Hertford County High School in the top eight percent of his graduating class.

Mr. Williams currently attends Fayetteville State University, a historically black university, where he is a member of the National Honor Society and maintains a perfect 4.0 grade point average. Mr. Williams is pursuing a degree in business and finance and has continued to excel as a student and an active member of the university community. In Mr. Williams' testimony to the National Press Club, he supported his assertion that his success as a student is directly linked to the unique and nurturing environment that HBCUs provide African American students. Mr. Williams contended that these types of environments provided by HBCUs facilitate the educational and professional development of African American students across the country. Mr. Williams is the consummate example of the positive effects that HBCUs have on the African American community, and reinforces the critical importance of maintaining support for these institutions of higher education.

The courage displayed by Mr. Williams' support for Historically Black Colleges and Universities deserves commendation. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Reynauld Merrimon Williams for giving his testimony, and in wishing him the best in his remaining academic career and future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was unable to cast my votes on Tuesday, April 12, 2011, due to a scheduled meeting in my District to discuss immigration policies with constituents in Champaign County, Illinois. Had I been present to vote on H.R. 1308, S. 307, and Approving the Journal, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall No. 254 on H.R. 1308, to amend the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act to extend the termination date for the Commission, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 255 on S. 307, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 217 West King Street, Martinsburg, West Virginia, as the "W. Craig Broadwater Federal Building and United States Courthouse", I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 256 on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "aye."

INTRODUCTION OF THE VOLUNTARY PROTECTION PROGRAM ACT

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, Rep. GENE GREEN and I are introducing the bipartisan Voluntary Protection Program, VPP, Act to make permanent one of the Federal Government's most successful workplace health and safety programs. The same legislation is being introduced in the Senate by Sen. MICHAEL B. ENZI, the ranking member of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee, and Senator MARY LANDRIEU.

This legislation would codify a successful program, the Voluntary Protection Program, operated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, that recognizes and rewards employers who voluntarily work to improve the health and safety of their work-sites. The program is currently operating but has never been authorized in law and was proposed to be cut by the Obama administration's fiscal year 2011 budget. While the administration backed away from those cuts in its fiscal year 2012 budget proposal, this legislation would put the program on a more solid foundation by specifically authorizing it in law.

Since the VPP was created in 1982, it has grown to include more than 2,200 worksites and more than 921,000 employees. A 2007 report noted that Federal VPP worksites saved the government more than \$59 million by avoiding injuries and that private sector VPP participants saved more than \$300 million. Participating workplaces have an illness and injury rate that, on average, is 50 percent below that of their industry.

Business owners in my district have reported to me that the relationship between OSHA and businesses has become more adversarial over the past couple years. While OSHA does have a responsibility to enforce workplace safety laws, it has been my experience that most employers want to run safe workplaces. The VPP program provides a mechanism for OSHA to build a more constructive relationship with employers who have demonstrated a willingness to invest in workplace safety. This creates an incentive for other employers to follow suit, improving safety and saving money on enforcement costs at the same time.

I hope that our colleagues will join us in authorizing this bipartisan and successful workplace safety program.

IN HONOR OF SERGEANT TIMOTHY LEAHY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sergeant Timothy Leahy of the Cleveland Police Department, and to celebrate his long career and well-deserved retirement.

Sgt. Leahy served with the Cleveland Police Department for 38 years, rising from the rank

of Patrolman to Sergeant. He was appointed to the force on January 16th, 1973, and has since received many awards and honors for his service. He was voted Legionnaire of the Year by the American Legion 13th District Council and he received the Distinguished Service Award from the Greater Cleveland Police Emerald Society.

The oldest of seven, Sgt. Leahy was born into a line of Cleveland Police Officers including his father, a Lieutenant who served on the force for 43 years, and his Uncle Robert, who retired as a Captain after 37 years of service.

He has been married for 36 years to his wife, Veronica, and has had three children and seven grandchildren, to whom he is known as "Papa." To his friends and family, he is known as an avid golfer and fisherman, and a devoted member of the community.

Sgt. Leahy served as a member of the Cleveland Police Funeral Detail and Ceremonial Unit for 18 years, and has received several Letters of Appreciation for his role in honoring those that have fallen in the line of duty.

He received the James P. Sweeney Founders Award as Retired/Retireable Irish Police Society Man of the Year, the Citizen Award from the Greater Cleveland Safety Forces Holy Name Society, and was awarded the Raymond "RIP" and Mary Reilly Memorial Directors Emeritus Award by the United Irish Societies for work with the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring Sgt. Timothy Leahy as he retires from a long and honorable career of serving the citizens of Cleveland as an enforcer of the laws and protector of the people.

HONORING MARTIN CHASE

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a hero from my district whose story I recently became aware of—Martin Chase.

During the war in Vietnam, Martin was a civilian engineer that responded to his country's call to develop more conventional weapons. Our soldiers frequently were pinned down with no way out. To counter this situation, Martin developed a grenade that detonated on impact, giving U.S. troops a more effective means of protecting themselves and fighting the Viet Cong.

When Martin's grenades were shipped to our troops overseas, Martin traveled with them to oversee the training and distribution of these new weapons. Upon arrival, Martin found himself in the middle of the Tet Offensive, and for the next 3 weeks followed our troops through some of the deadliest battles of the war in Vietnam.

However, upon learning that his grenades were distributed to thousands of soldiers to use without training, Martin approached the American commanders, alerting them the grenades could result in countless deaths to American troops. In fact, Martin pointed out that if these new grenades were used without training, there could be more deaths to U.S. troops than enemy Viet Cong deaths. This heroic act of bravery prevented countless, unnecessary deaths of our soldiers.

I am proud to have Marty as a constituent and have enjoyed getting to know him and his story. Martin believed in the power of truth. By confronting the war's needs for results, he saved countless lives. I wish him all the best and thank him for his service and courage during the war in Vietnam.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EVIDENCE REGISTRY (SAFER) ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to reintroduce important bipartisan legislation, the Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Registry, SAFER, Act, with my colleagues, Representatives POE, MORAN, COSTA, GRIJALVA, RICHARDSON, GWEN MOORE, BARTLETT, DEUTCH, ADERHOLT, ROONEY, and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

I have been working on the issue of DNA technology since 2001 when I, along with former Representative Steve Horn, held a hearing in the Government Reform Committee where we heard from a courageous rape survivor, Debbie Smith. It was for Debbie, and the thousands of rape survivors like her, that I authored "The Debbie Smith Act" to provide federal funding to process the unconscionable backlog of DNA evidence. This legislation passed as part of the Justice for All Act of 2004, authorizing the necessary funding to start processing the backlog through the creation of the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program.

Since 2004, millions of dollars in funding have been appropriated under the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program. Efforts to eliminate the national backlog of rape evidence samples that have not been tested for DNA have been slowed or stymied by the lack of solid data on the extent and nature of the remaining backlog. While there is extensive evidence that we are making progress towards eliminating the backlog, policy makers lack a reliable estimate of the number of kits awaiting testing, or even how many kits remain at each stage of the process (in police custody, at labs awaiting processing, etc.).

This legislation addresses these issues to reduce rape kit DNA backlogs nationwide by allocating existing program funds for incentives to local jurisdictions to audit rape kits awaiting processing, the hiring and/or training of staff to handle the backlog, and establishing a national database of every individual rape kit result. It also requires the Attorney General to report on best practices for testing and using DNA evidence in criminal investigations of sexual assault.

As Congress considers legislation to amend the Debbie Smith Act or make other changes to DNA testing policy, it is crucial that we first gather reliable, comprehensive backlog data. DNA evidence does not forget and it cannot be intimidated. By processing this evidence, we can prevent rapists from attacking more innocent victims and ensure that the survivors and their families receive justice.

RECOGNIZING WILLIAM WILSON, RECIPIENT OF THE FRONTIERS IN PHYSIOLOGY'S ONLINE TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FELLOWSHIP

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor William Wilson, recipient of the Frontiers in Physiology's Online Teacher Professional Development Program Fellowship.

When Mr. Wilson is not coaching high school wrestling, he is inspiring his students in the field of science as a teacher at Clover Park High School in Lakewood, Washington. His outstanding research proposal in the biomedical field earned him the Frontiers in Physiology's Online Teacher Professional Development Program Fellowship. Mr. Wilson will be awarded educational grants to help him advance his research and make improvements to Clover Park's science department.

The Frontiers in Physiology program was initiated in 1990 by 10 impassioned high school science teachers embarking on a summer research grant in physiology. The 10-month fellowship aims to integrate best practices in scientific research into middle schools and high schools, incorporate technology and internet-based resources to enhance learning, and improve classroom labs with a better understanding of the scientific research process. The program has been proven to enable teachers to advance teaching techniques and promote excellence in science education.

As a dedicated and inspiring teacher, Mr. Wilson has proven to be an invaluable asset to the Pierce County community. The resources that Mr. Wilson will bring from the Online Teacher Professional Development Program fellowship will undoubtedly allow him to contribute more to Clover Park High School and the greater science community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives please join me in congratulating Mr. William Wilson for receiving the Frontiers in Physiology Online Teacher Professional Development Fellowship and honoring him as a model teacher.

IN HONOR OF ELAINE AND LARRY MYERS UPON RECEIVING THE 2011 GRINDSTONE AWARD

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Elaine and Larry Myers for winning the 2011 Grindstone Award which recognizes their devotion to the Berea community. Both Elaine and Larry will be honored at the 44th annual Grindstone Award Dinner.

The list of benefits the Myers have bestowed upon the Berea community is long. Larry established the Berea Athletic Hall of Fame in 1981. Both Larry and his wife have served on the Athletic Booster committee year after year. Elaine has held numerous positions

on organizations such as the Committee for Good Schools, the Coe Lake Nature Trail Committee, the Education Foundation Auction Committee and she worked for the Suicide Prevention Education Alliance, an extremely noble cause.

Within the community, Larry and Elaine are known as Mr. & Mrs. Pancake, since both co-chair the Annual Kiwanis Pancake Festival and the Committee for Good Schools Pancake Breakfast.

As one member of the Berea community has said, "Larry and Elaine Myers truly make Berea a better city in which to live and give truth to the line, a small city is like a big family."

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition on these two truly remarkable individuals. Through their devotion and love for their community both Elaine and Larry have truly made their mark and improved the Berea community.

RECOGNIZING JULIE MEIER WRIGHT, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished tenure of Ms. Julie Meier Wright on the occasion of her retirement as President and CEO of the San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation (EDC).

Prior to her work with the EDC, Ms. Wright served as California's first Secretary of Trade and Commerce. Under her management, Ms. Wright built a new Agency to expand the state's international role and presence, including opening five new overseas offices.

Ms. Wright's service as President of the EDC has been the capstone of a notable career. For 13 years, she has served as an economic booster, marketing the San Diego region as the world's foremost job creation location celebrating a highly-skilled workforce, innovation climate, and quality of life.

In her work, Ms. Wright championed the Partnership for a New Economy, an initiative which spurred the creation of High Tech High, a school designed to prepare students for technology and life sciences careers along with the Rady School of Management at UCSD, which educates global leaders for innovation.

As a strong advocate for the economy of California, Ms. Wright has been a visionary that has undoubtedly helped shape San Diego to become a leader in so many industries.

Among her many commendations, Ms. Wright has been named the nation's Outstanding Secretary of Commerce by the Biotechnology Industry Organization and the California Leader of the Year by Leadership California. Her manifest of remarkable achievements includes receiving the Junior Achievement's San Diego Hall of Fame Lifetime Laureate Award, the San Diego Business Journal's Women Who Mean Business Award, the "Women of Distinction" award from Soroptimist International and she was named in

"Women Who Move the City" by San Diego Magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues please join me in recognizing the tenure of Ms. Julie Meier Wright as she retires as President of the San Diego Regional EDC.

TIME FOR AN AFGHANISTAN-PAKISTAN STUDY GROUP

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues legislation I am introducing to create an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group, APSG, modeled after the Iraq Study Group, ISG, to bring "fresh eyes" to the war effort in Afghanistan which is now in its 10 year.

Last August, I began pressing the administration to convene an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. I submit a copy of my initial letter to the President.

In the letter, I outlined the genesis of the Iraq Study Group, ISG—an idea which was born in 2005 after my third visit to Iraq, during which I witnessed firsthand the deteriorating security situation. While reticent at first, to their credit President Bush, Secretary of State Rice and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld came to support the ISG, ably led by bipartisan co-chairs, former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton.

It has been my hope that the Obama administration would come to view this bipartisan "fresh eyes" approach as something which is ultimately good for our men and women in uniform and good for the country as a whole.

Aside from the specific policy recommendations of the ISG, the formation of the group and the issuance of the report helped force a moment of truth in our national conversation about the war effort.

It was apparent last summer, and it is truer still today, that with roughly 100,000 U.S. troops presently in Afghanistan, no clear end in sight to our nation's longest running war at 10 years and counting, and public support for the war at an all-time low, a national conversation about Afghanistan is what is in fact urgently needed.

Before proposing this idea to the Obama administration I spoke with a number of knowledgeable individuals including former senior diplomats, public policy experts and retired and active military. Many believed our Afghanistan policy was adrift, and there was near unanimity that an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group was needed. Among those distinguished individuals who embraced the idea was former Ambassador to Iraq Ryan Crocker. I also sought input from senior foreign policy experts, among them former U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan Ronald Neumann, who now serves as president of the American Academy of Diplomacy, regarding the implications of failure in Afghanistan. I submit for the record Ambassador Neumann's letter which lays out in sobering detail all that is at stake in that country.

I also submit for the record a letter I received last year from a constituent who is the mother of six children, all of whom are currently serving or have served in the U.S. military. She wrote of being troubled by "how distant this war is for so many Americans" and

she offered her wholehearted support for “the formation of an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group in the hope that it will turn the tide of this war . . .” I shared this constituent correspondence, too, with the administration last September and again urged them to take action.

The war has remained distant for many Americans. It is rarely spoken of from the presidential bully pulpit. In fact a recent Fox News piece reported that “The last time Obama specifically devoted a full public speech to Afghanistan was December 9, 2009, 16 months ago, when he announced at West Point that he was sending an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to that war-torn country.”

Further, the war is seldom covered in great depth in the news. And yet for the husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters who have sent off a loved one in uniform, the war in Afghanistan is anything but distant. It is uncertainty and sacrifice, it is separation and worry, it is life and death.

Despite my several letters to the President and other senior administration officials calling for a “vigorous, thoughtful and principled debate and discussion among some of our nation’s greatest minds,” the idea for a study group has languished.

And so today I am introducing legislation to create an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group, comprised of nationally known and respected individuals who love their country more than their political party, and who would, I believe, serve to provide much-needed clarity to a policy that appears adrift at best and highly politicized at worst.

In reading Obama’s Wars, I was deeply troubled by Bob Woodward’s reporting which indicated that discussions of the war strategy were infused with political calculations. Woodward also wrote of an administration that “wrestled with the most basic questions about the war . . . What is the mission? What are we trying to do? What will work?”

These are questions that demand answers.

I believe that Americans of all political viewpoints can embrace this “fresh eyes” approach—for it is always in our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to success. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 4, 2010.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,
*The President, The White House,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On September 14, 2001, following the catastrophic and deliberate terrorist attack on our country, I voted to go to war in Afghanistan. I stand by that decision and have the utmost confidence in General Petraeus’s proven leadership. I also remain unequivocally committed to the success of our mission there and to the more than 100,000 American troops sacrificing toward that end. In fact, it is this commitment which has led me to write to you. While I have been a consistent supporter of the war effort in both Afghanistan and Iraq, I believe that with this support comes a responsibility. This was true during a Republican administration in the midst of the wars, and it remains true today.

In 2005, I returned from my third trip to Iraq where I saw firsthand the deteriorating security situation. I was deeply concerned that Congress was failing to exercise the necessary oversight of the war effort. Against

this backdrop I authored the legislation that created the Iraq Study Group (ISG). The ISG was a 10-member bipartisan group of well-respected, nationally known figures who were brought together with the help of four reputable organizations—the U.S. Institute for Peace, the Center for the Study of the Presidency, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Baker Institute for Public Policy at Rice University—and charged with undertaking a comprehensive review of U.S. efforts there. This panel was intended to serve as “fresh eyes on the target”—the target being success in Iraq.

While reticent at first, to their credit President Bush, State Secretary Rice and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld came to support the ISG, ably led by bipartisan co-chairs, former Secretary of State James Baker and former Congressman Lee Hamilton. Two members of your national security team, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and CIA Director Leon Panetta, saw the merit of the ISG and, in fact, served on the panel. Vice President Biden, too, then serving in the Senate, was supportive and saw it as a means to unite the Congress at a critical time. A number of the ISG’s recommendations and ideas were adopted. Retired General Jack Keane, senior military adviser to the ISG, was a lead proponent of “the surge,” and the ISG referenced the possibility on page 73. Aside from the specific policy recommendations of the panel, the ISG helped force a moment of truth in our national conversation about the war effort.

I believe our nation is again facing such a moment in the Afghanistan war effort, and that a similar model is needed. In recent days I have spoken with a number of knowledgeable individuals including former senior diplomats, public policy experts and retired and active military. Many believe our Afghanistan policy is adrift, and all agreed that there is an urgent need for what I call an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group (APSG). We must examine our efforts in the region holistically, given Pakistan’s strategic significance to our efforts in Afghanistan and the Taliban’s presence in that country as well, especially in the border areas.

This likely will not come as a surprise to you as commander in chief. You are well acquainted with the sobering statistics of the past several weeks—notably that July surpassed June as the deadliest month for U.S. troops. There is a palpable shift in the nation’s mood and in the halls of Congress. A July 2010 CBS news poll found that 62 percent of Americans say the war is going badly in Afghanistan, up from 49 percent in May. Further, last week, 102 Democrats voted against the war spending bill, which is 70 more than last year, and they were joined by 12 members of my own party. Senator Lindsay Graham, speaking last Sunday on CNN’s “State of the Union,” candidly expressed concern about an “unholy alliance” emerging of anti-war Democrats and Republicans.

I have heard it said that Vietnam was not lost in Saigon; rather, it was lost in Washington. While the Vietnam and Afghanistan parallels are imperfect at best, the shadow of history looms large. Eroding political will has consequences—and in the case of Afghanistan, the stakes could not be higher. A year ago, speaking before the Veterans of Foreign War National Convention, you rightly said, “Those who attacked America on 9/11 are plotting to do so again. If left unchecked, the Taliban insurgency will mean an even larger safe haven from which al Qaeda would plot to kill more Americans. So this is not only a war worth fighting . . . this is fundamental to the defense of our people.” Indeed it is fundamental. We must soberly consider the implications of failure in Afghanistan. Those that we know for certain are chilling—name-

ly an emboldened al-Qaeda, a reconstituted Taliban with an open staging ground for future worldwide attacks, and a destabilized, nuclear-armed Pakistan.

Given these realities and wavering public and political support, I urge you to act immediately, through executive order, to convene an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group modeled after the Iraq Study Group. The participation of nationally known and respected individuals is of paramount importance. Among the names that surfaced in my discussions with others, all of whom more than meet the criteria described above, are ISG co-chairs Baker and Hamilton; former Senators Chuck Robb, Bob Kerrey and Sam Nunn; former Congressman Duncan Hunter; former U.S. ambassador Ryan Crocker; former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, and General Keane. These names are simply suggestions among a cadre of capable men and women, as evidenced by the make-up of the ISG, who would be more than up to the task.

I firmly believe that an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group could reinvigorate national confidence in how America can be successful and move toward a shared mission in Afghanistan. This is a crucial task. On the Sunday morning news shows this past weekend, it was unsettling to hear conflicting statements from within the leadership of the administration that revealed a lack of clarity about the end game in Afghanistan. How much more so is this true for the rest of the country? An APSG is necessary for precisely that reason. We are nine years into our nation’s longest running war and the American people and their elected representatives do not have a clear sense of what we are aiming to achieve, why it is necessary and how far we are from attaining that goal. Further, an APSG could strengthen many of our NATO allies in Afghanistan who are also facing dwindling public support, as evidenced by the recent Dutch troop withdrawal, and would give them a tangible vision to which to commit.

Just as was true at the time of the Iraq Study Group, I believe that Americans of all political viewpoints, liberals and conservatives alike, and varied opinions on the war will embrace this “fresh eyes” approach. Like the previous administration’s support of the Iraq Study Group, which involved taking the group’s members to Iraq and providing high-level access to policy and decision makers, I urge you to embrace an Afghanistan-Pakistan Study Group. It is always in our national interest to openly assess the challenges before us and to chart a clear course to success.

As you know, the full Congress comes back in session in mid-September—days after Americans around the country will once again pause and remember that horrific morning nine years ago when passenger airlines became weapons, when the skyline of one of America’s greatest cities was forever changed, when a symbol of America’s military might was left with a gaping hole. The experts with whom I have spoken in recent days believe that time is of the essence in moving forward with a study panel, and waiting for Congress to reconvene is too long to wait. As such, I am hopeful you will use an executive order and the power of the bully pulpit to convene this group in short order, and explain to the American people why it is both necessary and timely. Should you choose not to take this path, respectfully, I intend to offer an amendment by whatever vehicle necessary to mandate the group’s creation at the earliest possible opportunity.

The ISG’s report opened with a letter from the co-chairs that read, “There is no magic formula to solve the problems of Iraq. However, there are actions that can be taken to

improve the situation and protect American interests." The same can be said of Afghanistan.

I understand that you are a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln. He, too, governed during a time of war, albeit a war that pitted brother against brother, and father against son. In the midst of that epic struggle, he relied on a cabinet with strong, often times opposing viewpoints. Historians assert this served to develop his thinking on complex matters. Similarly, while total agreement may not emerge from a study group for Afghanistan and Pakistan, I believe that vigorous, thoughtful and principled debate and discussion among some of our nation's greatest minds on these matters will only serve the national interest. The biblical admonition that iron sharpens iron rings true.

Best wishes.
Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

P.S. We as a nation must be successful in Afghanistan. We owe this to our men and women in the military serving in harm's way and to the American people.

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY
OF DIPLOMACY,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2010.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLF, I am responding to your letter of September 16 requesting my personal views on the consequences should our mission in Afghanistan fail. I believe the answer must examine both the likely results in Afghanistan and Central Asia on the one hand, as well as the risks to direct American security through terrorism on the other.

Should we withdraw our forces before the Afghan army is ready to assume the internal defense of Afghanistan—an issue of force quality and support services, not just numbers—I believe there is every reason to assume a civil war will occur in Afghanistan. The Tajiks, Uzbeks, Hazaras, and even some of the Pushtun population, having experienced Taliban rule once will not submit again. However, lacking an adequate army with which to resist they will fall back on armed militias as they have in the past. This will have several consequences.

Such militia bodies inevitably empower warlords who seek power on their own. They will, at times, collude against each other. Similar infighting led to the initial acceptance of the Taliban by many Afghans in their desperate search for peace at any price.

The civil war will draw in outside powers to further or defend their own interests. At a minimum, the Russians will support forces in order to build a buffer between Afghanistan and the Central Asian states that Russia sees as its zone of influence. Iran will re-enter the fray, as it did before, to protect Shia co-religionists and to extend its power. Pakistan will be a major player, quite possibly reverting to the effort to back a Taliban victory as Pakistan did in the past. The Indians will be drawn in to counter the Pakistanis since India fears the growth of terrorist movements that have found sanctuary in Afghanistan in the past. The involvement of both India and Pakistan in a contest that each views as a zero sum game presents additional dangers of conflict between the two nuclear armed states (although I would put this risk as low).

It has been argued that the Taliban and al-Qaida have different goals and, therefore, that a return of the Taliban to Afghanistan would not bring back al-Qaida. The first is true but immaterial. The second conclusion is false. The tactical alliance between the

two movements is strong and has been intensified during the insurgency. This is particularly true of the areas of Haqqani's influence where we see a steady growth in the presence of foreign fighters as I learned in my visit to Afghanistan in May of this year. In the context of the likely civil war the Taliban will have every incentive to maintain their alliance with al-Qaida since the latter bring with them resources, recruits and fanaticism. Indeed, before our entry into Afghanistan, al-Qaida often constituted the shock troops of the Taliban. There is every reason to believe they will return to this role in their alliance.

It is important to consider the likely consequences within Pakistan of a US defeat and a civil war involving the Taliban. It is not simply that Pakistan has a previous stake in a Taliban victory. The Pakistani army has shown itself deeply fearful of Indian influence with the largely Tajik Northern Alliance. The combination of fear and history is very likely to lead the Pakistanis to support the Taliban, notwithstanding whatever pressures we might bring to bear against this. Under these circumstances it is entirely possible that Pakistan will slow down or back off from its active military campaign against extremists within Pakistan. This was the pattern of the past. Pakistan tried repeatedly to put together short term alliances with domestic extremists to keep peace inside Pakistan while concurrently supporting or tolerating their activities in Afghanistan. The history of these alliances is that each one failed, extremism spread out of the tribal areas and into the Punjab and the major Pakistani cities where it now threatens the Pakistani state. This scenario is not guaranteed but it is certainly possible and, indeed, it is difficult to see how Pakistan could refuse to support the Taliban in Afghanistan or do so without compromising with the Taliban's backers in Pakistan. Of course, such actions would render the current US-Pakistani relationship difficult to sustain.

Renewed insurgencies in Central Asia are also possible. In the period of Taliban rule extreme Islamist movements gained support in Afghanistan for insurgencies in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. The Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan still exists. Within the last week, Tajik insurgents have mounted an attack that appears to have come from an unsecured area in Afghanistan. Instability in Central Asia will have unpredictable consequences for everything from political reform to gas pipelines.

In short, the future of civil war in Afghanistan, involvement of outside powers, increased extremism in Pakistan, and unrest in Central Asia could continue for years. The civil war in Lebanon involved fewer outside players, a smaller country and population, and less difficult terrain—and it lasted 15 years. The consequences in Afghanistan could easily challenge that record.

A second set of challenges involves our direct struggle with Islamist extremist terrorism directed against US and American interests. The goal of these self proclaimed jihadist movements is the reshaping of the Islamic world. Everywhere they look they think they see us in their way; our military presence in the region, support of Israel, ties with moderate Arab and Muslim governments, and even our very culture are seen by them as a threat. So their war with us will go on even if we retreat from Afghanistan.

The difference will be that the extremists will have gained their largest propaganda victory since the fall of the Soviet Union. They will trumpet the defeat of the second superpower to fall to their arms. They will use this to rally support and adherents and to discredit those Muslims who oppose them

in the name of religion, moderation and modernity.

One cannot predict the results with specificity. Nevertheless, I think it would be extremely naive to believe that we can unilaterally cease fighting, those who are waging a continuing, violent war of terrorism against us and not pay a heightened price in attacks against us in the future. It is important to remember that on jihadist web sites the incident we refer to as the terrorist attack of 9/11 is referred to as "the raid on New York," a chilling reminder of how they see that incident as part of a continuing war.

In sum, sir, should we be defeated in Afghanistan I foresee a substantial period of civil war, regional instability and enhanced risk to American lives and interests. All the dominoes did not fall in Vietnam, a war I fought as a soldier. It is possible that not all the disasters I foresee in Afghanistan will come to pass. Yet even a portion of them would be a considerable calamity for the region and our interests. That is why I believe we must persevere in Afghanistan. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to express my views.

Sincerely,
RONALD E. NEUMANN,
Former US Ambassador to Afghanistan.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: I have read your proposal for the formation of an Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group with deep personal interest and approbation. I applaud its respectful, well-reasoned, bipartisan approach to rethinking the war in Afghanistan. The following are my personal thoughts regarding this war. Please accept them as the insights of an average American mother.

It has been troubling to me how distant this war is for so many Americans. Many are only vaguely aware of the events taking place, other than perhaps the recent increase in the number of casualties. Even gathering information of what is daily happening in Afghanistan hasn't been easy. I comb the internet daily searching many different online news sources in an attempt to be informed. Our country is at war and yet so often the top news items contain nothing regarding it. Often it is the local papers in towns with soldiers, sailors and marines serving in Afghanistan that contain the most news. Other times it is the news stations with an embedded reporter who will have a flurry of articles while the reporter is there but then nothing once they return.

The War on Terror is not just impersonal news but it is a war that strikes very close to home. My father has a dear friend whose son-in-law died in the Twin Towers. I have a friend who lost a son in Iraq during the battle for Fallujah. A student of mine lost her fiancée in the war. My children and son-in-law have served in both Iraq and Afghanistan and have buddies injured or killed in action.

One of my daughters is currently serving in Afghanistan in a Combat Support Hospital. She arrived in time to experience first hand the peak number of casualties in June and July. In a recent news interview her Commanding Officer said they are seeing an almost constant stream of casualties; something that none of them were prepared for, but will remember the horrors of the rest of their lives.

It has sometimes appeared that the efforts in Afghanistan have trudged along, with success measured in part by the areas in which we have gained some measure of control versus the price paid in human lives both civilian and military. The casualties suffered aren't just numbers to me; each name, each face, represents a family who is paying the ultimate price, the loss of a son or daughter, brother or sister, father or mother; a family that will never be the same. Therefore, I

wholeheartedly support the formation of an Afghanistan/Pakistan Study Group in the hope that it will help to turn the tide of this war and lessen the number of casualties as well.

I, too, have a deep respect and confidence in Gen. Petraus and would not want my comments to be construed as being critical of the leadership of our military. I have no formal training in political science or history so please accept these comments as simply the perspective of an American mother with children glad to serve our country.

God bless you and give you wisdom as you serve in the leadership of our country.

Sincerely,

* * *

PS It meant so much to see my sons receive a standing ovation when introduced during last weeks luncheon. It is these very Lance Corporals, Corporals and Sergeants who are almost daily listed among the casualties. My son, * * *, remarked that listening to your speech "restored his faith in the republic". Thank you again for recognizing their service.

HONORING THE LAJKONIK SONG AND DANCE ENSEMBLE

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the thousands of Polish-American constituents residing in the 5th District of Illinois, I rise today in recognition of the 20th Anniversary of the Lajkonik Song and Dance Ensemble. For 20 successful years, the Lajkonik Song and Dance Ensemble has promoted Polish folk culture and history to constituents of Polish and non-Polish decent alike.

Founded in 1991—under patronage of the Polish National Alliance Group 3241, and belonging to the Holy Trinity Polish Mission—Lajkonik has had the opportunity to flourish to an influential organization and cultural asset to the City of Chicago.

The Lajkonik Ensemble has performed in various locations in Chicago; some include the Chicago Cultural Center, Taste of Chicago, Daley Plaza, Chicago Public Libraries and Millennium Park, among others. Additionally, Lajkonik has traveled the Midwest and also represented the Chicago Polish Community at the International Folk Dance Festival in Rzeszów, Poland on four occasions.

Though the event focuses on Polish traditions, Lajkonik also reaches out to the American population to promote and encourage all people to learn about Polish culture, to support and appreciate it. The performances consist of different Polish regional folk songs, dances and colorful authentic Polish costumes.

Sunday, May 29th, 2011 marks the 20th Anniversary of the Lajkonik Song and Dance Ensemble. All the community support and time volunteered by numerous individuals have made two decades possible and hopefully many more anniversaries to come. The 20th Anniversary celebration will be held at the Copernicus Cultural and Civic Center consisting of hundreds of children performing in a Gala Concert displaying regional costumes, folk dances, songs, and other performances.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize this exciting day on behalf of my 110,000 Polish

American constituents. I congratulate all those who contributed their time and passion of preserving the Polish culture toward another successful celebration.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber yesterday. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 254 and 255 and "no" on rollcall vote 256.

RECOGNIZING KEITH LEWINGER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RE- TIREMENT FROM THE FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable public service of Keith Lewinger as he retires as General Manager of the Fallbrook Public Utilities District (PUD) of California.

After graduating from the University of Cornell in the early 70's, Mr. Lewinger worked for the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, the Irvine Ranch Water District, and the Otay Water District. Mr. Lewinger proceeded as General Manager for ten years at Otay which is one of the largest water districts in San Diego County.

In 1999 Mr. Lewinger joined the team at the Fallbrook PUD which contains approximately 8,000 water and 4,000 sewer connections. After 12 years of committed leadership, Mr. Lewinger has established a solid foundation for the Fallbrook PUD and has been instrumental in the area's resource management efforts.

Previously a member of the Governor's Recycled Water Task Force, Mr. Lewinger also represents the San Diego County Water Authority on the Metropolitan Water District Board of Southern California. Additionally, he serves on the Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA's) Board of Directors as Vice-Chair of Region 10, has been Chairman of ACWA's Water Reclamation and Reuse Committee, a member of the California and National Boards of Directors of the WaterReuse Association including President of the California Section of the WaterReuse Association, and a member of the American Water Works Association's (AWWA's) Water Reuse Committee.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Lewinger on the occasion of his retirement after nearly three decades of contributions to the resources community. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to please join me in recognizing Mr. Keith Lewinger's dedicated service to the Fallbrook Public Utilities District and the state of California.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR STRENGTHENING SAFETY STANDARDS FOR OFFSHORE BLOWOUT PREVENTERS AND EMERGENCY SHUTOFF EQUIP- MENT

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to once again to introduce the Offshore Drilling Safety Improvement Act.

As we rapidly approach the one-year anniversary of the catastrophic Deepwater Horizon oil spill, which killed 11 workers and dumped hundreds of millions of gallons of oil into the Gulf of Mexico, we must confront the fact that Congress still has yet to pass comprehensive safety reform for offshore oil drilling. A year after toxic sludge drenched the Gulf beaches, communities are still suffering from economic ramifications of the loss of tourism and fishing.

Last year, after numerous congressional hearings and months of hard work, the House passed the Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic, CLEAR, Act, a comprehensive approach to make sure American jobs and coastlines are protected. Among other beneficial improvements, the CLEAR Act included important provisions requiring better technology on blowout preventers and other commonsense safety reforms. Unfortunately, the bill did not make it through the Senate, and over the last few months the House has yet to pass similar legislation.

That is why I am once again, with bipartisan support, introducing the Offshore Drilling Safety Improvement Act. This act strengthens the standards for safety equipment on offshore oil rigs by requiring the use of the best available technology for blowout preventers and emergency shutoff equipment. It will also require the Administration to consider independent and reputable science and expertise when determining appropriate equipment. It is one vital piece of the larger, comprehensive effort to create a regulatory system that protects American jobs, coasts, and communities.

We may never know for sure what exactly caused the disastrous leak but we do know that we must work together to protect our shores and local economies from future spills. Other countries around the world require more comprehensive emergency safety equipment. It is time that, in the places we decide to drill, we are using the best safety equipment available.

A MODEL OF FEDERAL/STATE CO- OPERATION ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the most troubling inconsistencies in our political dialogue is the one in which many conservatives argue on some issues that the Federal Government must be respectful of states' rights and not intrude on the prerogatives of the States, but, on the other hand,

when any significant group of businesses is offended by regulatory actions at the State level, that one national federal standard is necessary.

This has been particularly the case in the area of financial regulation. In 2004, under President Bush, the Comptroller of the Currency—a holdover from the Clinton administration to make this somewhat bipartisan—preempted all state laws regulating the activities of national banks. This cancellation of a variety of State consumer protection laws contributed to our national crisis, because many of the States would have prohibited the kind of irresponsible loans to people who could not afford them, which contributed to our financial crisis. In the Financial Reform bill last year, we restored the status quo that existed before 2004, in which the Federal Government had the power to prevent inconsistent and excessively intrusive regulation, but did not seek to prevent the States from taking steps to protect their citizens from abuses.

In fact, sensible public policy recognizes a role for both the Federal Government and the States in this area, and I am very pleased—but not surprised—that Elizabeth Warren, on behalf of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, created a financial format, and the Presidential Initiative Working Group of that National Association of Attorneys General recently announced an agreement on principles to govern their joint activities in this area.

Mr. Speaker, as this agreement shows, consumer protection is an area where Federal and State policies can and should be coordinated to the benefit of our citizens, and the conflict that some have tried to foment between Federal and State activities in this area is based not on any commitment to federalism, but rather on a desire to hinder effective financial regulation in the service of those businesses that would prefer to work unhindered by any such rules.

Elizabeth Warren, Assistant to the President and Special Advisor to the Secretary of the Treasury on the CFPB, and North Carolina Attorney General Roy Cooper, who is President of the NAAG, in announcing this important agreement, make this point clear.

Mr. Speaker, the need for there to be Federal/State cooperation in consumer protection—and the fact that this can be done in the context of a healthy and vigorous financial system, and in the true spirit of American federalism—is not only important in itself; it provides a model for how we can work together in appropriate regulation in other areas and I ask that the statement announcing this agreement from the U.S. Treasury Department Office of Public Affairs be printed here.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: April 11, 2011
CONTACT: CFPB Public Affairs, (202) 435-7454

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVE WORKING GROUP RELEASE JOINT STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Consumer Bureau, State Attorneys General Partnership Will Help Better Protect American Consumers of Financial Products and Services from Unlawful Acts and Practices

WASHINGTON—The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) and the Presidential Initiative Working Group of the National Association of Attorneys General

(NAAG) today announced agreement on a Joint Statement of Principles, the first step in forging a new partnership between federal and state officials to protect consumers of financial products and services.

Elizabeth Warren, Assistant to the President and Special Advisor to the Secretary of the Treasury on the CFPB, highlighted the agreement in her remarks at the NAAG Presidential Initiative Summit today in Charlotte, NC.

“I anticipate that our cooperation will have a profound effect on the consumer financial markets,” Warren told state attorneys general and others gathered at the summit, according to her prepared remarks. “Together, we can pose a greater deterrent to unscrupulous financial services providers. We can protect more consumers, and we can ensure that more institutions follow the rules.”

“People are hurt every day by unfair financial products,” said North Carolina Attorney General Roy Cooper, who serves as President of the NAAG. “This agreement will put more cops on the beat to protect consumers and businesses that are doing the right thing.”

The Joint Statement of Principles was developed to advance three goals shared by the CFPB and state attorneys general to ensure protections for consumers of financial products and services: protect consumers of financial products or services from unlawful acts or practices; provide clear rules that improve the marketplace for consumers and remove unfair competition for the benefit of law-abiding businesses; and find ways to promote understanding and address concerns raised by consumers about financial products or services as efficiently and effectively as possible.

In the Joint Statement, the parties agree to:

Develop joint training programs and share information about developments in federal consumer financial law and state consumer protection laws that apply to consumer financial products or services;

Share information, data, and analysis about conduct and practices in the markets for consumer financial products or services to inform enforcement policies and priorities;

Engage in regular consultation to identify mutual enforcement priorities that will ensure effective and consistent enforcement of the laws that protect consumers of financial products or services;

Support each other, to the fullest extent permitted by law as warranted by the circumstances, in the enforcement of the laws that protect consumers of financial products or services, including by joint or coordinated investigations of wrongdoing and coordinated enforcement actions;

Pursue legal remedies to foster transparency, competition, and fairness in the markets for consumer financial products or services across state lines and without regard to corporate forms or charter choice for those providers who compete directly with one another in the same markets;

Develop a consistent and enduring framework to share information and to coordinate enforcement activities to the extent practicable and consistent with governing law;

Share, refer, and route complaints and consumer complaint information between the CFPB and the state attorneys general;

Analyze and leverage the input they receive from consumers and the public in order to advance their mutual goal of protecting consumers of financial products or services; and

Create and support technologies to enable data sharing and procedures that will support complaint cooperation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT PETER HART

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to the life and legacy of Sergeant Peter Hart, a soldier and New York City Police Officer, who served in the American Civil War.

Sergeant Hart will be remembered for valiantly leaving New York to join in the defense of Fort Sumter in January 1861. Major Robert Anderson, Commander of Fort Sumter, had served with him in the Mexican American War. As tensions between the North and South increased, Major Anderson's wife requested Sergeant Hart join the defense of Fort Sumter. Early in the morning of April 12, 1861 the first shots of the American Civil War rang out. By afternoon the shelling had knocked the American flag from the flagstaff flying over the fort. Sergeant Hart proudly retrieved the fallen flag, climbed up the flagstaff and successfully reattached it. His refusal to allow the flag to lie torn and tattered serves as a symbol of the unwavering spirit of all Americans who defend our Nation in the Civil War.

I offer my recognition of Sergeant Peter Hart on the 150th anniversary of the start of the American Civil War. Sergeant Hart's courage not only inspired the brave men at Fort Sumter. His patriotic spirit and devotion to our Nation continues to inspire Americans today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, because of business in my District yesterday my return to Washington, D.C. was delayed and therefore I was unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 254, 255 and 256.

Had I been present I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall vote No. 254; “yea” on rollcall vote No. 255; and “yea” on rollcall vote No. 256.

CONGRATULATIONS, CONGRESSWOMAN DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, ON YOUR NOMINATION AS CHAIRWOMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

HON. FREDERICA S. WILSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to congratulate my friend, colleague, housemate and homegirl—Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Last week, she was nominated by President Barack Obama as the first female Floridian to serve as the Chair of the Democratic National Committee, a highly coveted honor. For almost two decades she has done nothing short of inspire, lead, and succeed.

When I served in the Florida state legislature with her, I recognized Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ's leadership abilities early—you couldn't help but notice. Through the years, she has proven time and again that she has the ability to bridge gender, racial, religious, and party boundaries; and she has proven that she will do whatever it takes to get the job done.

We are all aware of her work on behalf of cancer survivors, her commitment to our men and women in uniform, and her passion for the poor. Her time on the House Appropriations Committee has demonstrated her zeal in advocating for these constituencies while at the same time promoting fiscal responsibility.

My praise for the Congresswoman is not just because she is a Democrat; however, nor is it just because of the honor which was recently bestowed upon her. I praise her equally for the obstacles she has overcome and the passion she displays every day here, in the halls of Congress. She represents what is best in America, and why the American political system is not broken.

She is a dedicated public servant who has represented the 20th Congressional District of Florida for more than six years, and I know that she will continue to represent all Americans in the manner they deserve well into the future.

I am honored to serve beside the new Chair of the Democratic National Committee as a fellow colleague. Florida is fortunate to have a native daughter to serve this Nation in such an admirable and elevated position. She stands as a textbook example for all elected officials and is a role model for the United States Congress. Thanks to the support of her wonderful husband, Steve and their three children, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ moves onward and upward for us all.

I wish her the best as we continue to fight for the people of Florida, for our country, and for the Democratic party.

Congratulations!

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MAY 11

MAY 25

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, April 14, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Guard and Reserve.

SD-192

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Missile Defense Agency.

SD-192

10:15 a.m.
Judiciary
Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the AT&T/T-Mobile merger.

SD-226

MAY 26

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing on the United States Central Command (CENTCOM) and United States African Command (AFRICOM).

SVC-217

MAY 12

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing on the United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM), and the United States European Command (EUCOM).

SVC-217

JUNE 15

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SD-192

MAY 17

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM) and the United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM).

SVC-217

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 4

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Department of Defense Subcommittee
To receive a closed briefing on Intel.
SVC-217

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2407–S2458

Measures Introduced: Fourteen bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 802–815, and S. Res. 144. **Page S2446**

Measures Passed:

Anniversary of the Death of the President of Poland: Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 135, remembering the 1-year anniversary of the April 10, 2010, plane crash that claimed the lives of the President of Poland Lech Kaczynski, his wife, and 94 others, while they were en route to memorialize those Polish officers, officials, and civilians who were massacred by the Soviet Union in 1940, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S2457–58**

Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, April 14, 2011 Senate proceed to a period of morning business for debate only with Senators permitted to speak for up to ten minutes each until the Senate receives the papers from the House of Representatives with respect to the following items: H.R. 1473, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011; H. Con. Res. 35, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and H. Con. Res. 36, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; that when the Senate receive the papers from the House of Representatives, Senate proceed to vote on the two concurrent resolutions and passage of the bill in the following order: H. Con. Res. 35; H. Con. Res. 36; and H.R. 1473; that there be two minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote; that there be no amendments in order to the bill or the concurrent resolutions prior to the votes; that the correcting resolutions and the bill be subject to a 60 vote threshold; that the only points of order and mo-

tions in order be budget points of order and the applicable motions to waive; provided further, that the Secretary of the Senate immediately notify the House of Representatives of the results of the Senate's action on the House measures. **Pages S2438–39**

Morning Business—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that on Thursday, April 14, 2011, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with the time until 2 p.m., equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees, with all other provisions under the previous order remaining in effect. **Page S2458**

Nomination Referral—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Committee on Finance reports the nomination of David S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Department of the Treasury, the nomination be referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. **Page S2458**

Messages from the House:

Page S2444

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Pages S2407, S2444

Executive Communications:

Pages S2444–45

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S2445–46

Executive Reports of Committees:

Page S2446

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S2446–48

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S2448–54

Additional Statements:

Pages S2442–44

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S2454–56

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S2456–57

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S2457

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:41 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 14, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2458.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense received a closed briefing on the proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 United States Pacific Command (PACOM), after receiving testimony from Admiral Robert F. Willard, USN, Commander, United States Pacific Command.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2012 for the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General Robert L. Van Antwerp, Commanding General, United States Army Corps of Engineers, and Jo-Ellen Darcy, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, both of the Department of Defense; and Michael L. Connor, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, and Anne Castle, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, both of the Department of the Interior.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Senator Nelson (FL); Sergeant Major of the Army Raymond F. Chandler III, USA, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy Rick D. West, USN, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps Carlton W. Kent, USMC, and Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force James A. Roy, USAF, all of the Department of Defense; Master Chief Joseph L. Barnes, USN (Ret.), Fleet Reserve Association, Captain Ike Puzon, USN (Ret.), Association of the United States Navy, and Kathleen B. Moakler, National Military Family Association, all of Alexandria, Virginia; Colonel Steven P. Strobridge, USAF (Ret.), Military Officers Association of America, Washington, D.C.; and Kathy Roth-Douquet, Blue Star Families, Falls Church, Virginia.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine ballistic missile defense policies and programs in review of

the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2012 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Bradley H. Roberts, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy, Lieutenant General Patrick J. O'Reilly, USA, Director, Missile Defense Agency, and Rear Admiral Archer M. Macy, Jr., USN, Director, Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Organization, Joint Staff, all of the Department of Defense; and Christina T. Chaplain, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request and oversight for fiscal year 2012 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), after receiving testimony from Jane Lubchenco, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, and Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

DOMESTIC RENEWABLE FUELS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine domestic renewable fuels, focusing on ethanol and advanced biofuels, after receiving testimony from Thomas Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture; Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Henry Kelly, Acting Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Michael J. McAdams, Advanced Biofuels Association (ABFA), and Scott Faber, Grocery Manufacturers Association, both of Washington, D.C.; Jan Koninckx, DuPont Applied BioSciences, Wilmington, Delaware; Kris Kiser, The Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Alexandria, Virginia; and Brooke Coleman, Advanced Ethanol Council, Boston, Massachusetts.

DEFICIT REDUCTION

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine perspectives on deficit reduction, after receiving testimony from J.D. Foster, Heritage Foundation, Washington, D.C.; David M. Walker, former Comptroller General of the United States, Bridgeport, Connecticut, on behalf of the Comeback America Initiative; and Alan S. Blinder, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine international development policy priorities in the fiscal year 2012 budget, after receiving testimony from Rajiv Shah, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development; and Daniel W. Yohannes, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 679, to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 300, to prevent abuse of Government charge cards;

S. 498, to ensure objective, independent review of task and delivery orders, with an amendment;

S. 762, to improve the Federal Acquisition Institute;

S. 191, to direct the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a study on emergency communications, with an amendment;

S. Res. 128, expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 1 through 7, 2011; and

The nomination of Rafael Borrás, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Management.

SUPPORTING VICTIMS OF CRIME

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine fulfilling our commitment to support victims of crime, after receiving testimony from Mary Lou Leary, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice; Kent Burbank, Pima County Attorney's Office, Tucson, Arizona; and Margaret Garvin, National Crime Victim Law Institute, Portland, Oregon.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Henry F. Floyd, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, who was introduced by Representative Clyburn, Nelva Gonzales Ramos, to

be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, who was introduced by Senator Hutchison, Richard Brooke Jackson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, who was introduced by Senators Udall (CO) and Bennet, Sara Lynn Darrow, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, and Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, who was introduced by Senator Brown (MA), after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine veterans' employment, focusing on improving the transition from the battlefield to the workforce, after receiving testimony from Raymond M. Jefferson, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training; John Berry, Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management; John R. Campbell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Wounded Warrior Care and Transition Policy; Garrett Reppenhagen, Veterans Green Jobs, Denver, Colorado; Eric Smith, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Baltimore, Maryland; T. L. McCreary, Military.com, and Michael L. Yauger, The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, both of Washington, D.C.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL DEVICE APPROVAL PROCESS REFORM

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the reform of the medical device approval process, focusing on premarket review and postmarket safety efforts, after receiving testimony from Marcia Crosse, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; William Maisel, Deputy Center Director for Science, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Diana Zuckerman, National Research Center for Women and Families, and David Nexon, Advanced Medical Technology Association (AdvaMed), both of Washington, D.C.; Frederic S. Resnic, Harvard Medical School Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts; Ralph F. Hall, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis; and Katherine Korgaokar, Denver, Colorado.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 28 public bills, H.R. 1504–1531; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 39–41 were introduced. **Pages H2664–65**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2666–67**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H. Res. 218, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1473) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 35) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473 (H. Rept. 112–60 Pt. 2) and

H. Res. 223, providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 (H. Rept. 112–62). **Page H2664**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Woodall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2607**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:58 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2613**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Dr. Jack Graham, Prestonwood Baptist Church, Plano, Texas. **Page H2613**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H2613, H2633**

Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to the rule that is providing for consideration of H.R. 1473, making appropriations for the Department of Defense and the other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011; providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 35, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473; and providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 36, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 260, after the previous question was

ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 259. **Pages H2616–24, H2632–33**

A point of order raised by Representative Weiner on the content of the measure was overruled by the Chair. **Page H2617**

Repealing the Prevention and Public Health Fund: The House passed H.R. 1217, to repeal the Prevention and Public Health Fund, by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 264.

Pages H2624–32, H2633–47

Rejected the Loeb sack motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 189 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 263. **Pages H2645–46**

Agreed to:

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 112–61) that requires the Department of Health and Human Services to post on its website a notice of rescission of unobligated Section 4002 funds and the amount rescinded. **Pages H2640–42**

Rejected:

Castor (FL) amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 112–61) that sought to require the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of the impact funds awarded through the Prevention and Public Health Fund would have on preventing chronic diseases and promoting health (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 237 noes, Roll No. 261) and

Pages H2642–43, H2644–45

Castor (FL) amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 112–61) that sought to require the U.S. Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of the economic impact funds awarded through the Prevention and Public Health Fund would have on states and communities (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 262).

Pages H2643–44, H2645

H. Res. 219, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 237 yeas to 180 nays, Roll No. 258, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 257. **Pages H2624–32**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, April 14th, for morning hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business. **Page H2660**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2631, H2631–32, H2632–33, H2633, H2644, H2645, H2646–47, H2647. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

IMPLEMENTING DODD-FRANK: A REVIEW OF THE CFTC'S RULEMAKING PROCESS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing on Implementing Dodd-Frank: A Review of the CFTC's Rulemaking Process. Testimony was heard from Dan M. Berkovitz, General Counsel, Commodity Futures Trading Commission; and public witnesses.

STATE OF THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry held a hearing on the state of the poultry industry. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

DEFENSE ACQUISITION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Defense Acquisition. Testimony was heard from Ashton Carter, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

MEMBERS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies, Members Day hearing. Testimony was heard from Members of the 112th Congress.

EXAMINING FRAGMENTATION AND OVERLAP OF FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies held a hearing on Examining Fragmentation and Overlap of Federal Education Programs. Testimony was heard from George Scott, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, GAO.

GUANTANAMO DETAINEE TRANSFER POLICY AND RECIDIVISM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Guantanamo detainee transfer policy and recidivism. Testimony was heard from William K. Lietzau, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Detainee Policy, Department of Defense; Daniel Fried, Ambassador, Special Envoy for the Closure of the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility, Department of State; Ed Mornston, Director, Joint Intelligence Task Force, Combating Terrorism Directorate for Analysis, Defense Intelligence Agency; Corin Stone, Deputy Assistant Director of National Intelligence for Policy

and Strategy, Intelligence Community Information Sharing Executive, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and Brad Wiegmann, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, Department of Justice.

FY 2012 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, BASE CLOSURE, ENVIRONMENT, FACILITIES OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on the fiscal year 2012 national defense authorization budget request for military construction, base closure, environment, facilities operation and maintenance. Testimony was heard from Dorothy Robyn, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Installations and Environment; Katherine Hammack, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Installations, Energy and Environment; Jackalyn Pfannenstiel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Energy, Installations and Environment; and Terry Yonkers, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Installations, Environment and Logistic.

JOBS AND ENERGY PERMITTING ACT OF 2011

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011 legislation. Testimony was heard from Sen. Murkowski; Sen. Begich; Rep. Young; Dan Sullivan, Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources, Alaska; and public witnesses.

STATUS OF FDA'S SCREENING EFFORTS AT THE BORDER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Government Reform held a hearing entitled "Import Safety: Status of FDA's Screening Efforts at the Border." Testimony was heard from Margaret A. Hamburg, M.D., Commissioner, FDA.

PRIORITIES FOR U.S. ASSISTANCE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a hearing on Priorities for U.S. Assistance in the Western Hemisphere. Testimony was heard from Arturo Valenzuela, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; and Mark Feierstein, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

CRISIS IN COTE D'IVOIRE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNTRY AND REGION; AND MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, and Human Rights held a hearing on Crisis in Cote d'Ivoire: Implications for the Country and Region. Testimony was heard from William Fitzgerald, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State. The hearing was followed by a markup of the following: H.R. 515, Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011; and H. Res. 85, supporting the democratic aspirations of the Ivoirian people and calling on the United States to apply intense diplomatic pressure and provide humanitarian support in response to the political crisis in Cote d'Ivoire. Both were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

POLITICAL TRANSITIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia held a hearing on Shifting Sands: Political Transitions in the Middle East, Part 1. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TAKING MEASURE OF COUNTERMEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications held a hearing entitled "Taking Measure of Countermeasures (Part 1): A review of government and industry efforts to protect the homeland through accelerated research, development, and acquisition of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear medical countermeasures." Testimony was heard from Cynthia Bascetta, Managing Director, Health Care, GAO; Segaran P. Pillai, Chief Medical and Science Advisor, Chemical and Biological Division, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Richard J. Hatchett, Chief Medical Officer and Deputy Director, Strategic Sciences and Management, Department of Health and Human Services; Gerald W. Parker, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Chemical and Biological Defense, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

H-2A VISA PROGRAM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement held a hearing on the H-2A Visa Program: Meeting the Growing Needs of American Agriculture. Testimony was heard from Jane Oates, Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS ACTIVITY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2011

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on legislation on the Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2011. Testimony was heard from Rep. Goodlatte; Rep. Scott of Virginia; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup. The following were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1229, Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act; H.R. 1230, Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, was ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1231, Reversing President Obama's Offshore Moratorium Act; and

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup. The following were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 828, Federal Employee Tax Accountability Act of 2011; H.R. 829, Contracting and Tax Accountability Act of 2011; and H.R. 1470, to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the probationary period applicable to appointments in the civil service, and for other purposes. The following was ordered reported without amendment: H.R. 1423, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 115 4th Avenue Southwest in Ardmore, Oklahoma, as the "Specialist Micheal E. Phillips Post Office".

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and Labor Policy held a hearing entitled "Federal Employees' Compensation Act: A Fair Approach?" Testimony was heard from Gary Steinberg, Acting Director, Office of Workers Compensation, Department of Labor; Bill Siemer, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, U.S. Postal Service; and public witnesses.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a structure rule for consideration of H. Con. Res. 34, concurrent resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021.

The rule provides four hours of general debate with three hours confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the

Budget and one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Rep. Brady (TX) and Rep. Hinchey (NY) or their designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution. The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the Rules Committee report as an original concurrent resolution for purpose of amendment, and provides that such amendment shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report.

The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the report, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report, except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of amendments. The rule provides, upon the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, for a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule permits the Chairman of the Budget Committee to offer amendments in the House pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. Finally, the rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption. Testimony was heard by Chairman Ryan of Wisconsin, Representatives Garrett, Van Hollen, Honda, Moore, Tonko, Cooper, Scott of Virginia, Woolsey, Fattah, Lee of California, Grijalva, and Cleaver.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation held a markup on H.R. 1425, Creating Jobs Through Small Business Innovation Act of 2011. The bill was forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

GREEN JOBS AND RED TAPE

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing on Green Jobs and Red Tape: Assessing Federal Efforts to Encourage Employment. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOW TAX COMPLEXITY HINDERS SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing on How Tax Complexity Hinders Small Businesses: The Impact on Job Creation and Economic Growth. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPROVING AND STREAMLINING THE COAST GUARD'S ACQUISITION PROGRAM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing on Improving and Streamlining the Coast Guard's Acquisition Program. Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral John Currier, Deputy Commandant for Mission Support, USCG; and John P. Hutton, Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management, GAO.

CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING PRACTICES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Inspect What You Expect: Construction Contracting Practices at the Department of Veterans Affairs". Testimony was heard from the following Department of Veterans' Affairs officials: Belinda J. Finn, Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Evaluations, Office of Inspector General; and Cherie Palmer, Audit Director, Chicago Audit Operations Division, Office of Inspector General.

SPECIAL BURDENS THAT THE TAX CODE IMPOSES ON INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYERS AND FAMILIES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing on the special burdens that the tax code imposes on individual taxpayers and families and on the need for comprehensive tax reform to address these problems. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ROLE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS IN IDENTITY THEFT AND OPTIONS TO GUARD THEIR PRIVACY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on the role of Social Security numbers in identity theft and options to guard their privacy. Testimony was heard from Patrick P. O'Carroll Jr., Inspector General, Social Security Administration; Maneesha Mithal, Associate Director of the Division of Privacy and Identity Protection, Federal Trade Commission; and Theresa L. Gruber, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Office of Operations, Social Security Administration.

MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Terrorism, HUMINT, Analysis, and Counterintelligence held a hearing on Muslim Brotherhood. Testimony was heard from departmental officials.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
APRIL 14, 2011**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Commerce, 10 a.m., SD-192.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Army and the Department of Air Force, 2 p.m., SD-124.

Committee on Environment and Public Works, to hold hearings to examine issues for surface transportation authorization, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance, business meeting to consider the nominations of Jenni Rane LeCompte, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary, and David S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, both of the Department of the Treasury, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on African Affairs, to hold hearings to examine assessing the fiscal year 2012 budget for Africa, 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings to examine Federal regulation, focusing on how to best advance the public interest, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Indian Affairs, to hold hearings to examine S. 636, to provide the Quileute Indian Tribe Tsunami and Flood Protection, S. 703, to amend the Long-Term Leasing Act, and S. 546, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, 2:15 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting to consider S. 350, to require restitution for victims of criminal violations of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, S. 623, to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, and the nominations of Bernice Bouie Donald, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, and Virginia A. Seitz, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, and Denise Ellen O'Donnell, of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice As-

sistance, both of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, and Credit, hearing on credit conditions in rural America, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, Public Witness Days, 9:30 a.m., B-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol. This is a closed hearing.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, hearing on U.S. Supreme Court—FY 2012 Budget, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, hearing on Department of Labor Enforcement Programs, 10 a.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies, Public Witness Day, 10:30 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing to receive testimony from Members on their national defense priorities for the fiscal year 2012 national defense authorization bill, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on accountability at Arlington National Cemetery, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Examining the Department of Labor's Implementation of the Davis-Bacon Act, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing "Warning: The Growing Danger of Prescription Drug Diversion," 8 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, hearing on H.R. 1391, the Recycling Coal Combustion Residuals Accessibility Act of 2011, 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled "Understanding the Implications and Consequences of the Proposed Rule on Risk Retention," 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Oversight of the Financial Stability Oversight Council," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1016, Assessing Progress in Haiti Act; H.R. 1280, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require congressional approval of agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation with foreign countries, and for other purposes; H.R. 515, Belarus Democracy Reauthorization Act of 2011; and H.R. 1326, Furthering International Nuclear Safety Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade, hearing on the State Department's Counterterrorism Office: Budget, Reorganization, Policies, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia, hearing on Budget Oversight: Examining the President's 2012 Budget Request for Europe and Eurasia, 2:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn. Testimony was heard from Daniel Rosenblum, Coordinator of U.S. Assistance to Europe and Eurasia, Bureau of Central and South Asian Affairs, Department of State; Susan Elliot, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Department of State; Paige Alexander, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Europe and Eurasia, U.S. Agency for International Development; and Nisha Biswal, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia, U.S. Agency for International Development.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection and Security Technologies, markup on H.R. 901, the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Security Authorization Act of 2011, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Elections, hearing on H.R. 672, to terminate the Election Assistance Commission, and for other purposes, 10:30 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, April 14, full Committee, markup on H.R. 1249, the America Invents Act, 10:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled "State and Municipal Debt: Tough Choices Ahead", 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, Homeland Defense and Foreign Operations, hearing entitled "Tsunami

Warning, Preparedness, and Interagency Cooperation: Lessons Learned." 1:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health Care, District of Columbia, Census and the National Archives, hearing entitled "Pathway to FDA Medical Device Approval: Is there a Better Way?" 1:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, hearing on Nanotechnology: Oversight of the National Nanotechnology Initiative and Priorities for the Future, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, hearing entitled "Drilling for a Solution: Finding Ways to Curtail the Crushing Effect of High Gas Prices on Small Business," 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing entitled "Richard H. Poff Federal Building Renovation: Is it Costing the Taxpayer Too Much?" 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing on Biometric IDs for Pilots and Transportation Workers: Diary of Failures, 9 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on the Social Security Administration's (SSA's) role in verifying employment eligibility, 2 p.m., B-318 Rayburn.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, April 14, Full Committee, hearing on FY 2012 Budget—Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice, 10 a.m., HVC-304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, April 14

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, April 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will be in a period of morning business, with the time until 2 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees; following which, when the Senate receives papers from the House of Representatives, with respect to the continuing resolution and two correcting resolutions, Senate will proceed to 3 rollcall votes.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 1473—Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, H. Con. Res. 35—Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473, and H. Con. Res. 36—Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473 (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H. Con. Res. 34—Establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E703
 Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E703
 Burton, Dan, Ind., E712
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E705
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E706
 Frank, Barney, Mass., E710

Gutierrez, Luis V., Ill., E710
 Inslee, Jay, Wash., E710
 Israel, Steve, N.Y., E704, E711
 Issa, Darrell E., Calif., E707, E710
 Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E705
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E703, E705, E706, E707
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E706
 Moore, Gwen, Wis., E703

Peters, Gary C., Mich., E704
 Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E706
 Quigley, Mike, Ill., E710
 Richardson, Laura, Calif., E704
 Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E703
 Smith, Adam, Wash., E707
 Wilson, Frederica S., Fla., E711
 Wolf, Frank R., Va., E707



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.gdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.