



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2011

No. 11

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Your wisdom is profound beyond our grasp and Your love penetrates all You create to reveal Your infinite beauty in everything and to everyone.

Bless the House of Representatives, its Members, and all who work here serving the people of this Nation. May the vision of righteousness, where justice and peace reign and where truth and true patriotism are standard, remain the constant guide in the daily labor to enact just laws and clear policies.

Gracious God, in truth we recognize that our own insights and powers are not able to right all the wrongs or find the paths to peace and reconciliation. So we turn to You, all powerful Lord, and place our trust in Your faithfulness, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SLAUGHTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five 1-minute speeches from each side.

HOPE VS. REALITY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech last night was long on hope and short on reality.

The administration's answer to America's problems is more investments, which is a fancy word for more spending and more government control.

The administration plans to freeze domestic spending, but domestic spending is already too high. Since last year the national debt has gone up over \$1.7 trillion.

Once again, the administration presents an incomplete solution to America's economic problems: A spending freeze is not enough to fix the deficits or the debt. We must go one step further and actually cut massive out-of-control government spending to get us out of this spending madness.

If we cut spending, then we need to also cut taxes. Putting money back in the hands of the American people is the proven way to stimulate the economy. We must cut both taxes and spending to reboot the American economy. We need less spending, fewer taxes, and less government. Congress needs to deal in reality, not hope.

And that's just the way it is.

UNEMPLOYMENT

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the President gave a great speech

last night. In it he mentioned the word "jobs" 31 times; he used the word "innovate" 11 times. But he didn't mention the word "unemployment" a single time.

That's because creating jobs is different than ending unemployment. In America capitalism and entrepreneurship have created great things and great wealth. To name a few, the automobile, the personal computer, the airplane. It is my hope that the cure for cancer will come from an enterprising entrepreneur.

But there is one persistent problem that innovation has not solved: unemployment. As FDR said, "Necessitous men are not free men."

So I challenge our leading innovators to help find a way to eliminate unemployment, since Democrats and Republicans have run out of ideas.

Mr. Gates, Mr. Buffett, Mr. Zuckerman, Mr. Immelt, Mr. Mulally: Put your organizational genius, your job-creating skills to use so that our Nation can be free from the threat of unemployment. But don't give us ideas that have been tried before, because none of them have eliminated unemployment.

Our task as leaders should be to end the scourge of unemployment once and for all so that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness can really be available to all Americans.

IRANIAN CHRISTIANS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on an early morning last month, over 70 Christians in Iran were suddenly arrested and detained by the Iranian authorities. As these Iranian Christians were taken to a notorious Tehran prison, one married couple was forced to leave a 2-year-old child behind. Another mother was taken while breast-feeding her baby.

□ 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.

H473

Eleven were released after hours of harsh interrogation. The fate of the others remains unknown. According to some reports they are suffering through sleep deprivation and blindfolded interrogations. They are likely to face charges of proselytizing, a death penalty offense in Iran.

The peaceful worship of these Christians poses no threat to the Iranian Government, and the government's persistence in accusing its own population of being enemies does nothing to strengthen the regime.

We stand with these oppressed Christians and other religious minorities in Iran that face constant harassment and potential prosecution. Most of all, we call on the Iranian Government to release those prisoners so they can raise their families and peacefully practice their faith.

Mr. Speaker, why would a government that claims to be so powerful be afraid or threatened by such a small, peaceful minority?

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DOCK BROWN

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a community giant, Mr. Dock M. Brown, a very special friend who passed away yesterday.

As a lifelong resident of Weldon, North Carolina, Dock Brown was an undeniable force who dedicated his 81 years to serving his community and as a champion for education. Dock Brown was a veteran of the Korean War, teacher, principal, county and town commissioner, a State legislator, 50-year deacon at First Baptist Church in Weldon, and much more.

He was a true public servant with a legacy that will live on through the many people he inspired over the years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and work of Dock Monteria Brown and to join me in praying for his wife, Helen, and his entire family and community during these difficult times.

SAFETY OF OUR SHORELINES

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a gulf coast district in Florida; so the safety of our coastlines is critical—it's of the utmost importance to me.

I am troubled that Cuba is moving ahead with plans to drill oil 50 miles off Florida's coast. Florida doesn't allow drilling within 125 miles of our shores; so why in the world would we allow Cuba to drill even closer?

Cuba's rig, built by the Chinese, would even drill deeper than BP's rig that exploded a year ago. And if there was a spill, they claim it would only take 3 days to get to our shores.

Whose problem does it become then? Let me guess, America's problem.

I have introduced legislation to stop this project. I hope my colleagues from both sides will join me in this effort to protect our coast.

TRIBUTE TO JACK LALANNE

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a truly remarkable constituent of mine, Mr. Jack LaLanne, who passed away this past Sunday.

Known as the godfather of fitness, Mr. LaLanne opened his health club in Oakland in 1936. For over 30 years, he starred in "The Jack LaLanne Show," encouraging all Americans to eat healthier and to exercise.

Today, as our country faces an epidemic of obesity, we know that Jack LaLanne's emphasis on physical fitness and healthy eating made him a man truly ahead of his time.

In addition, he accomplished many remarkable feats over the course of his life, such as swimming handcuffed from Alcatraz to Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco in 1955, completing 1,033 pushups in 23 minutes on TV in 1956, and swimming the Golden Gate Channel towing a 2,500-pound cabin cruiser in 1957.

Jack LaLanne used to say, "I can't afford to die; it would wreck my image." But I think we can all agree that his image is intact and his influence on our Nation's health will continue for years to come.

He is survived by his wife of over 50 years, Elaine, and 3 children: Dan, Yvonne, and Jon.

Thank you, Jack LaLanne, for all you have done for the health of this country.

□ 1010

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a grassroots movement that is currently taking place all across our great Nation, the celebration of National School Choice Week. In many States across the country, events are being held to promote school choice as a commonsense idea that gives every parent the power and freedom to choose what's best for their children's education.

Here in Washington, D.C. we've seen the positive impact of injecting free-market principles into the educational system. While the previous Congress chose to decide against innovation, I sincerely hope this new Congress will see fit to remember that every child is

important and that every child learns differently.

Across this Nation, we are seeing proposals for school choice expansion in places like Wisconsin, Florida, Georgia, Indiana and others. In my home State of South Carolina, I'm pleased to see that legislators in both chambers and on both sides of the aisle have introduced a bill that would give opportunity to all children in South Carolina to attend the school of their choice.

It is imperative that we empower parents with the ability to choose the best educational experience for their child, whether it is public, charter, private, or home school.

May God bless our children, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

CONGRESS ON YOUR CORNER

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, less than 3 weeks ago, a horrible tragedy in Arizona gave our Nation pause. All Americans were horrified at the news that Congresswoman GABBY Giffords, her staff, and constituents were shot in an appalling act of violence. Six people lost their lives that day. Even more were hurt. And our friend GABBY now faces a long road to recovery.

But some good came out of all of that horror. Ordinary Americans risked their lives to help those in need. Violence was denounced from the left and from the right. And Members of Congress pledged to not let this tragedy keep them from meeting with their constituents.

To honor GABBY, the other Tucson victims, and our great democracy, I have introduced a resolution today that designates the first Saturday in January as "National Congress on Your Corner Day."

We cannot allow one single gunman to alter our representative form of government. In that spirit, I will be holding a Congress on Your Corner in my district this weekend. And I know that when GABBY is fully recovered, she will do the same.

To honor all those affected by the Tucson tragedy, I urge support of this resolution.

SUPPORTING FREE AND OPEN ELECTIONS

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last night, President Obama said that the U.S. stands with the people of Tunisia and supports the democratic aspirations of the people. That has not always been true, however. We've stood for far too long with the undemocratic and the dictatorial

Ben Ali, the President of Tunisia. And it is time that we stand, as the President said, with the people of Tunisia now and support their democratic aspirations.

The U.S. gets another chance to stand with the democratic aspirations of another people, the people of Egypt, against the autocratic, dictatorial, and undemocratic leadership of Hosni Mubarak. For too long, the U.S. has stood against the people of Egypt seeking a more democratic country and a more democratic government. Every election has been rigged by the Mubarak government, and the state emergency power laws have been extended so that people would be rounded up so his viable opponents would be thrown into jail and political parties would be outlawed.

The time has come to stop this. The time has come for the United States to tell the Mubarak government that this election has to be free and open. The sole purpose of the election cannot be to pass on a great country to the son of the current leader in spite of the democratic aspirations of the Egyptian people.

REDUCE FEDERAL SPENDING

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, "we have to confront the fact that our government spends more than it takes in. That is not sustainable. Every day, families sacrifice to live within their means. They deserve a government that does the same."

Those are the words that were stated less than 24 hours ago, at 9 o'clock last night, by the President of the United States. And I have to say that truer words have never been spoken.

Mr. Speaker, when Ms. FOXX calls up this rule, we will be proceeding with the first modified open rule for debate in 4 years, and we will be putting ourselves on a path towards reducing the size, scope, and reach of government so that we will send a signal out there that job creation and economic growth can finally, finally get moving.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 359, ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 54 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 54

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. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by termi-

nating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed five hours. 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 portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read. 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 (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. 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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 54 provides for a modified open rule for consideration of H.R. 359, which is a bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns and party conventions.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to stand before you in a House dominated by new a Republican majority focused on changing the direction from the failed liberal policies that have dominated Washington for the past 4 years. Although there remains some obstacles to realizing the full breadth of a Republican agenda so desperately needed to pull our economy out of the doldrums, it is indeed a new day.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 359, legislation authored by my friend, Mr. COLE, that I have cosponsored as it represents a small step towards a brighter future for our country. Instead of considering legislation providing perpetual spending increases as the solution for all that ails us, in a departure from Washington

groupthink, H.R. 359 would actually reduce Federal spending, Mr. Speaker.

Although this concept may be foreign to many liberals and many Washington Beltway insiders, it's what the Americans expect out of the new Republican majority they recently sent to represent them here in the people's House. Instead, H.R. 359, which CBO estimates would save \$617 million over 10 years, eliminates an expensive Federal program that wastes taxpayer money funding Presidential campaigns and national party conventions.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the proposed rule to H.R. 359 to terminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the ability for taxpayers to designate \$3 of their Federal tax liability for financing of Presidential election campaign.

This week, Republicans have engaged in what amounts to a shifty attack on a program that successfully limited the influence of corporations and special interests in our Presidential campaigns, tilting the playing field further in favor of multimillionaires who can, and often do, spend their own money.

Just as poll taxes and literacy tests prevented poor people and minorities from voting, eliminating this program will place those without the multimillion-dollar political clout yet another step away from having their day in a Presidential race.

□ 1020

This program allows every taxpaying American to voluntarily check a box—and I think I should reiterate here the individual "opts in" to this program—on their 1040 to put \$3 in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. A married couple has the option of \$6 if filing jointly.

Checking the "yes" box does not increase the amount of taxes an individual owes, nor does it decrease any refund to which he or she is entitled.

In establishing the checkoff program, Congress left the single most important decision to the taxpayer. The taxpayer, not the House Republican leadership, decides whether he or she wants \$3 of their taxes to be used for the Presidential funding program. The choice is theirs to voluntarily check "yes" or "no." And I might add, during our hearing in the Rules Committee yesterday, several of us, including some of my Republican colleagues, indicated that they had at one time or another participated in this program. And yet now they want to eliminate it. Yes, this program does need improvement, but it is far from ineffective or obsolete.

Since the fund's inception in 1976, every Presidential candidate before 2008 has used the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in the general election,

and Republicans' own 2008 Presidential candidate, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, used it to fund his election.

During the 2008 election cycle, nearly \$17 million of public funds were spent for the Republican convention, and an equivalent amount for Democrats; \$84 million to Republicans for general election grants; and a total of \$18 million for primary matching funds for parties' candidate nominations.

House Republican leaders have promised to bring reform and accountability to Congress, and I quote from the Republican Pledge to America: "We are fighting to bring much-needed sunlight to the process." Is this the kind of reform and sunlight that you pledge to the American people?

YouCut gives Americans a choice? Really? A Web site where you only have the opportunity to vote "yes" for cutting—that is, either you support the Republican agenda, or we do not care what you think. A Web site where saying "yes" to meaningful programs, such as the National Endowment For the Arts, Legal Services Corporation, the Community Development Program, and a fund that was created specifically to empower Presidential candidates to participate in the political system regardless of their socioeconomic status or their relationship with special interest influence, is not welcome.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: A more fitting name for the "YouCut" program would be "CutYou" because it hurts everyday Americans while doing little to cut the Federal deficit.

Simply put, YouCut undercuts our democracy. The summary's headline for the legislation we are considering today is: End the Presidential Election Fund—Savings of \$520 million over 10 years.

The biased paragraph goes on to say: "In short, it provides taxpayer subsidies to political candidates and parties." Not only are the summaries provided on YouCut inaccurate, they are written to elicit a specific response.

We know that use of the fund has declined in recent years. President Obama was the first candidate since the fund's inception to opt out of the public financing in the general election, and other candidates have opted out of public financing in primary elections. If candidates from major parties continue to decline public financing, then the savings from eliminating the fund could and likely will be substantially lower.

Confusing YouCut voters with one-sided jargon and eliminating programs like the Presidential Election Campaign Fund are not the answers; fixing the public financing system and paying attention to what the American people really want are the answers.

What Republicans fail to mention is that the YouCut program is inherently selective, and therefore biased. Neither online nor cell phone voters are able to vote to save a program rather than cut

it. Furthermore, the YouCut program conveniently targets only those who have Internet access and cell phones, which disproportionately leaves out a lot of the poor and elderly. The last time I checked, an undisclosed number of votes on a partisan Web site does not constitute the will of the American people.

Republicans seem to think that this online gimmick is an effective substitute for good governance. Now, the Republicans have promised over and over again that the 112th Congress would be a new wave of accountability and transparency. And yet this, like every other major bill that has been considered thus far, is lacking in both. The Republican leadership has held no hearings or markups, failed to consider alternatives, and crafted a bill so narrow that very few amendments can even be considered germane.

Mr. Speaker, this bill eliminates rather than repairs the Presidential public financing system, which is, in my judgment, irresponsible and will move our Nation in the wrong direction. I suggest that the next campaign more than likely on either side, Republican or Democrat, will cost as much as \$1 billion each.

The House Republican leadership has touted that they are going to change the permissive culture of Congress. Today's consideration of this legislation is evidence that the only thing House Republicans want to do is glorify the permissive culture of their own party.

I urge my colleagues to instead focus on repairing the system and maintain the focus on increasing the roles of average citizens in our Presidential election process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chair of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend from Grandfather Community for doing her typically wonderful job of managing the rule. I also want to say to my friend from Fort Lauderdale that I appreciate his thoughtful remarks. I am somewhat dumbfounded, though, that for the first time since April 8, 2008—it has been 4 years, April 4, 2008, it was a beach bill that was being considered here—we had a modified open rule. We now are going to allow Members of this House to engage in a free-flowing debate. Our Rules Committee colleague, Mr. POLIS, came up to me last night right before the State of the Union message saying that he was looking forward to offering an amendment that he told me he submitted for the RECORD last night. So we are going to, for the first time in a long time, allow for free-flowing debate. So I can understand why my friend might want to oppose the under-

lying legislation. I disagree with him, but I can't understand why in the world they would conceive of opposing for the first time since April 8, 2008, having the kind of free-flowing debate that both Democrats and Republicans and the American people deserve to see their representatives have in this institution.

And what is this legislation all about? This legislation is all about job creation and economic growth. Job creation and economic growth. And one might say, when you are talking about the Presidential checkoff, how is that about job creation and economic growth?

Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. Last night the President time and time again talked about the importance of creating jobs. And as I said during my 1-minute presentation here, the President made it very clear that we need to make sure that we live within our means. Now, what is it that living within our means will do?

□ 1030

We need to send a message to those potential job creators out there that the United States Government is getting its fiscal house in order so that there can be a level of confidence for those businesses to create jobs. Right now, when you look at the fact that we have this \$14 trillion debt, when you look at the fact that we have deficits as far as the eye can see, it's not sending a very positive signal for those people who want to create jobs.

So you ask, Why is it we're taking on a new program like this? Well, the new estimate has it from \$520 million to \$617 million. This is based on the new estimates.

Now, is it a small amount of money? Of course it's a small amount of money.

Why is this chosen? Well, I think that there is a reason. It's the fact that it has failed.

President Obama chose to cast aside and not utilize this system when he was running for President, and JOHN MCCAIN did use it, as my friend from Fort Lauderdale said in the Rules Committee yesterday. We've already had the President of the United States announce that his plan is to raise \$1 billion for his reelection campaign. That would lead me to conclude that President Obama, assuming he runs for reelection, is not planning to use this fund.

Let's also look at the fact that, since 1980, when it was in effect, 28.7 percent of the American people utilized that checkoff; and today, about 7.3 percent—or something like that—of the American people are using that check-off system that is there.

Now, I listened to the remarks of my friend from Fort Lauderdale in which he said that the notion of getting rid of this would allow corporations to be involved in a much greater way, and he implied that there would be all kinds of corruption.

No one—no one, Mr. Speaker—is advocating that we go back to the way the campaign finance law was before 1974 and Watergate. I mean, it was a horrible, horrible time. Disclosure and accountability are very important, and we have in place today, under the Federal election law, limitations that exist. No corporate contributions are allowed to be made to Federal advocates. No corporate contributions are allowed to be made to Federal candidates.

There is the notion of somehow claiming that, by saving \$617 million, the idea of taking that amount of money off the table and allowing people to voluntarily support the candidates of their choice is somehow going to encourage greater corporate contributions. It's against the law. This does nothing to change that, and I think that it's a very specious argument to propound something other than the case here.

Mr. Speaker, I will say again we are going to have a rigorous debate on this, and Members are going to have an opportunity to participate. If Members do want to oppose the underlying legislation, I think they should be welcomed to do that, but I still find it very hard to believe that for the first time in the history of our Republic, now approaching 222 years this spring, we saw an entire Congress have not a single bill considered under an open amendment process; and while this is not an open rule—and I'm not claiming it's an open rule—it is a modified open rule that does allow for the kind of free-flowing debate that we haven't seen in a long period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with Ms. FOXX in support of this rule. Then let's have the free-flowing debate and allow, as Speaker BOEHNER regularly says, the House to work its will. Then we'll have a vote, and people can vote however they'd like at the end of the debate.

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

Mr. Speaker, that free-flowing debate consists of six preprinted amendments. Five of those amendments are not in order. So we're going to have a free-flowing debate on six matters that are offered; and if what he just said is going to give the American public the impression that we're having a free-flowing debate, then I must have missed something.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say that, obviously, this is a very positive step in the direction for allowing for that debate. If we had 100 amendments filed that were germane, we'd have the outside time limit and an opportunity for a debate to take place on those amendments.

So, again, any Member had the chance—Democrat or Republican alike—to file amendments last night so

that we could consider them on the House floor, and I think it's a great thing.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reclaim my time merely to point out that I don't consider five matters that are not in order and one that's going to be ultimately debated to be a free-flowing debate.

We'll get there. Perhaps we'll get there after we listen to my good friend, the former chair of this committee and the distinguished ranking member from New York.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

You know, it's rather ironic that we are having this debate today, because it is almost exactly 1 year from the day the Supreme Court decided the Citizens United case. That decision opened the floodgates for anonymous special interests and corporations to dump unlimited amounts of cash into our political system. Predictably, the result of this awful judgment was to set loose a torrent of secret money to influence the midterm elections this past November.

Now my Republican colleagues propose to further erode whatever protections our government has left against a state of "democracy for the highest bidder" by attempting to undo our system of Presidential public financing.

Let's remember where this system came from. It was a direct response to the Wild West—unregulated, free-wheeling campaigns that led up to the Watergate scandal. The atmosphere of that time was described by campaign finance expert Fred Wertheimer as so bad that contributors to Richard Nixon's reelection campaign were "literally flying into Washington with satchels of cash." Hidden, unregulated, private money ruled.

In response to that, Congress acted as much as it could to clean up that system, and we have done fairly well with that.

Our democracy will not be able to afford a return to that corruption, but that is what we start today with this bill. This bill will result in even more corporate and special interest money in our campaigns than we have today—and that's really saying something. We don't even know how much money comes in from foreign money.

The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is the one place in our Federal electoral system where we take some of the pressure off of candidates who otherwise have to raise bushels of private money. For the life of me, I can't see how this bill does anything other than add insult to the injury of the terrible Citizens United decision last year. This bill will also take away from American taxpayers the freedom to choose to support good government, to choose to support the public financing of campaigns.

Republicans cite the low participation rate as a reason to scrap the en-

tire program. I don't see the sense of that argument. The amount of money that goes into the Presidential Election Campaign Fund is directly proportional to how many people check the box on the tax form. Apparently, there is enough support for the program for American taxpayers to designate a projected \$617 million, since that's the number being thrown around here today, to be saved over the next 10 years. That sounds to me like enough support to keep the program around. Now, that is certainly not to say that this current system is perfect. It has not really been changed since the seventies. On the contrary, our current system is one in dire need of reform.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. As the Washington Post said yesterday in an editorial opposing this bill: We have a great need to rehab it. Let's fix it. Don't junk it.

I wholeheartedly agree.

I'd like to see an honest attempt to reform our campaign finance system to provide for openness, transparency and good government. I hope that the other side will join me in supporting such an effort. There are already two bills introduced last Congress and being circulated now that will do just that. The House's very own campaign finance policy expert, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, introduced a bill last year, H.R. 6061, the Presidential Funding Act of 2010, which would strengthen and expand the system the Republicans want to dismantle, to bring the system into line with the reality of today's campaigns and boost participation rates.

Also, H.R. 5175 in the last Congress, the DISCLOSE Act, which this House passed last year. The DISCLOSE Act would make sure we know where the money flooding our campaigns is coming from.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule, and "no" on the bill. Instead of this anti-small-d-democratic bill the Republicans have brought to the floor without any public input, without any committee hearings and markups, let's debate a serious plan to improve our campaign finance system and strengthen our democracy.

□ 1040

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to our colleagues across the aisle who are complaining about some of the proposed amendments being declared not germane that it is not the Republicans who decide whether amendments are germane or not germane; it is the Parliamentarian's office that decides that. They can do the same thing to our amendments as well as to the Democrats' amendments.

I now yield such time as he may consume to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I could not get over here to the floor fast enough when I saw this rule come up for debate, and I rise in strong support of this rule today and in strong support of the underlying legislation.

I am pleased to be joined on this day after the State of the Union not just by my colleagues but with so many young people in the gallery today, because that is exactly what this debate is about.

We've heard much talk on the floor of this House over the past week about the upcoming CBO baseline report. Well, if it arrived in your email boxes this morning like it did mine, you saw that CBO's most recent score predicts a \$6.9 trillion, 10-year operating deficit. That's not the \$14 trillion in debt that these young people are going to have to pay back, it's the actual operating deficit, the additional debt that we're going to add over the next 10 years. This proposal today is one small step towards attacking that operating deficit.

Now we're talking about big numbers here today. Somewhere between \$500 million and \$600 million will be saved with the elimination of this proposal. But folks, \$6.9 trillion is where we have to go over the next 10 years. So if you think that this underlying proposal, the public financing proposal, has some merit, I look forward to debating that when the time comes, when we get our operating deficit under control. But we don't just need to pass this provision today; we need to pass this provision and 10,000 more just like it to get to a balanced budget.

Now, I want you to think about that. All of the discussion, all of the gnashing of teeth, the handwringing about eliminating this provision today, folks, this is just the beginning. This proposal and 10,000 more just like it are what we need to pass in this House. The question isn't why are we bringing up this proposal today; the question is why don't we have three or four or five more just like it.

I look forward to joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to talk about those provisions, talk about those spending items in our budget that we can get rid of. But folks, I am absolutely certain, as the YouCut site pointed out when America voted, that public financing is one of the top 10,000 things that we can get rid of. We don't have to decide today whether this is number one of the 10,000 most wasteful programs in government or number 10,000 of the 10,000 most wasteful programs in government; we only have to decide if it's somewhere on that spectrum. I tell you that it is, and I rise in strong support of this rule.

The second reason I had to rush over here to the floor is I'm brand new. I've been in this House less than 1 month, and I'm down here speaking on a rule that offers an open amendment process.

Now, if anybody has been watching the House floor, as I have, over the past 2 years, you might wonder what an open amendment process is, and you would be right to wonder because you've never seen one. I may be a freshman in this body, but folks who came 2 years before me, the sopho-

mores in this body, they don't have any more experience in this process than I do, because this is the first open amendment process that we've seen on the floor of the House. Why are we seeing it? Because it's the right thing to do for the institution.

Speaker BOEHNER has made a point of saying the House is going to work its will. I come from a very conservative district in the northeastern suburbs of Atlanta. And I tell you, when the House works its will, we're not always going to get what we want in the northeastern suburbs of Atlanta, because the House sits kind of here in the middle, and I'm a little further over here on the right-hand side of the spectrum. But in order for this Congress to work, in order for this House to work, in order to restore the dignity of this House, we have to allow the House to work its will.

I am just so pleased, in my very first month in Congress, that we not only have seen very narrowly focused pieces of legislation come to the floor, but we're seeing them come to the floor under an open amendment process.

And let me just say one thing about that open amendment process, particularly for folks, again, who haven't seen one before, folks who are in the gallery or watching on TV who have not seen an open amendment process before. Just because it's open doesn't mean you can do whatever you want to do on the House floor. We're talking about the public financing of elections today. So if you have an amendment that's going to change the way we finance education, that amendment is not going to be germane. If you have an amendment about what you want to do with the health care system, that amendment is not going to be germane.

When you bring narrowly crafted pieces of legislation to the floor, the amendments that are germane are narrowly crafted amendments. And folks, I love that. For too long we have had 2,000-page bills, 1,000-page bills that folks can't read and can't understand and that can't be amended. And I am so pleased today to be standing here in strong support of my colleague from North Carolina's resolution. I will be voting in favor of the rule, and I will be voting in favor of the underlying legislation.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for allowing me to speak on the rule.

I rise in opposition today to the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, first it was repealing patients' rights; then it was a budget resolution with no budget. Every one of

us in this Chamber was elected to Congress with a goal of creating jobs and growing our economy, yet there hasn't been any talk about that.

Today, the Republican leadership has brought to the floor another piece of political posturing that takes us away from that goal of creating jobs for millions of Americans and establishing economic stability and growth. Rather than wasting time bringing these bills to the floor, we should be working to develop innovative, bipartisan solutions that will create jobs, reduce the deficit, and put our economy back on track.

We can all agree that our campaign finance system is broken. In every election, more and more dollars are spent by wealthy corporations and special interests on campaigns, inflicting great damage on the American people's trust in government. I know a lot of my friends wanted to turn the television off by the end of the last campaign. But ending the Presidential Campaign Fund would only further breach that trust.

Recent polls have found that the public overwhelmingly believes that money buys elections—by 5 to 1 in some polls. And it's no surprise, because election spending has gone up fourfold between the 2006 and 2010 congressional elections. With a voluntary \$3 individual contribution, the Presidential Campaign Fund is a modest part of the answer to the Nation's campaign finance needs, not the problem. It is a way to include the people's voice in our government by honoring small donations and helping restore the people's faith in democracy.

Nearly all Presidential candidates from both parties over the past 35 years have used this fund as a way to reduce the emphasis on fundraising and special interests. Our democracy in its current form would cease to exist if only the rich and powerful could influence public officials.

I ask you today, when the middle class is suffering and job creation is our number one goal, why do we continue to talk about giving more power to big money contributors for Presidential campaigns? After the Supreme Court's terrible decision on Citizens United, we need the exact opposite of this bill—true, reasonable campaign finance reform. That's how democracy is restored and people are empowered.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. The people's House should not be spending its time cutting off the connection of the people of this country to the White House. Yes, our Presidential campaign finance system is broken. It needs to be repaired, not eliminated, so we can have a fair way of electing our leaders.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my colleague from Colorado,

this is not cutting off access of our citizens to the White House. Our citizens have voted in lots of different ways to express their opinions in this country in the last year or so. In November, they voted to replace our spendthrift colleagues on the other side of the aisle with people on our side of the aisle who want to cut government spending. They voted on this program by reducing their involvement in this program to a very small number. If they wanted this program, they could have continued to participate in it. They participated in the YouCut program, which singled out this program as something that needed to be cut.

We are listening to the American people, Mr. Speaker—we are doing that in many different ways; this is one of the ways—because they've told us at least in three different ways that they want a different kind of working going on in Washington, D.C. They don't want a lot of spending; they want us to cut back spending. And they've told us this on this program three different ways. So I would like to point that out.

Mr. Speaker, according to Congressional Quarterly, nearly \$139 million in public funds were spent during the 2008 election cycle, including \$17 million each for the Democratic and Republican conventions, \$84 million to Republicans for general elections grants, and a total of \$18 million for primary matching funds for candidates for the nominations of Democrats, Republicans, and other parties.

□ 1050

As is the case with so many other actions, the Federal Government has no business funding political campaigns, particularly while the troubled economy demands fiscal restraint. And let me point out that the way the Federal Government gets its money is, again, by taxing the American people or, in this case, by using funds that the people have said that it could be used for.

The proposal embodied by H.R. 359 first received attention as a result of then-Republican Minority Whip CANTOR's initiative dubbed "YouCut." Majority Leader CANTOR is continuing this innovative effort which encourages public participation in our wonderful American democracy.

The Web site, located at majorityleader.gov/YouCut, for the first time enables Americans to make their voices heard by voting weekly on various proposals to shrink, rather than grow, Federal spending. As I said in my earlier remarks, this is one of the ways the American people can tell us what they think.

According to the official YouCut Web site, "The Presidential Election Campaign Fund provides Federal tax dollars in the form of matching funds to candidates in Presidential primaries provided the candidates qualify and agree to abide by certain spending and contribution limits. It provides grants to qualifying Presidential candidates in general elections, if they agree not

to accept other contributions. The program also provides grants to sponsor national party conventions.

"In short, it provides taxpayer subsidies to political candidates and parties. Since 2000, some major candidates have chosen to forgo public financing. While some have argued that providing even more taxpayer funding for this program might entice more candidates to participate, eliminating the program altogether . . . would require candidates and political parties to rely on private donations rather than tax dollars. The amount of funding for the public financing system is determined by checkoffs on income tax returns, and taxpayer participation via the checkoffs has declined," Mr. Speaker, "from 28.7 percent in 1980 to 7.3 percent in 2009." And that's the end of the quote from the Web site.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the American people are telling us how they feel about this program because they're not using the checkoff.

As the program grows increasingly less popular, its purpose is accordingly muddled. For example, while on the campaign trail, then-candidate Barack Obama, who portrayed himself as a longtime supporter of public financing, ultimately broke his pledge to participate in the presidential public financing system. If public financing isn't good enough for such a vehement supporter, why should taxpayers finance partisan political campaigns?

That's why I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, my good friend, GERRY CONNOLLY.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard a reference to YouCut and that this was one of the most popular cuts suggested by people on this Republican blog. Well, Mr. Speaker, 10 million Americans want to participate in public financing of Presidential campaigns. And I would dare say that dwarfs anything we've heard from YouCut. So if we're going to get in the business of what the American people want and how they've expressed themselves, 10 million voices are in threat of being silenced today by this rule and the underlying legislation.

The idea that we're going to save money and solve the deficit by eliminating public financing in presidential campaigns is fallacious. But I will give the other side credit: It is intellectually honest. When you have a Supreme Court ruling like Citizens United that fosters anonymous financing of campaigns, no wonder you want to delete public financing of campaigns.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2

minutes to my friend of longstanding, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I don't like to reference the Republican chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, because he did leave the floor. But he made a couple of statements that I have to comment on.

First of all, he said that this Republican initiative is about creating jobs. Nothing could be further from the truth, in my opinion. I've watched as the Republicans have been in the majority now for about 3 or 4 weeks, and they're not doing anything to create jobs. And this certainly doesn't create jobs.

And then Mr. DREIER said that there can be no corporate contributions under the current law. Well, the Citizens United case clearly says that there are unlimited corporate contributions, and that's the problem. Rather than having public financing of campaigns—which this legislation would eliminate—we're going to have more and more corporations just spending millions and millions of dollars to finance campaigns. And that's what this is all about.

This is the Republicans basically catering to special interests and the large corporations who will spend unlimited amounts of corporate money on campaigns, and not having in this case a public financing component through voluntary largely small donations.

Now, I have to say this is a system that we have now that's been in place since Watergate. It was a reform that Democrats and Republicans used, a reform of a very bad system that the Watergate scandal showed was not the way we should go. And I agree that the system needs to be updated, but it should be changed to meet the needs of today's elections that are costing more, and more primaries, and the focus should be on small donations, not getting rid of small donations.

But what we see instead is the Republican majority eliminating the system altogether and making Presidential campaigns more susceptible to what I call outside influence.

We saw the effect of the Citizens United case in the past election, where corporations and special interests poured money to sway the elections in their favor. With disclosure requirements almost nonexistent, we have no way of knowing whether foreign corporations or entities were contributing to the elections. And we have to question whose side the new Republican House majority is on.

Unfortunately, it appears that this is just another attempt by the Republicans to support their special interest friends and big corporations who have an unfair and undue influence on our electoral process.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the American people are buying these tired arguments that our colleagues across the aisle are using

about us wanting to be the tools of corporate interest. That is not the issue here.

The issue here is that the public has said in at least three different ways, as I said before, that this program is not worth continuing.

My colleague from Virginia said that we're denying 10 million Americans the opportunity to participate in donating to campaigns. That isn't true. Individuals can donate to any campaign they want to. So these American people who are now doing the checkoff can easily write a \$3 check to the candidates of their choice. We're not stopping that in any way whatsoever.

What we are doing is saying we don't need to be supporting political conventions, primarily, and candidates. They're perfectly capable of raising the money directly from the American people. And what we are doing, though, is saying that \$617 million is real money. Our colleagues across the aisle don't think \$617 million will put a dent in our deficit? That shows you how far away from the American people they are. They don't think of \$617 million as significant.

Mr. Speaker, the American people think that \$617 million is significant. They want us to cut spending wherever we can, and this is a program that has long ago outlived its usefulness.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1100

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am one of those people among the 10 million that did do the checkoff of \$3 for publicly-financed Presidential campaigns and to support the national parties' conventions. I feel very strongly that my \$3 now is directed in a way that I did not wish that it should be directed.

I do urge my friend from North Carolina to understand that at least one Member on this side clearly understands that \$617 million is a whole whale of a lot of money. To some of us, \$617 or \$67 is a whole lot of money. That said, what is balanced here is whether or not we should try in this institution to eliminate the kind of corruption that comes by virtue of a flood of dollars going into campaigns.

To correct my colleague from California—and I wish he were here; I would yield to him to respond—when he cites the fact that no corporate dollars can be contributed to the respective candidates who are on the ballot, he is absolutely correct. That is the law. But under the aegis of the Citizens United decision, corporations and individuals can contribute anonymously to any campaign. And we saw evidence of that on both sides.

Now, I have seen every iteration of reform during the last 50 years in the United States of America. Some of it was good and some of it didn't achieve its mark. This particular measure had some limitations and at the very same time did permit people like Eugene McCarthy, Jimmy Carter, Pat Bu-

chanan, Pat Robertson, Jerry Brown, Jesse Jackson, Sr., just to mention a few, and more recently my good friend Dr. RON PAUL—it gave them an opportunity to put forward their ideas. And the argument that they can go out there and raise the kind of money that would allow for that to happen I think is specious at best.

For most candidates, public funding from the Presidential election campaign fund has been the source of sorely needed funds at crucial points in Presidential races. To make matters worse, as has been pointed out by Ms. SLAUGHTER and myself and others, the legislation we are considering today is a repeat of the disastrous Citizens United decision, which on January 21, 2010, unleashed massive corporate influence-buying expenditures in our national elections. In the face of the first anniversary of Citizens United, we know for a fact how essential it is to repair the Presidential public financing system and provide Presidential candidates with a viable alternative for financing their elections, as opposed to having to depend on influence-seeking big donors, lobbyists, bundlers, and corporate spenders. We cannot eliminate the corruption of our political system when we are eliminating a program that was created to try to do that.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this legislation is a vote for big corporations and big private money to fund the election of their desired candidates. The Presidential public financing system needs repairs, but eliminating a program that works, that is voluntary, and that gives a voice to the American people is not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide that immediately after the House adopts this rule it will bring up the DISCLOSE Act, with the same text as H.R. 5175 from the 111th Congress, as it passed the House on June 24, 2010. This Republican proposal to eliminate voluntary public financing for Presidential elections is, in my view, a step in the wrong direction.

When Presidential campaigns stop receiving this clean money, they'll have to go after private contributions instead. That's going to mean more time spent talking to special interests and the powerful and less time spent talking with the voters and communities and groups that have good ideas and real problems to discuss but don't have multi-million dollars to donate to a campaign.

Is that really what we want for our constituents? I am confident that the answer is a resounding "no." Make no mistake, this will affect the quality of our campaigns and it will affect our democratic process.

We should be considering real campaign finance reform like the DISCLOSE Act. That bill would establish disclosure requirements for election-related spending by corporations, unions,

and other organizations. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, it was a measure, as offered in the previous Congress, that did go through regular order, did have substantial committee hearings, and was presented to the Rules Committee, as opposed to this measure that has had absolutely no hearings and just comes here direct to the floor under the rubric of a modified open rule. And it would require, this DISCLOSE measure, any person or organization making so-called "independent expenditures" over \$10,000 to disclose them within 24 hours. That's what we need after Citizens United, not politicians spending more time and energy to raise big money.

The DISCLOSE Act would put a check on donations by Federal contractors and prohibit contributions and expenditures by foreign-controlled domestic corporations. And among its other provisions, for example, is a prohibition on recipients of TARP funds from making contributions or expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment 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. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass real campaign finance reform today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 54 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 a bill consisting only of the text of H.R. 5175 of the 111th Congress as passed by the House. 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 House Administration. 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 impli-

cations. 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.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question, rule, and underlying bill.

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.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were 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 adoption of the resolution, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 178, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—234

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

Pearce	Ross (FL)	Terry
Pence	Royce	Thompson (CA)
Platts	Runyan	Thompson (PA)
Poe (TX)	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Pompeo	Scalise	Tiberi
Posey	Schilling	Tipton
Price (GA)	Schmidt	Turner
Quayle	Schock	Upton
Reed	Schweikert	Walberg
Rehberg	Scott (SC)	Walden
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Walsh (IL)
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	Webster
Ribble	Sessions	West
Rigell	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Rivera	Shuster	Whitfield
Roby	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Womack
Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Woodall
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Yoder
Rokita	Stivers	Young (FL)
Rooney	Stutzman	Young (IN)
Roskam	Sullivan	

NAYS—178

Ackerman	Green, Al	Pascrell
Andrews	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Baca	Grijalva	Payne
Baldwin	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Barrow	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Bass (CA)	Harman	Peters
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Berkley	Heinrich	Polis
Berman	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Quigley
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Rahall
Blumenauer	Holden	Reyes
Boren	Holt	Richardson
Boswell	Hoyer	Richmond
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Royal-Allard
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Capps	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Cardoza	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Carney	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Keating	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Chandler	Kind	Schiff
Chu	Kissell	Schrader
Ciциlline	Kucinich	Schwartz
Clarke (MI)	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Clay	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Cleaver	Levin	Sewell
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Cohen	Lipinski	Shuler
Connolly (VA)	Loeb sack	Sires
Cooper	Lofgren, Zoe	Lowey
Costa	Lujan	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lynch	Speier
Courtney	Maloney	Stark
Critz	Markey	Sutton
Crowley	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Cuellar	Matsui	Tierney
Cummings	McCarthy (NY)	Tonko
Davis (CA)	McCollum	Towns
Davis (IL)	McDermott	Tsongas
DeFazio	McGovern	Van Hollen
DeGette	McIntyre	Velázquez
DeLauro	McNerney	Visclosky
Deutch	Meeks	Walz (MN)
Dicks	Michaud	Wasserman
Dingell	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Donnelly (IN)	Miller, George	Waters
Doyle	Moore	Watt
Edwards	Moran	Waxman
Ellison	Murphy (CT)	Weiner
Engel	Nadler	Welch
Eshoo	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Neal	Woolsey
Fattah	Olver	Wu
Filner	Owens	Yarmuth
Fudge	Pallone	
Gonzalez		

NOT VOTING—22

Black	Garamendi	Pingree (ME)
Broun (GA)	Giffords	Pitts
Capuano	Hincheey	Rangel
Conyers	Hinojosa	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Honda	Rush
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Young (AK)
Emerson	Mica	
Frank (MA)	Petri	

□ 1131

Messrs. HOLT, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for:

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was detained in committee. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 22 on H.R. 54, the button did not record my “no” vote as the gavel fell.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, on the bill we’re going to be considering shortly, the Presidential checkoff bill, there’s a requirement under the rules that the amendments be printed in the RECORD. Is that RECORD available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the printed RECORD is not yet available.

Mr. WEINER. Further inquiry, does the Speaker have any guidance for the House on when that RECORD might be available so we can read what we’re going to be considering in a matter of minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not currently have that information. Under the terms of House Resolution 54, any issue would become ripe when the amendment process begins.

Mr. WEINER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 359.

ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 54 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. 359.

□ 1134

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. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, with Mr. LATOURETTE 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.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

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

Mr. Chairman, last night, the President in this very Chamber issued us an invitation. In that invitation, there were several opportunities, but two of them I would like to highlight. One is, he said this: He said he is willing to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. I take the President at face value that he’s interested in doing that.

The thing that the President issued was an invitation where he said this: He said, in fact, the best thing we could do on taxes for all Americans is to simplify the Tax Code.

Well, the law of governing Presidential election campaign funds in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account is located in the Internal Revenue Code, which really inherently makes no sense.

And I think during the course of this debate, Mr. Chairman, we’re going to lay out the argument as to why the President’s first point can be greeted and agreed to, that first goal that this is simply something that we can do without.

Let me make a couple of quick points. I think it’s important to recognize the irony of the Statement of Administration Policy that was published on January 25, and I’m reading in the third paragraph, he says—the administration, in criticism of this effort, says, “Its effect would be to expand the power of corporations and special interests in the Nation’s elections to force many candidates into an endless cycle of fundraising at the expense of engagement with voters on the issues.”

How can that be, Mr. Chairman? President Obama, when he was a candidate in 2000 for the United States Presidency, declined to participate in this fund, both in his primary and in his general election. And if President Obama has been able to rise above that, I think other Americans can rise above that.

Also, I would just like to bring your attention to that same argument, and that is, a “Dear colleague” that was sent criticizing this bill said basically the same thing: By creating a viable alternative to private fundraising, the public financing system was designed to level the electoral playing field and ensure that candidates remain accountable to voters, not special interests.

So does that mean, implicitly, Mr. Chairman, that candidates who didn’t participate in the program are somehow not accountable to voters? I think President Obama would say he’s really accountable to voters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1140

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this measure, which, along with the Supreme Court’s radical decision in Citizens United, takes our Nation’s campaign finance system in precisely the wrong direction: less transparency and less information for the voters.

Americans from across the political spectrum—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—want less special interest money in politics, not more. They want clean, transparent, and competitive elections; and campaigns where candidates—those of us in this room and Presidential candidates—rise and fall based on the quality of their ideas, the strength of their arguments, and their ability to attract support from the voters that they seek to represent.

What they don’t want are campaigns decided by how much secret money flows into an election from secret outside groups. And they will no longer tolerate, I believe, those politicians turning around and saying to those citizens: You have no right to know who is paying for what in our political campaigns; you have no right to know who is paying for those TV advertisements you’re watching.

Let’s remember what we are talking about here. The current Presidential financing system that this bill would eliminate arose from public outrage in the post-Watergate period. Rather than Presidential candidates trafficking in secret slush funds, our Nation decided that our democracy would be better served by a system of public disclosure, contribution limits, and emphasis on smaller-dollar contributions matched by the Presidential financing fund.

The system is voluntary, one line on our Tax Code, not complicated; and while not perfect, for most of its 36 years in existence, it has served this Nation well. Candidates from across the political spectrum, from Ronald Reagan to Jesse Jackson, have voluntarily participated in the Presidential financing system.

As my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned there is no doubt

that the current law needs to be modernized; it needs to be fixed. We saw that in the last Presidential election. But rather than throw out something that has served the country and the electorate well for 36 years, let's fix it. And the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I and others have introduced legislation to do exactly that.

So rather than shielding an avalanche of unlimited special interest money from public view, we should shine a light on it. We should do it by modernizing the Presidential system, and we should also pass the DISCLOSE Act, which we could have brought up and voted on except for the previous question was just defeated.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day, our Nation's democracy doesn't belong to Presidents or Members of Congress; it belongs to the voters who send us here, and we have a solemn responsibility to safeguard it on their behalf and protect it for future generations from the lessons in corruption in history. Let's mend it. Let's fix it. Let's not throw it out.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, a native of Hiawatha, Iowa, and the first living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

ELIMINATING TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 359, which terminates the taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns and party conventions.

At the outset, I just want to mention in response to something that was said by the other side, this has absolutely nothing to do with the Citizens United case decided by the Supreme Court. That changed not one iota of campaign finance law. Corporations still cannot make contributions to campaigns or candidates. It does not change that.

Citizens United had to do with the question of whether or not one loses his or her First Amendment protections of free speech, particularly with respect to expressions of political nature, merely because they associate with another person. The Supreme

Court told us that you do not in fact lose your First Amendment rights because you happen to say it jointly with someone else. As a matter of fact, they pointed out that some people with the least amount of influence in a society actually expand their influence in the political debate by joining with others. And then the question that the Supreme Court answered was, if that association happens to be corporate in nature, happens to be a union, happens to be a for-profit, happens to be a not-for-profit, whether that changes the dynamic as contemplated by the First Amendment protections, and they told us it did not. So let's get rid of that canard here on the floor right away. This has absolutely nothing to do with that. This has absolutely nothing to do with corporate contributions to campaigns or foreign contributions to campaigns, both of which remain illegal, with criminal sanctions, under the law.

So let's get that out of the way to begin with so we don't have a lot of debate here that has nothing to do with the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves at a unique juncture in the longstanding debate over this issue; but, frankly, in reality, it is a juncture no longer. Taxpayer financing of Presidential elections and party conventions of the two major parties is simply no longer defensible.

The first tax liability contributions from American taxpayers to be diverted toward the funding of Presidential elections began 35 years ago in 1976. This new practice was, as we were told by the other side, supposed to raise the public's trust in their government as well as increase both the number of candidates and, thus, electoral competition and the financial footing between parties. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it has failed on all accounts.

It did allow us to have Lyndon LaRouche be a participant in the Presidential elections. I am not sure when we have had someone who had been subjected to a criminal conviction and actually conducted part of his campaign while still incarcerated, but that was brought to us by way of this fine law.

Since 1976, approximately \$1.5 billion has been spent on this system. As we speak, there is a balance of \$195 million sitting in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund at the U.S. Treasury Department. And yet this system of electoral subsidization has not changed the public's perception of our Presidential elections or our politics. According to one survey after another, Americans continue to harbor deep distrust of their elected officials. So does anyone think that our Presidential elections over the past 35 years have shown a virtuous progression toward more accuracy and more honesty?

Mr. Chairman, prominent Presidential candidates, candidates who even supposedly believe in this system, have opted out of this taxpayer financing scheme in recent years. In 2004 and

2008, several candidates declined public financing for their primary campaigns.

And as was mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois, during the most recent Presidential election, for the first time, a nominee of one of our two major political parties withdrew from the public financing during the general election and instead went on to raise record amounts of money for his campaign. And I recall when I thought we heard a pledge to participate in this program because of the virtuous nature of the program. Somehow that was lost along the campaign trail.

One of the things I would like to point out is this: There is this idea that somehow we are going to be able to suppress money that goes into politics. The fact of the matter is it is like a balloon, a water balloon. If you squeeze it on one side, it comes out on the other side. The question is: How do we get it within the system?

We should be talking about the idea of this silly demarcation between our parties and our candidates where we limit in extreme fashion the amount of money that can be transferred or coordinated, as if somehow that corrupts the candidate to have him or her identified with the very party they represent. We ought to be working towards those kinds of changes that will allow a greater responsibility on the party and the candidates to express their positions and to hold to their positions, be responsible for their positions. But no, we talk about these ways of how we are going to somehow reduce the impact of money in campaigns. It hasn't worked under this system. It hasn't worked.

□ 1150

In addition to Presidential primaries and general elections, if there is anything the American taxpayer should not be subsidizing, I would say—as much as I enjoy them—it is the week-long Presidential conventions. On our side of the aisle, in our party, I think we've had some indications of what I consider to be wasteful spending in preparation for our upcoming convention; and to say to the taxpayer that, in light of that, we ought to continue to subsidize the production of our Presidential conventions by the two major parties, it is very difficult to articulate and even to understand.

They are, as I say, grand fun, wonderful occasions—week-long party gatherings that are, unfortunately, in this day and age, largely symbolic. One can't even argue something important is being decided because, unfortunately, they ceased to have real significance sometime ago, and that was part of our effort to try and cleanse the system.

Rather than having people selected by these delegates that come to these conventions, we should move more and more to the primary operation and, of course, then earlier and earlier in the season so that somehow it becomes a 2-year event. I guess we're already in

that. Taxpayers would be shocked, if not outraged, to discover that they have been funding these extravagant photo ops.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, since 1976, approximately \$1.5 billion has been spent on publicly funding our Presidential primaries, our Presidential general elections, and our Presidential party conventions. The American taxpayer has paid enough for this unwise experiment. I think it should be ended and the balance in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account returned to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction. I think we'd actually have the American people cheering us for that. According to a 2010 Congressional Budget Office estimate, the elimination of this program will save American taxpayers \$617 million over the next 10 years.

Now, some could say, Well, that's your opinion. We have our opinion. Why change things?

Well, why don't we look to the opinion of the American people. Not a bad idea in this House. Simply put, this program does not have the support of the American people.

Taxpayer support has declined precipitously over time. I remember, years ago, I thought it was a good experiment. I thought it was a good idea. I checked off for some of my taxes to go to this program. I was in hopes that it would actually prove to be a good change. I, like most Americans, though, who contributed to that in the past, have given up on the program. We don't believe it gave us what we thought it might.

In 1980, for instance, the percentage of taxpayers participating through their tax form checkoffs was 28.7 percent. It was so popular that in 1985 it was 23 percent. It proved so successful that in 1990 it was 19.5 percent. Boy, it really proved itself by the year 1995, because then 12.9 percent of the American taxpayers decided they'd participate. In the year 2000, it dropped to 11.5 percent. In 2005, it was 9.1 percent. According to the IRS data obtained from the FEC, the checkoff rate in 2010 was 7.3 percent.

In other words, on a direct vote, a plebiscite taken by the taxpayers of America, 92.7 percent reject the notion. Now, where I come from, that's a landslide. I think even in Chicago it would be a landslide—even if you paid your taxes only once.

Mr. Chairman, this candidate and convention subsidy is obviously unpopular. To paraphrase one former member of the Federal Election Commission, "Any system of public financing must have popular support to succeed. Today's low taxpayer checkoff rates cast serious doubt on whether the public financing system has this support. When only one in 13 taxpayers are participating, it is very difficult to conclude that the public financing system has broad popular support."

Mr. Chairman, as we promised in the Pledge to America and as we have promised here on the floor during these initial weeks of the 112th Congress and as we have verified by our transparency-enhancing rules package, our bipartisan votes to trim Congress' budget and end excessive congressional printing, by our determination to return discretionary spending to fiscal year 2008 levels or less and now through this bill, the Republican majority is committed to fiscal stewardship, to having a relentless eye on waste and inefficiency, and to a continued commitment through this 112th Congress to reduce spending, to create private sector jobs, and to produce meaningful legislation that makes long-lasting reforms.

Mr. Chairman, if we, in fact, mean what we say when we say we are willing to look at those programs that already exist and to judge whether or not they have proven to be efficacious, or efficient or successful, in promoting the principles that underlie their passage in the first place, we ought to start with this. This is a program that almost 93 percent of the American people who pay taxes reject, and we're asking them to participate. Maybe we ought to listen to what they are saying and, instead, allow the savings garnered by this particular bill to go toward deficit reduction.

This bill, introduced by my colleague from Oklahoma, should garner overwhelming bipartisan support. We should thank him for introducing it—and I do—and for his commitment to a more responsible and efficient stewardship of taxpayer dollars. I would urge my colleagues to understand what this bill is and understand what it is not and to support H.R. 359.

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN), a distinguished member of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 359.

This bill will unnecessarily eliminate the \$3 checkoff box—it's voluntary—on tax returns to fund Presidential elections, and it could increase the influence of special interests in the funding of Presidential campaigns.

Now, the bill has been fast-tracked by the Republican leadership—without any hearings, no markups, no respect for the committee process. As a member of the House Administration Committee and as a former chair of the Subcommittee on Elections, I am very concerned by the end run around our committee and the lack of deference shown to the committee and its members.

Speaker BOEHNER promised 2 weeks ago, when he took the Speaker's gavel, more transparency in the legislative process and to focus on job creation.

Last week, the new majority fast-tracked a health care reform repeal bill. This week, they expedite the repeal of this voluntary program without the proper process. So I think the Speaker may need to revisit his statement about process and transparency.

In addition to the process concerns, I question the need for Congress to pass this bill at all. I was here as a young staffer when the Judiciary Committee took up the impeachment of President Nixon. It is worth remembering that the public finance system was created as a direct result of the Watergate scandal.

Remember Phillips Petroleum, which illegally contributed \$498,000 to the Nixon campaign; or Ruth Farkas, who told the Watergate grand jury that she gave \$300,000 to the Nixon campaign as an explicit exchange for an ambassadorship to Luxembourg; or the Nixon tapes that revealed that Secretary John Connally shook down dairy farmers for \$600,000 in contributions in exchange for raising milk price supports—to the detriment of children who needed milk around the country.

These incidents eroded public confidence, not only in the Nixon administration, but in the entire system. In response, pursuant to the General Welfare clause of the U.S. Constitution, Congress passed sweeping election reforms, including the Presidential checkoff system.

Now, I would not argue that this system is perfect at this time. I think it does need reform.

□ 1200

But I think mere elimination without a committee process is a huge mistake.

I would hope that the committee could convene, that we could sort through what the problems are with this current system and how do we fix them, work in a bipartisan way to create the fixes, and then come to this House for the solution.

I urge opposition to this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the author of the bill, Mr. COLE.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As I listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I would just urge them to read the bill. It's only three pages long.

Frankly, most of the things I've heard so far don't have anything to do with this legislation. This legislation doesn't raise the legal contribution limit for anybody. This legislation doesn't allow corporate contributions. This legislation keeps in place all the disclosure requirements for Presidential campaigns that we currently have. So those of you that are concerned about those things don't need to be concerned about this bill.

H.R. 359 is really a very simple piece of legislation. It does two things: It removes taxpayer funding for Presidential campaigns, and it eliminates

taxpayer funding for political party conventions by the two major parties.

Now, I have to say, if you look at whether or not these ideas have been popular, historically they, frankly, haven't. When this was put in in the 1970s, the idea was that it would spread. It hasn't. We don't fund any of our elections with taxpayer dollars, our colleagues in the other body with taxpayer dollars; and, frankly, as my friend Mr. LUNGREN pointed out, popular participation in this program has declined for almost 30 consecutive years, from a high of 28 percent in 1980 to barely 7 percent today. So there is not much indication that it's popular.

I need to say, for the record, that I philosophically have always been opposed to taxpayer dollars being used for political advocacy of any kind. Some of my friends on the other side have a very different point of view, and I respect that. We just have a philosophical difference. I think this is an inappropriate use of public money.

Having said that, as I think even my friends on the other side at least tactically acknowledge, this is a program that is broken beyond belief. And the current system didn't just begin to break down in 2008. I'd go back to 2000. President Bush didn't use this system during the primary campaign. He only used the public system during the general election. Four years later, neither President Bush nor Senator KERRY chose to use this system in the primary portion of the campaign.

Fast-forward another 4 years to 2008, neither President Obama nor now-Secretary Clinton chose to use this in the primary campaign. And the President, having committed to use it in the general, then chose not to use it in the general—certainly his right—but said at the time he still thought it was a great idea and that some day we ought to go back and fix it.

Now, I will say this for the President. Having said that, we haven't seen any action on that front. He has been in office for 2 years. There has not been a proposal from the White House to fix this system. In fact, as my friends on the other side of the aisle know, currently he is planning to run for reelection; he is setting up a campaign. There has been a lot of thought on how to raise the money and how to put together a campaign, but no proposal from the administration to actually fix the system that they purport to support and that they said years ago they were going to try and fix. That's not true, by the way, of every Member on the other side. There have been some that have, I think, genuinely tried to fix things, but let's recognize this system has been in decline and decay for a long time.

Now the estimates are that we could save \$612 million over a 10-year period. We all know in this Chamber we have a \$1.4 trillion deficit problem. Governing is choosing and prioritizing. This is \$612 million that doesn't feed a single

American, doesn't build a single mile of interstate highway or infrastructure, doesn't pay to defend the country; it simply goes to support a handful of politicians that want to run for President, many of whom are marginal.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROSKAM. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE. So in an era where we have to make genuinely hard decisions, to me, this is a no-brainer. This is a lot less important than a lot of the things that we need to consider and a lot of the decisions that we will have to make.

There is leadership by lip service and there is leadership by example. If my friends on the other side think this is the appropriate thing—and certainly if the President thinks it, he ought to lead by example and participate in the system. If not, we ought to recognize it's broken, end it, save the money; and if somebody wants to rewrite a bill, then they ought to do that and let's introduce it and have that debate. But right now, this is money we can't afford to waste and this is a system that's broken.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 359. Let's get rid of this outdated system.

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

The short title of this bill ought to be "The White Flag of the United States Congress on Campaign Finance." My distinguished colleague from Oklahoma says, if it's broke, why don't we write a bill. That's exactly what the point is. There weren't very many people on this floor who were involved in politics when this whole thing blew up. You've forgotten 1972. We wrote a bill in the Congress—we didn't, but the Congress wrote a bill. Interestingly enough, they left themselves out of it, but they tried to control how much money went into a Presidential campaign. Now, if you don't index it for inflation or do some kind of mechanism, it's pretty clear that a law written with the limits of 1972 is going to be pretty out of date by 2012.

There are some things we could do to change this process and make it more in sync with what's going on in society financially. But by saying you repeal it with nothing to replace it, you simply are saying we don't care how much money is spent in the election of the President of the United States; it is of no concern to the Republican Party whatsoever.

It fits very nicely with the Citizens United lawsuit that allows corporate money to come in a variety of other ways. And the system is now so corrupt that what you heard my colleague from California say, that is, all the things that were uncovered as a result of Watergate and the investigation that followed and led to the ejection of the President from the White House, was because we didn't have any controls on anything.

Now, did we put the perfect controls in? No. Should we be amending this bill? Yes. Because I don't know what 2012 is going to cost—maybe \$1 billion on either side. Sarah Palin will have \$1 billion and Barack Obama will have \$1 billion, and that will be all right with everybody. But the problem with that is that the ordinary folks in this country don't have any opportunity to participate.

They also know that people don't give \$1 billion with no expectation of something coming back. That's what happened in 1972. People gave money and they expected something back. And that's where the real fallacy here is in simply wiping this out without trying to fix it. It's an admission that you do not care how much money gets spent in a Presidential campaign. And if that's your view of how the democracy works, I think we are in serious trouble.

I'm one of those who think there should be publicly financed campaigns. I think even my opponents against me—I get 84 percent, but I think my opponent ought to have an equal shot at me. But the Congress didn't put that in this bill because they didn't want that. Neither did the Senate want that. They wanted to put it on the President and say, well, we fixed it over there. We really need it for this House and the Senate as well as what's going on in the Presidential election. And to simply repeal this is bad public policy and it is an admission that we don't care.

I oppose the bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 359—TERMINATION OF PUBLIC FINANCING OF
PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS AND PARTY CON-
VENTIONS
(Rep. Cole, R-Oklahoma, and 18 cosponsors,
Jan. 25, 2011)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 359 because it is critical that the Nation's Presidential election public financing system be fixed rather than dismantled.

The Presidential election public financing system was enacted in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal to free the Nation's elections from the influence of corporations and other wealthy special interests. Rather than candidates having to rely on raising large sums of private money in order to run, the system provides qualifying presidential candidates with the option of accepting matching funds in the primary and a public grant in the general election. It has done so at minimal cost to taxpayers, who fund it by voluntarily choosing to direct \$3 of their Federal taxes to this beneficial system. For many years, the system worked well and attracted wide participation. In time, however, it became clear that a system introduced in the 1970s was in need of modernization and repair. Beginning in the 2000 Presidential campaign, candidates began to opt out. Since that time, promising proposals for the strengthening of the system have been made.

H.R. 359 would kill the system, not strengthen it. Its effect would be to expand the power of corporations and special interests in the Nation's elections; to force many candidates into an endless cycle of fund-raising at the expense of engagement with voters on the issues; and to place a premium on access to large donor or special interest

support, narrowing the field of otherwise worthy candidates. After a year in which the Citizens United decision rolled back a century of law to allow corporate interests to spend vast sums in the Nation's elections and to do so without disclosing the true interests behind them, this is not the time to further empower the special interests or to obstruct the work of reform.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

□ 1210

The CHAIR. The Chair would advise that there is now a single manager on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 19½ minutes, the gentleman from Illinois has 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from California has 3 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 359, a bill summarily repealing our system of public funding for Presidential elections.

The process by which this bill has been brought to the floor—no hearings, no committee consideration, no markup, no deliberation—is the opposite of responsible legislating. It contradicts everything the Republican majority committed to a mere 3 weeks ago.

The process is atrocious; the substance is even worse. This repeal bill would destroy one of the proudest and most successful examples of reform that followed the Watergate scandal. Have we forgotten what the Watergate scandal was about? The Committee to Re-Elect the President, fueled by huge quantities of corporate cash, paying for criminal acts and otherwise subverting the American electoral system.

The hallmark of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974—enacted in response to Watergate at a time when public confidence in the government was dangerously low—the hallmark was our voluntary program of public financing for Presidential elections. To this day, this innovative reform stands as the flagship of public financing systems used in the United States and one of the greatest steps we have taken to bring transparency and accountability to our electoral system.

The Supreme Court, in affirming the constitutionality of the system, noted its basic purposes: "To reduce the deleterious influence of large contributions on our political process, to facilitate communication by candidates with the electorate, and to free candidates from the rigors of fundraising."

Presidential public financing has worked remarkably well—being utilized in the general election by every Republican and Democratic Presidential nominee from 1976 through 2004

and by JOHN MCCAIN in 2008—although in recent years the need for modernization has become evident.

Perhaps the best example of this program's success is President Ronald Reagan, who participated in the Presidential public financing system in all three of his Presidential campaigns in 1976, 1980, and 1984.

In his 1976 primary campaign, Reagan had less than \$44,000 in campaign money at the end of January of 1976 while his opponent, incumbent President Gerald Ford, had fifteen times more cash on hand. The \$1 million in public funds that Reagan received in January and the \$1.2 million that he received in February were essential in allowing him to continue his campaign.

Reagan was once again short of cash at the end of March and was allowed to continue as a result of an infusion of public money, which matched small private contributions. This illuminates one way that public financing has worked in both parties. It has often benefited candidates who challenge the party establishment.

In later elections, due to his broad base of supporters throughout the Nation, Reagan was able to capitalize on his small-donor fund-raising capacity to accrue substantial amounts of public money. In fact, even in 1984 when he was seeking reelection without significant opposition from within his own party, President Reagan raised about 60 percent of his campaign funds from small donors and as a result received \$9.7 million in matching funds. This was the maximum amount of public money a primary candidate could receive in accordance with the law at that time. And to this day, President Reagan is the only candidate ever to reach that public funding primary campaign maximum.

My colleagues, the Reagan case is merely illustrative of the positive effects that public financing has had in both parties at both the primary and general election stages. It also highlights the system's focus on small donations, rather than big bucks from large contributors. This is no free ride. This is no willy-nilly spending program. All primary candidates must seek the support of thousands of small donors, and only then do they receive matching public funds.

Today one could wish not for this Republican juggernaut—flying in the face of the positive history of this program, flying in the face of prior Republican support, flying in the face of responsible legislating—but for a bipartisan effort to repair the system, to restore its effectiveness.

I don't know of any policy challenge that exemplifies the maxim "mend it; don't end it" better than this one.

Yesterday, Congressman VAN HOLLEN and I reintroduced a bill, H.R. 414, that would do just that. The White House has cooperated in formulating this bill. It would modernize the Presidential public financing system and again make it an attractive and bill would

bring available funds into line with the increased costs of campaigns, adjust the program to the front-loaded primary calendar, and enhance the role of small donors further. It also would remove public funding of political conventions, as their roles indeed have changed since the system was first instated. This bill has been carefully designed. It deserves deliberation and debate through the normal committee process in this body.

At a time when confidence in government is low and assumptions of government corruption are high, why is the new majority trying to return us to the dark days that preceded Watergate? Why would we even want to contemplate such a thing?

Let's, instead, restore and improve our public financing system and move on to real solutions to put our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Before I yield 1 minute to our majority leader, I'd like to take 15 seconds to say when I find myself on the floor listening to my colleagues on the other side declaring Ronald Reagan to be the patron saint of Democratic Party ideas, I am bemused a bit because I served here when Ronald Reagan was President, and I don't recall those same words at that time.

However, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 2 years, the legislative schedule of this House was dominated by spending money, not cutting spending. But after the people voiced their displeasure in November, the discussion in this town is now focused on rolling back the unchecked growth of government and Federal expenditures.

Our majority is dedicated to cut and grow: cutting spending and job-destroying regulations; growing private sector jobs and the economy.

Yesterday, we directed the Budget Committee chairman to set spending levels so we return non-defense discretionary spending to 2008 levels or below.

Today, the American public, through the YouCut program, has put on the chopping block an example of unnecessary government waste. Specifically, this bill would eliminate the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, an outdated mechanism that provides Federal tax dollars to candidates in Presidential primaries in the form of matching funds and general elections and subsidies for the Democratic and Republican National Conventions.

Eliminating this program would save taxpayers \$617 million over 10 years and would require candidates and political parties to rely on private contributions rather than tax dollars.

In times when government has no choice but to do more with less, voting to end the Presidential Election Campaign Fund should be a no-brainer. I

urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

□ 1220

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the Republicans will accomplish with this legislation to upend the Presidential campaign finance system is to drown out the voice of the people and to give more power, not less, to their well-heeled special interests. Actually, this repeal bill is the beginning of the end of any hope for a system of public financing for all elections in this country.

So Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised. After all, the majority largely owe their unprecedented spending levels in the last election thanks to the Citizens United decision that turned on the spigot of anonymous, unaccountable corporate cash. And in keeping with the spirit of secrecy and lack of transparency, it's somehow fitting that this bill comes to the floor without any hearings, without any committee referral, without full debate or deliberation.

We have a deeply corrupt campaign system, Mr. Chairman. Special interest money is having a corrosive effect on our democracy, eating away at the people's confidence in their government and their elected Representatives. The one beacon of light in this system is the public financing of Presidential campaigns. It is, I would remind everyone, a voluntary system. Americans must choose to opt in on their tax returns. It has served the country well, at limited expense. It needs updating. It does not need to be dismantled. We need more public financing, in all of our Federal elections, not less. H.R. 359 goes in exactly the wrong direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Chairman, earlier this month I read articles about President Obama's reelection campaign plans on raising upwards of three-quarters of a billion dollars. There is no system of public financing for our Presidential elections that can accommodate anywhere near that level of spending. That is why I believe the President's strong opposition to legislation abolishing a system the President himself found unworkable in reality is profoundly hypocritical.

Putting out a statement of administration policy that states repealing the public financing system would, quote, "force many candidates into an endless cycle of fundraising at the expense of engaging with the voters on the issues; and to place a premium on access to large donors or special interest support, narrowing the field of otherwise worthy candidates"—what incredible audacity. This is like the proverbial arsonist child who kills his parents by setting their house on fire and then appeals for sympathy by exclaiming he is an orphan.

The President's statement is absolutely saying one thing while doing the opposite. A New York Times editorial on January 24 of this year said, "ERIC CANTOR is targeting for extinction the publicly subsidized Presidential campaign finance system adopted in the wake of the Watergate scandals." Wrong. It was President Obama who killed it and made a mockery of public financing of Presidential campaigns with his arrogant pressing of self-advantage, his unprecedented move to decline public financing for the first and only time since the adoption of this system.

In disparaging the majority leader, the Times went on to say that, "We suspect his real motive is to give an even bigger voice to big-money contributors in Presidential campaigns." Once again, the record needs correcting. No campaign in American history had more maximum donors, at \$30,400 per person, than Obama for America. Much has been made of that committee's legendary prowess in generating small donors over the Internet. But that committee also had a record-shattering haul among big donors, bundlers, and influence peddlers. But such is the right for Mr. Obama as a candidate in America.

However, when he alone has refused to participate in public financing of a general election for a Presidential campaign, his protestations ring rather hollow. No one has made more of the system operationally obsolete than Barack Obama. Actions do speak louder than words. And Barack Obama alone has refused to participate on the level playing field that existed in publicly financed Presidential general election campaigns in history.

It was not that the system was antiquated that forced Barack Obama to break a very sanctimonious campaign promise to participate in public financing. It was his decision to put expediency over his expressed support for the Democrat mantra of public financing. It was all about a ruthless pressing of self-advantage, despite a core campaign theme of promising to rise above self-interested politics.

Today, we will hear about on the floor measures to address the inadequacies of the system and the need to repair the system. First, I want to note an earlier New York Times editorial on June 20, 2008, which stated, "Senator Russ Feingold, the ranking authority on campaign finance reform, rightly points out that while the primary cycle's public matching subsidies are 'broken' and need updating for inflation, 'the system for the general election is not'."

Secondly, I ask my Democratic colleagues this: Have any of you received the specifics of what it would take to change the law that would cause President Barack Obama's campaign to abide by public spending limits in the general election for 2012? Because without those specifics, this debate is not grounded in the reality that the incum-

bent President has zero intention of giving up his gargantuan financial advantage in his reelection campaign by opting out of one of the most perfect systems of public financing we could possibly adopt.

I ask the supporters of public financing for Presidential campaigns, are you willing to adopt a system that makes it mandatory for all candidates to participate in the system? And can you unequivocally pledge that the President's reelection committee will agree to be bound by your new system? And if not, I would suggest you are preaching at the wrong end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The CHAIR. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes, the gentleman from California 1¾ minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania 11½ minutes remaining.

The Chair would further advise that ascribing unworthy motivations or intentions to the President of the United States or another Member of the United States Congress is inappropriate.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to our Democratic leader, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Thank you for your leadership, Mr. BRADY, and participating in this important discussion, as fundamental as our democracy, on the floor today.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to urge this Congress to focus on our number one priority, the creation of jobs. This is a priority for the American people and for this Congress. We should be focusing on it. That was the message we heard last night from President Obama on this floor, who called on us to out-educate, out-innovate, and out-build the rest of the world.

But instead of talking about job creation, this legislation we debate today will not create jobs, will not reduce the deficit, and will not strengthen the middle class. And those are the standards we should apply to any legislation that comes to the floor. Instead, it will put American elections more squarely into the hands of special interests.

One year ago, the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United opened the floodgates to unlimited, uninhibited, undisclosed special interest spending in our elections and unlimited special interest influence over our public policy debate. In response to the Citizens United ruling, Democrats worked to restore transparency, fairness, and accountability to our political process. Last Congress, with bipartisan support, the House passed the DISCLOSE Act to require corporations and donors to stand by your ad. Why are you running and hiding? And to keep foreign-owned entities from participating in our elections.

But Senate Republicans blocked DISCLOSE. Even though it came out of the

House with bipartisan support, Senate Republicans blocked DISCLOSE from even receiving an up-or-down vote, and now House Republicans are perpetuating a sneak attack on campaign finance reform.

The result was clear in the last election. Special interest groups spent tens of millions of dollars more in the 2010 election than ever before. Again, undisclosed, without identification. There is a reason they don't want it disclosed. First of all, if the public knew who was paying for those ads, they would realize that their own personal interests were not being served, but the special interests. That's our experience in California, where we had a special interest initiative placed on the ballot by outside oil companies. And the strongest statement against the initiative was to see the disclosure at the bottom of the ad as to who was funding it. That spoke more eloquently to the fact that it was not in the people's interest. And the initiative was defeated.

□ 1230

Eliminating the Presidential Election Fund, as this election would do, opens the door for foreign-owned entities and large corporations to enjoy an even greater role in the funding of political campaigns.

In the past, Members from both sides of the aisle have supported legislation to reform, not eliminate, the public financing system. We should come together to ensure that the American people are heard and that they are not drowned out by special interest dollars.

In our democracy—and God bless our Founders for establishing it—voters determine the outcome of our elections. That's the way it should be. Special interests should not be determining the outcome of our elections. One year after the Supreme Court's decision undermined that fundamental American value, let's come together to fight on behalf of the public interest, to preserve the integrity of our political campaigns; and, therefore, to strengthen our democracy. And maybe we could, instead of undermining it here today, strengthen our country by creating jobs, by reducing the deficit, by strengthening the middle class, none of which is being done by this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this effort to further empower the special interests over the people's interest.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, last night just a few seats down from where I stand, I listened to our President say that he would offer his support to eliminate whatever we can honestly afford to do without. I stand here today in this House Chamber feeling a little less like a freshman representative of the United States Congress and more like a guy presiding over the people's choice awards. There is no better program in

my judgment that is tailor-made for elimination than this program.

In overwhelming fashion, the people of Arkansas and indeed the people of America spoke loud and clear last year about the need to reduce spending in this country. The gentleman from Oklahoma talked about the fact that this program does not educate anyone; it doesn't feed anyone; it doesn't produce a mile of interstate highway. The gentleman from California articulated the declining participation in this checkoff program. I don't think there's a better barometer out there for the overwhelming support that the people have for this particular measure.

I urge my colleagues to join me today and vote in favor of H.R. 359.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 359. Adopted in the shadow of the Watergate scandal, the public financing of Presidential elections eases the burden of fund-raising campaigns and lessens the impact of private donations by a small number of wealthy donors.

Since 1976, candidates from across the political spectrum have used the public financing program to run for President. Is the system perfect? Absolutely not. The system needs to be reformed, not repealed. I heard one of my colleagues on the floor mention that our President, President Obama, opted out of this program. That was his choice. I do not think we should be in a position to legislate the American people's choice. That's their choice, to opt out or to check that box. I don't think we have the right to do that, nor should we do that.

With the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United little over a year ago, we are already well on our way to elections brought to the American people by the highest corporate bidder. If this bill passes, there will be even more incentive for foreign controlled companies to secretly invest in political causes that could help move American jobs overseas. Companies that outsource jobs will have a very simple message to Presidential candidates—support our agenda, or face the consequences. This bill takes secret corporate dominance of our elections to the next level.

This bill is also being considered at the wrong time and under the wrong circumstances. Less than 3 weeks ago, the American people were promised an open Congress, a Congress that allowed for open debate, one that allows for open rules. The American people are still waiting. In consideration of this matter, the committee process was completely disregarded. There have been no hearings. No testimony from witnesses either for or against. No markup. No refining in the committee or input from experts. Zero. None. When we did the DISCLOSE Act, we had three hearings and 17 witnesses.

We learned from our witnesses. They gave us their opinion and they gave us their education on what they thought, pro and con. To bypass that, which we have never done before in our committee, I think is wrong. We should have had our hearings and let it happen.

There's no reason why we have to rush this thing over to the Senate. I would doubt very much if they're sitting there waiting for it. And we could have taken our time, done our hearings, which we do in a complete and nonpartisan way; and we could have had this thing thrashed out, we could have aired it out, people could have put their amendments in, they could have offered amendments at our committee level, we could have aired it out perfectly and gotten much more education and maybe had a chance to reform it for the better.

While reforming the Presidential financing system is an important effort which I support, the next Presidential election is 2 years away. This bill does not create or save a single job. Zero. None.

There is a time and a place for campaign reform. While here might be the place, now is certainly not the time. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and to get back to the important task of putting the American people back to work.

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

The CHAIR. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Pennsylvania still has 8½ minutes. The majority side has a combined 3¼ minutes. The gentleman from Illinois is reserving; the gentleman from California is reserving.

The order of closing that the Chair would prefer in this instance would be that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would exhaust time on the minority side; we will then move to the gentlemen on the majority side for conclusion.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield as much time as he may consume to, in my opinion, an expert on this matter, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

I am pleased to close for our side with a plea to our colleagues that they not dismantle, in an irresponsible and summary fashion, one of the proudest achievements of post-Watergate political reform in this country.

I also can't let pass what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) said about our President. Of course we want President Obama, we want all Presidential candidates, to opt into this system. We've made it about as clear as we possibly could that the bill that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and I have introduced is designed to make it feasible once again for candidates to participate in the public financing system.

But the gentleman from Illinois—talk about having it both ways—comes

onto this floor to condemn President Obama for opting out of the system, and then he proposes to abolish the system so that everybody has to opt out! Neither President Obama nor anyone else could participate. The logic of that is way beyond me.

Of course we want a system that works. We know the system needs to be adjusted. And we have constructive efforts under way to do just that. What we should be doing, instead of having this up-or-down exercise on the floor today, with no committee consideration, is actually undertaking that kind of discussion, that kind of reform, that kind of improvement.

There is a bipartisan history here. There is a bipartisan history of supporting this program; a bipartisan history of participating in the program. I assume that is out of fashion now for our Republican colleagues.

But under the pretense of achieving fiscal responsibility, to come to this chamber and abolish one of the proudest and most successful of our reform efforts—that does a disservice to the new majority and to this House. It also violates all the pledges we had 3 weeks ago—of hearings, committee consideration, markups. None of that has been done. This is simply an up-or-down vote, as I say, flying under the false colors of fiscal responsibility.

We have a chance to take on this challenge—to mend it, not end it—to make certain that we preserve this reform, but to adjust it to the realities of modern campaigning.

□ 1240

To simply abolish this, to once again turn over Presidential financing to big private and corporate interests, to overlook the abuses, the problems that led to this system in the first place, falls far short of what we should be about as responsible legislators looking out for our country's best interests.

I ask for Members to look at our legislation, to repair and rejuvenate the public funding system and in the meantime to reject this summary attempt to destroy one of the proudest achievements of reform.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. First of all, Mr. Chairman, the ranking member of our committee has been very fair in the proceedings that he had with us over the last number of years, and I appreciate that. We will continue that tradition.

We were unable to have any hearings or consideration of this matter before our committee until yesterday when we finally were told by the minority party as to who they wish to have on our committee.

We could not meet as a full committee until we had a complement of both Democrats and Republicans. We established our side several weeks ago.

I am sorry that happened. We will have plenty of hearings in the future on this and other issues.

What is the current system that we are hearing the other side defend? What has it given us? It has given us Lyndon LaRouche, but it would prevent Eugene McCarthy from being a successful Presidential candidate. That's what we don't hear.

The system works against some people like a Eugene McCarthy, who was a poor fundraiser but managed to have a number of people who supported him, who gave him large contributions.

And yet he was able to change the course of history, bringing down a sitting President and allow for—well, he was called the Pied Piper of the youth vote.

So let's understand the complexity of the history of this law. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, this law has failed us. It has failed the American people.

The American people have rendered their judgment. Nearly 93 percent of the American people who paid taxes have voted "no" to this system. That ought to give us good guidance as to where we could find savings to bring down our national debt.

As I understand it, we are going to have an amendment from the Democratic side of the aisle which causes any money saved here to go to bringing down the debt. I hope that it comes forward, and I will support it.

I hope we have the support of our colleagues for this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, the minority leader was on the floor a couple of minutes ago—and I know the weather is urgent, I didn't want to prolong this drama—but it seemed to me to make the argument that this doesn't do anything as it relates to economic growth is just an incredible overstatement.

One of the things that we continue to hear, and the President's own debt commission spoke eloquently about the nature of debt and the stifling nature of debt on the economy and the stifling nature of spending on the economy. Here the Congressional Budget Office says, without ambiguity, the Congressional Budget Office says H.R. 359 would reduce direct spending by \$617 million over the 2011–2021 period.

This is an opportunity for us to take the admonition of the minority leader, to take the admonition of the President, to take the admonition of what the electorate told us in November and that is to concentrate on ways that we can trim this government, the burden on the taxpayer that adds absolutely no value.

There is not one Member on this House floor, Mr. Chairman, that has

defended the results of this system. I urge passage of this bill.

Mrs. CAPPAS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 359.

This deeply flawed legislation would do away with a voluntary program that helps ensure transparency in our elections.

Created in the wake of Watergate, the presidential election public financing system—which this bill would eliminate—has helped stop corporate interests from buying elections with large anonymous donations.

While I'm disappointed that Republicans are playing political games with our election safeguards, I can't say that I'm surprised. H.R. 359 is just the latest effort by the new Majority to undermine our campaign finance laws in favor of Wall Street Banks and foreign corporations.

This political gimmick comes one year after the catastrophic Citizens United Supreme Court ruling that opened the floodgates to unlimited and anonymous special interest spending in our elections.

Last year my Democratic colleagues tried to repair some of the damage done by passing the DISCLOSE Act—a bill that would require corporations to stand by their advertisements and to keep foreign-owned entities from funding our elections.

Virtually all Republicans voted against this bill in the House, and their colleagues in the Senate blocked it from consideration.

Mr. Chair, this bill is nothing more than a thinly veiled attack on transparency in our elections that does absolutely nothing to create American jobs or encourage economic growth. In fact, by shifting our election system to favor big business, this legislation could strengthen the power of companies that ship American jobs overseas.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for an open and transparent election process, and vote no on this deeply flawed legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 359, which repeals nearly 40 years of reforms in how our Presidential election campaigns are funded. It is a great disservice to our democracy and to fundamental democratic processes.

As with the House vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, this sweeping measure has been brought up for a vote without any hearing, without any testimony, without any documentation, and without any opportunity for those who support current law to state their case before the American people. The new Republican leadership pledged to be open, transparent, and fair in the workings of the House. These good principles are simply being ignored, once again.

I don't believe the American electorate wants to have even more corporate influence in Presidential elections. During the midterm election season, there was no call to scrap our public finance system, but there was a real sense of concern and a vigorous debate about the huge amounts of corporate funds that entered the campaign season as a result of the Supreme Court's ruling in Citizens United last year.

H.R. 359 would undermine processes that have been an essential part of our electoral system since the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 were enacted in the wake of the greatest corruption scandal in modern American history, Watergate. Watergate was marked, in significant measure, by revelations of massive amounts of cash from

undisclosed sources being funneled into our presidential election campaigns and expended without proper accountability. Congress responded with significant reforms that restored the integrity of our Presidential elections.

For decades there has been a consensus that public funding of Presidential campaigns is preferable to special interest funding. Every Republican and Democratic Presidential nominee from 1976 through 2008, except for Barack Obama, used the public finance system for their general election campaigns. The system is contingent on support from private donors; there is a match of public funds, which are donated on a purely voluntary basis by Americans who want to promote honest elections. The system makes campaigns possible for candidates who initially do not have access to substantial funding. It encourages the broadest participation by candidates across the political spectrum. This strengthens our democracy and the vibrancy of political campaigns, thereby serving the interest of the American people.

Proposals have been introduced in recent Congresses to strengthen and improve the public finance system, which has had difficulty providing sufficient funding to meet the almost uncontrollable escalation in the costs of running for President. We should be considering legislation today to update and improve it, not to destroy it.

Although the public finance system runs on voluntary contributions, the Republican leadership has promised that getting rid of it will control the deficit. In reality it will only further lard Presidential campaigns with special interest money.

Like our vote on the Affordable Care Act last week, the Republicans can vote to repeal our landmark post-Watergate reforms without offering anything to replace them. Their indifference toward the public interest is a threat to the integrity of future elections.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 359, which would eliminate the presidential public campaign financing system. A year ago, the Supreme Court handed down one of its most devastating decisions in recent memory, ruling in *Citizens United vs. the FEC* that corporations could spend unlimited amounts in elections to argue for the election or defeat of a candidate. The ruling indeed opened the floodgates: corporate and special interests spent nearly \$300 million in the 2010 midterm elections, four times what was spent during the 2006 midterms.

Citizens United provided corporations like Exxon Mobile and Goldman Sachs the same free speech rights under the First Amendment as teachers, factory workers, and janitors. And yet, at a time when most Americans are fed up with the amount of special interest money flowing in Washington, the Republican party wants to make it easier for corporate voices to be heard. Moreover, these corporate donations can be funneled to tax-exempt organizations that do not have to disclose their donors, decreasing transparency when Americans want more of it.

Last year, the House passed a bipartisan bill to increase disclosure and transparency in federal elections. Unfortunately, the legislation died in the Senate. The last thing we need to counteract the harmful *Citizens United* decision is to eliminate the public campaign fi-

nance system established by Congress in the wake of Watergate which has helped candidates whose voices would not otherwise be heard to participate in federal elections.

Mr. Chair, we were promised more transparency and regular order from the new Republican majority. But we are considering this legislation six days after it was introduced, bypassing the committee process of hearings and mark-ups. I applaud the majority for allowing amendments; but, the truth is, this bill is so tightly written that few amendments are germane. And in the height of hypocrisy, the majority is using an estimate provided by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office to justify savings to taxpayers, the same agency which the majority party was decrying just last week when it reported that repeal of the health care reform law would add to the deficit.

Unlike my friends across the aisle, I will not dismiss the CBO's score of this legislation as somehow deceptive. However, the bill's savings over 10 years amounts to less money than is spent in 1 month on the war in Afghanistan. Mr. Chair, I agree that we need to find solutions to our deficit problems but this is not one of them. Rather, eliminating the public-financing system will cost us much more in the long term, requiring our elected officials to spend more time raising money to keep up with the corporate spending in elections than legislating.

Everyone agree that the presidential public campaign financing system must be fixed. Fewer Americans are checking the box on their tax forms to contribute to it. President Obama eschewed it in 2008 in favor of receiving small dollar donations via the Internet. Let us work together, in a bipartisan fashion, to reform the system and make it work for the 21st century. As the Washington Post editorial said, "fix the system—don't junk it."

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose H.R. 359. This bill terminates the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, which provides grants and matching funds during a presidential campaign for primary candidates, general election nominees, and party conventions.

Elections are not the problem in America. Our troubles don't stem from a case of too much non-special interest money.

Every year, nearly 40 million Americans voluntarily choose to support the public financing system by directing \$3 of their Federal taxes to the fund. This program, with little expense to the taxpayer, has played an important role of increasing transparency, ensuring that campaigns are funded at an appropriate and sustainable level, and strengthened the voice of small-donor Americans.

While I appreciate that this bill has been brought to the floor under a modified open rule, that does not excuse the fact H.R. 359 bypassed committee hearings, silencing a much-needed debate. In an era of half-a-billion dollar—and growing—presidential campaigns, public financing needs reform, not repeal.

This system was first used 35 years ago in the wake of Watergate to ease pressure on political candidates, enabling them to spend more time connecting with voters and less time securing large contributions.

Before costs outstripped financing, the system helped every candidate from 1976 to 2008, increased the number of viable contenders, and promoted competition in an oth-

erwise restrictive two-party dominated system. The system is broken and has not kept pace with the new campaign environment, but on the anniversary of *Citizens United*, a decision that upended a century of law that had brought transparency to our electoral process, the last thing we need are presidential campaigns more beholden to private donations.

This piecemeal approach of addressing this nation's fiscal woes is wrong and insufficient. You can't right-size the deficit through spending cuts alone. We must change the way we do business by addressing defense, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Until this happens, we will have a very long and unproductive Congress that fails to address the long-term stability of our economy.

H.R. 359 will eliminate the system when we need—more than ever—to strengthen it. Getting rid of the public financing option in Presidential elections would close the path that leads back towards a better, more transparent democracy where the candidate can more clearly hear the voters, not large corporate interests.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 359, a bill that would terminate the public financing system for presidential election campaigns. The vast majority of Americans oppose the damage done to the integrity of the electoral system by the *Citizens United v. FEC*, which opened the floodgates for corporate spending in elections. According to a Washington Post poll, 80 percent of Americans oppose the ruling, with little difference reflected by party affiliation (85 percent of Democrats oppose it, 76 percent of Republicans, and 81 percent of independents). Yet, inexplicably, the majority is celebrating the one-year anniversary of that disastrous and poorly-reasoned decision by offering a bill that would make that damage vastly worse.

Frankly, I believe we would be moving just plain backwards if, instead of building upon the public financing system for presidential elections by updating it and adding to it a system of public financing for House and Senate races, instead, we remove the public financing system for presidential elections. So far, the new majority seem focused on undoing landmark legislative achievements rather than strengthening them.

I find two aspects of this bill particularly puzzling. First, it is being offered to "reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions." But nothing in the bill would specifically reduce either federal spending or federal borrowing. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is funded exclusively by a check-off box on Americans' tax returns, stating that they want \$3 (\$6 for joint returns) of their tax liability to be deposited in the Fund. If that check-off box were removed, their tax liability would be the same, but the \$3 or \$6 would simply be allocated to something else. That is, the size of the revenue pie would be the same but the slice that would have been spent on presidential election campaigns would simply be spent on something else, and nothing in the bill would prevent additional borrowing to increase the size of the pie.

In addition, even if the entire existing balance of the fund were transferred to the Treasury, as called for by the bill, according to the fiscal year 2011 budget the unobligated

balance in the fund is approximately \$200 million. The national debt is more than \$14 trillion. So transferring \$200 million to the Treasury for the express purpose of debt reduction would only reduce the debt by one one-thousandth of one percent. The majority argue that this bill would save hundreds of millions of dollars in mandatory funding over the next decade, but the only thing it seems to do is keep those hundreds of millions of dollars out of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

That is how little would be gained. But what would be lost? That brings me to the second aspect of this bill that is puzzling. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund is a completely voluntary program. It only exists because people volunteer to participate in it. Although tax-payer designations have decreased in recent years, the American people voluntarily contributed the more than \$1.3 billion that presidential candidates and party committees have received under the program between 1976 and 2004. Why would the American people voluntarily contribute that much money to the program if they didn't prefer the neutrality of public money being used to finance elections to the bias and manipulative potential of private money being used for that purpose?

Similarly, virtually all American presidential candidates have voluntarily participated in the program since it was founded. With the exception of President Obama, every single Republican and Democratic presidential nominee since 1976 has used the public financing system to fund their general election campaigns. Why would the majority—with no real fiscal benefit ensured by this bill—terminate a program that both the citizens and the candidates have voluntarily supported for decades?

The Citizens United decision is drowning out the voice of the average citizen under a tidal wave of corporate spending. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund amplifies the voice of the average American as against the voice of corporate America. It is a critical and valuable program that we should be updating, enhancing and expanding, as a number of Members of this body have been seeking to do. For example, Representative PRICE of North Carolina and Representative VAN HOLLEN championed in the prior Congress, and reintroduced yesterday with my support, legislation that would increase the role of small donors and decrease the role of corporate spenders and other big donors in presidential campaigns. It would also eliminate spending limits, freeing up candidates to compete with the onslaught of corporate spending resulting from Citizens United. And it would increase the amount available in the fund by increasing the tax return check-off amount from \$3 to \$10 (and from \$6 to \$20 for joint filers). Representative LARSON and Representative JONES also championed legislation that would establish a program of public financing for House elections. I think these efforts are the ones we should be devoting our time to.

I want to reiterate—the check-off box for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund is a strictly voluntary funding mechanism. Keeping it does not constitute an appropriation. Eliminating it does not, in and of itself, reduce spending or borrowing. Eliminating it in this case would simply take away the only national program American citizens and presidential candidates have been able to use to help ensure that elections are as free as possible

from the manipulative force of wealthy and powerful special interests.

I strongly oppose this bill and, for the sake of preserving the voice of the American people in elections, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 359, terminating voluntary taxpayer financing of presidential elections. This legislation seeks to end a 35-year-old program that uses money taxpayers choose to help pay for presidential campaigns and political conventions. The impetus for creating this public-financing system was the 1970s Watergate scandal and the desire to make fundraising for presidential elections more transparent. This bill would terminate the taxpayer option to designate a mere \$3 of income taxes to the financing of presidential campaigns, thereby also eliminating the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account.

Currently, taxpayers can designate a \$3 contribution to the public-financing system by checking a box on their federal income tax form. The money comes from taxes paid to the U.S. Treasury and does not affect a person's tax refund or payment. Passing this legislation would do irreparable harm to our presidential election system by preventing everyday Americans from having their voices heard while opening the door for special interests and large corporations to dominate presidential elections even more. This legislation would prevent patriotic, tax-paying grandmothers who may not be technologically savvy enough to go to the Web site of a presidential campaign but who have for years and decades checked this box from expressing their civic right to support a presidential campaign. I think we should all stand up for grandmothers throughout this great Nation and oppose this legislation.

Furthermore, this attempt to fast-track a bill that will destroy the presidential public finance system and privatize election fundraising is highly irresponsible. This violates recent pledges by the GOP's leadership of increased transparency, accountability and debate in Congress. Not one hearing has been held on the legislation, nor has a single committee debated its merits at a markup. If it passes, this legislation will roll back more than 30 years of law born out of the Watergate scandal, eviscerating one of the few remaining protections stopping corporations from heavily influencing American elections even more. The Supreme Court already opened the floodgates to unrestricted special interest spending in our elections and over our public policy debate in the Citizens United case; this legislation would pave the way for special interest groups, large corporations, and other large donors to dominate the political landscape even more at the expense of everyday, hard-working, tax-paying Americans.

House Republicans' much-touted "Pledge to America" criticized Democrats for "limiting openness and debate" during the legislative process and vowed to "ensure that bills are debated and discussed in the public square." The pledge says the GOP "will fight to ensure transparency and accountability in Congress and throughout government." And in Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's first remarks after taking control of the House, he spoke of a greater emphasis on "real transparency" and "greater ac-

countability." He went on, "Above all else, we will welcome the battle of ideas, encourage it, and engage in it—openly, honestly, and respectfully." Bringing forth such sweeping legislation without committee hearings and mark-ups completely contradicts these promises.

Public financing of presidential campaigns provides matching tax dollars to the small donations received by candidates who agree to publicly finance their campaigns, instead of relying on private donations. The intent is to encourage small donations and the burden on taxpayers is not much: Americans can voluntarily contribute \$3 to the fund on their federal tax filings. The public finance system was created in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal in the mid-1970s. After President Richard Nixon's re-election campaign was found to have illegally accepted hundreds of thousands of dollars from big corporations, Congress created a public financing system so that candidates would not have to rely on corporations and deep pocketed donors to finance their campaigns.

Legislation to make presidential public financing more competitive has won support from both parties in the past. In 2003, Senators Russ Feingold and JOHN MCCAIN introduced a bill that would reform the public financing system; Reps. Christopher Shays and Marty Meehan filed a companion bill in the House. "The public financing system for presidential elections, which aims to allow candidates to run competitive campaigns without becoming overly dependent on private donors, is a system worth improving and preserving," the lawmakers said in a joint statement.

More recently, Rep. DAVID PRICE introduced the Presidential Fund Act, which would notably increase the funds available to candidates who opt in to public financing. In 2007, when PRICE introduced his bill, cosponsors included three Republicans—Reps. Mike Castle of Delaware, TODD PLATTS of Pennsylvania, and Shays. Rep. PRICE has offered the bill again in the 112th Congress with Rep. VAN HOLLEN.

Since 1976, every Democratic and Republican presidential candidate has used the public financing system except Barack Obama's 2008 campaign. The way reformers see it, the presidential public financing system needs repair, not repeal. This legislation has drawn sharp criticism from campaign-finance watchdog groups who argue that the program should be expanded, not eliminated, to reduce special-interest money in elections.

Meredith McGehee, policy director at the Campaign Legal Center, says the amount of public funds currently available to candidates is too small to be competitive in modern presidential races. She says lawmakers need to update the system to better emphasize small donations to candidates and raise the total amount of public funding available. "Imagine if you didn't make any changes to the tax code since 1976. Of course public financing is outdated. The issue, then, is not to get rid of, but how to fix."

Craig Holman from the public interest group Public Citizen says his organization and others like it will urge lawmakers to oppose the GOP's bill because it violates the GOP's transparency promises, both on the 2010 campaign trail and now as the House majority. "This just came out of the blue, has had no deliberation and no discussion within the Republican and Democratic conferences," Holman says. "They have just been seated and

they're already breaking the ground rules on how they'll do business."

This legislation is strongly opposed by Americans for Campaign Reform, the Brennan Center for Justice, Common Cause, Democracy 21, the League of Women Voters, People for the American Way, and U.S. PIRG, to name a few.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, which would be damaging to our democracy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, this past Thursday marked the one year anniversary of the United States Supreme Court's ruling on the case *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*.

That is the day the liberty of the American Republic want on sale to the highest bidder.

And today, the House gathers to remove one of the few remaining tools the average American has to voluntarily participate in a presidential election—let me remind those in support of H.R. 359 that the average American is not a multi-national corporation with hundreds of millions of dollars at their disposal.

My friends on the other side have said that this bill has nothing to do with the *Citizens United* case; I respectfully disagree.

Because of the overreaching ruling in *Citizens United*, not only are large corporations now allowed to reach into their deep pockets to spend unlimited funds in support of those running for office. But they can pay for political advertisements in the days leading up to an election—a provision previously banned by the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act.

The winner in this case was not *Citizens United* and the loser was not the Federal Elections Commission. The winners are multi-national corporations and Wall Street. The loser is the liberty of the American people. For if money = free speech, then lack of money = lack of free speech.

Corporations have always had heavy influence in the U.S. government. But today, as a result of the Supreme Court's decision one year ago, we have entered a new era in the corporate ownership of America.

In this past mid-term election, the fallout of *Citizens United v. FEC* saw close to \$4 billion poured into the mid-term cycle. This was an all-time record.

It is frightening to imagine how much money will be spent during a presidential election year if public financing is stripped.

Four billion dollars—a record-breaking amount of money—was spent at a time when our country's unemployment hovers near 10 percent.

That gross amount of cash came from big business and Wall Street. To claim the *Citizens United* made no difference in the billions spent is absurd.

A few justices on the Supreme Court curiously decided that giant banks—which have already taken so much from the American people—are deserving of the same protection under the First Amendment of the Constitution as the very people they hurt.

Wall Street has stripped the average American of their retirement funds, their homes, and drown our society in debt; now the Supreme Court has stripped them clean of their Constitutional right to a free democracy.

This is unacceptable.

Those who benefit from the big money that is injected into elections by big business and

Wall Street banks have tried to stop legislative fixes. The Supreme Court has shown its willingness to overturn a century's worth of legislation designed to protect our electoral system. Now this Congress is about to vote to remove the voluntary public financing system put in place in the wake of the Watergate Scandal.

My friends in the new majority say that the system is broken, and I agree.

That is why I have introduced, year after year, a Constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 6, to ensure that no corporation, no Wall Street bank, no big oil company, no deep pocket interest will be able to buy elections.

I believe, the only long-term solution is to amend the United States Constitution.

America's founders had the wisdom to know that as our young Republic matured, changes would need to be made.

That is why they wrote Article V of the United States Constitution, which allows for amendments to the Constitution.

The time has come to exercise this Constitutional right and fundamentally protect American liberty.

Additionally, H.J. Res. 8, another amendment I have introduced, will amend the Constitution to give Congress the authority to set limits on the amount of contributions that may be accepted by a candidate.

Congress cannot allow a tidal wave of big money to drown the integrity of our electoral system. *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* was not a question of First Amendment rights; instead, it was an opportunity to protect the voices of average Americans who have been silenced by hugh corporate bank accounts.

One year ago this free Republic suffered a staggering blow.

Today, we must be firm and resolute in our response.

I urge my colleagues to protect public funding, to vote in favor of the Polis amendment, and to vote NO on H.R. 359.

The freedom and liberty our founders envisioned truly is at stake.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period not to exceed 5 hours and shall be considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 359

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) **TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF INCOME TAX PAYMENTS.**—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—This section shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009.”.

(b) **TERMINATION OF FUND AND ACCOUNT.**—

(1) **TERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 9014. TERMINATION.**

“The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to any presidential election (or any presidential nominating conven-

tion) after the date of the enactment of this section, or to any candidate in such an election.”.

(B) **TRANSFER OF EXCESS FUNDS TO GENERAL FUND.**—Section 9006 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS REMAINING AFTER TERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the fund after the date of the enactment of this section to the general fund of the Treasury.”.

(2) **TERMINATION OF ACCOUNT.**—Chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“**SEC. 9043. TERMINATION.**

“The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to any candidate with respect to any presidential election after the date of the enactment of this section.”.

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9014. Termination.”.

(2) The table of sections for chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9043. Termination.”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate.

The Chair would advise, in light of the gentleman from New York's parliamentary inquiry earlier, that the printed RECORD is available.

Each amendment printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee and shall be considered as read.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 23, strike “Treasury.” and insert “Treasury, to be used only for reducing the deficit.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, there is a strong bipartisan agreement that the long-term health of our economy necessitates confronting persistent budget deficits and the growing national debt.

Democrats and Republicans were able to work together to create balanced budgets in the 1990s and a similar attempt is needed now.

While I appreciate the efforts of the Republican leadership to put forward a specific budget cut, I have serious concerns with eliminating the public campaign financing system. However, if the House is going to vote on this, we owe it to the American people to ensure that the funds are actually used for deficit reduction and not for additional spending.

When I was reading the text of this legislation, I was surprised to find that the bill does not make specific provisions for using the remaining money in

the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to reduce the deficit. This is why I am putting forward my amendment that will ensure that the \$194 million in tax dollars currently sitting in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund will be used to reduce the deficit should this legislation become law.

As introduced, H.R. 359 would transfer this money to the Treasury's general fund where it could be dedicated to new spending or lent to government trust funds. My amendment would simply specify that upon transfer to the Treasury, these funds are to be used only, to be used only, for reducing the deficit.

This is about sending a message to taxpayers. If we are going to put deficit reduction in a bill's title, then we should make sure the deficit reduction is in the statutory language as well.

It is a matter of fact that the bill, as introduced, simply returns the \$194 million in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to the Treasury's general fund and it is from this fund that most expenditures are made, as well as loans to a number of government trust funds. If we are going to pass a bill to reduce the deficit, let's make sure it actually does that.

It is not uncommon or unprecedented to specify funds being returned to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction. In fact, I am proud to be a bipartisan cosponsor of two Republican bills introduced this session, one by my colleague from Michigan, Chairman CAMP, and Representative GINGREY, that would codify the requirements that unspent funds from the Members' representational allowances be used specifically for deficit reduction.

This amendment basically uses the same language as in both of those bills by Mr. CAMP and Mr. GINGREY. If Congress is going to send a message to taxpayers that cutting spending is a top priority, then let's make sure those recovered funds are actually used to reduce the deficit.

My amendment is a commonsense change that ensures that the stated purpose of this bill, deficit reduction, will actually be carried out.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. I wholeheartedly agree and ask that it be passed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, amend line 21 to read as follows: "to the Office of Justice Programs for local law enforcement for costs of providing security at Presidential nominating conventions."

□ 1250

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Castor amendment to safeguard the local government security funds that come from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. I know a lot of the debate has been focused on public campaign financing of Presidential campaigns, but another important portion of that fund goes to local communities to help them with local security and local law enforcement costs when they host a political party convention.

And we're very proud in my hometown of Tampa to be the host of the 2012 Republican convention. It's no wonder that the Republicans selected Tampa; it's a wonderful place. We have beautiful beaches. We need the business and the jobs. So we're going to be a very welcoming community. We do conventions very well. And we're very happy that we're going to play host to the Republican convention.

But here are great warning flags going off because what I hear from my local law enforcement community is that the security costs, especially in the post-9/11 world, are very daunting. They are very concerned with the cost of providing security for the Republican convention, just like, I think, any host community would be for any party convention.

So what this amendment does is it says that, rather than completely do away with this fund, we will retain the portion that will cover local law enforcement security costs. We're going to need this help.

What I understand from my colleagues in Minneapolis after the last convention is that they received over \$16 million from this fund to help them cover the costs of security, yet that wasn't enough to fully cover all the cost. And let me tell you, in this economy right now, in an area where we were hard hit by the recession in 2007, early 2007, our local governments simply don't have the wherewithal to go this extra mile and cover all of these security costs.

So what I'm asking through this amendment, as we come together in a bipartisan way to cover those local law enforcement costs, is let's not throw out the entire fund. Let's retain this amount, or what's left in the fund, to go to cover these local security costs.

Let's face it, too, this is voluntary. This is the voluntary checkoff on your income tax form that taxpayers all across America can decide if they want to do this or not. This is not something that is mandatory upon all taxpayers across the country. And if folks around the country, if taxpayers want to say, voluntarily, We want to help keep big money out of campaigns and we want to help cover local security issues, then we should be following through with that commitment and not eliminating it, not giving them any choice at all.

Overall, if the majority will not accept this amendment, since you have raised the point of order, and it seems like you don't want to bring it up to a vote, I would urge everyone to vote "no" on H.R. 359 because it puts in danger dollars that can be used by the City of Tampa, the Tampa Bay area, and other communities for security, transportation, preparation, and other allowable purposes.

This amendment intends to replace the \$100 million we spend for security every 4 years with funding from this voluntary fund. If we kill this fund, we're going to be hurting many local communities such as my hometown of Tampa. The host committee will be way behind the eight ball. They're doing a good job but, boy, this was a commitment, this is the law, and you're going to really stick it to them by taking these security funds away.

So let's vote on making our communities safe when we rally a democracy under our political conventions.

Mr. Chairman, at this point, since the majority party has offered a point of order, it appears that they are not going to allow this amendment and probably the next one to come up for a vote. So because the majority has raised a point of order to prevent a vote on my amendment, I reluctantly ask unanimous consent to withdraw both of my amendments, which would have safeguarded our security funds for local law enforcement.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN AND LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

With respect to Federal funds received by an entity, other than a natural person, it shall be unlawful for such entity to—

- (1) use such funds to advocate the election or defeat of a Presidential candidate;
- (2) use such funds to engage in any lobbying activity; or
- (3) donate such funds to any entity that advocates for the election or defeat of a Presidential candidate or engages in lobbying activities.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to withdraw, however reluctantly, the amendment. But I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for giving me this opportunity to discuss what I believe is a critically important issue for our democracy.

My amendment is straightforward. Entities that received Federal funds may not use those funds, be they bailouts, earmarks, grants, or payments for contracts, toward the election or defeat of a Presidential candidate.

I understand what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle hope to accomplish with the underlying bill today. They want to protect taxpayer dollars. Saving taxpayer dollars is a noble goal, particularly in these tough economic times.

Unfortunately, this bill eliminates the voluntary fund that taxpayers elect to put toward campaign financing and does nothing about the much larger share of taxpayer dollars that can now go to campaign financing with no say from taxpayers. If we are truly serious about protecting taxpayer dollars, it is these dollars we should be concerned with. We should ensure that corporations and other entities receiving taxpayer money cannot turn around and use that same money to finance Presidential campaigns.

The Supreme Court, in *Citizens United*, allowed corporations to have unlimited influence in elections. It removed longstanding protections that prevented corporations from making large contributions to candidates and drowning out the voices of everyday Americans trying to participate in our democracy. In the wake of *Citizens United*, public financing of Presidential elections is all the more important to ensure a level playing field for candidates running for office and to preserve the voice of the American taxpayer. By eliminating the Presidential Campaign Fund, my colleagues across the aisle would increase the influence of special interests in the elections, leaving Presidential candidates beholden to large, private contributions.

If my colleagues insist on eliminating this important and completely voluntary fund, let us at least make sure that corporations receiving taxpayer money through bailouts, earmarks, and other Federal funds are not able to then use these taxpayer funds towards influencing Presidential elections. Let us level the playing field and protect all American voters by ensuring that these large, private contributions to political candidates aren't funded using taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TAXPAYER OPTION TO CONTRIBUTE OWN FUNDS TO PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6096. CONTRIBUTIONS OF OWN FUNDS BY INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—Every taxpayer who makes a return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any taxable year may designate that \$3 (\$6 in the case of a joint return) in addition to any payment of tax for such taxable year shall be paid over to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 9006(a).

“(b) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—Any designation under subsection (a) for any taxable year—

“(1) shall be made at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, except that such designation shall be made either on the first page of the return or on the page bearing the taxpayer's signature, and

“(2) shall be accompanied by a payment of the amount so designated.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 6096 in the table of sections for part VIII of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 6096. Contributions of own funds by individuals.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* created an uninhibited voice for special interest spending in our elections and unlimited corporate speech in our public policy debate.

Special interests were heard loud and clear this past election cycle to the tune of \$281.6 million, almost five times greater than the previous midterm election of 2006. By eliminating the Presidential Election Campaign Fund where everyday Americans can have their voices heard, special interest groups will be able to shout from the top of the mountain and dominate Presidential elections even more.

Currently, between 7 and 8 percent of Americans choose to direct \$3 of their tax liability to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. My amendment is simple. Instead of directing that amount, that \$3 of their tax liability by checking that box, citizens would be

able to check that box and voluntarily make a donation in the same amount to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

What's important here is not whether a President uses the fund or doesn't use the fund. What's important is to preserve the opportunity for the average American to have that speech and the opportunity to say loud and clear that they support clean, good, and fair elections.

□ 1300

My amendment, instead of eliminating the entire program, lets Americans make a donation out of their own pockets. Good government groups are against the underlying bill, such as the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Democracy 21, and Public Citizen. Rather than eliminating the public financing system, we should be working together in a bipartisan manner to reform it and improve it.

Now, I understand that a point of order is being reserved against my amendment because CBO has scored my amendment as saving only \$400 million over 10 years, while the underlying bill saves \$600 million. So I think given that my amendment does contribute to deficit reduction, we shouldn't throw the baby out with the bath water.

Understanding, Mr. Chairman, that a point of order has been reserved, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. VOLUNTARY FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 6096. VOLUNTARY DESIGNATION BY INDIVIDUALS.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—Every taxpayer who makes a return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for any taxable year may designate an amount shall be paid over to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 9006(a). The amount designated under the preceding sentence—

“(1) may not be less than \$1, and

“(2) shall be in addition to any payment of tax for the taxable year.

“(b) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—Any designation under subsection (a) for any taxable year—

“(1) shall be made at the time of filing the return of the tax imposed by chapter 1 for such taxable year and in such manner as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, except that such designation shall be made either on the first page of the return or on the page bearing the taxpayer's signature, and

“(2) shall be accompanied by a payment of the amount so designated.

“(c) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS DESIGNATED.—For purposes of this title, the amount designated by any taxpayer under subsection (a) shall be treated as a contribution made by such taxpayer to the United States on the last date prescribed for filing the return of tax imposed by chapter 1 (determined without regard to extensions) or, if later, the date the return is filed.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 6096 in the table of sections for part VIII of subchapter A of chapter 61 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 6096. Voluntary designation by individuals.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss an amendment that can maintain our commitment to true democracy and reduce the corrupting influence of Big Money in Presidential campaigns, but will also allow for fiscal responsibility and the savings that Members of both parties believe so strongly about.

Rather than end the program, as has been proposed in the Republican bill to fund Presidential elections and reduce the influence of Big Money on our political system, this amendment would make the source of the voluntary individual donations to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. It can be structured in such a way where the same amount of money is saved because rather than, and when I looked into this matter, like many Americans, I thought and many people thought that the \$3 check-off was actually additional money you pay. On the tax form, it looks like it is and you check it off. Most people think it is additional; it is not actually an additional \$3. It comes out of the money you already pay.

So what this amendment would do is say it would be an optional amount on top of the other amount that you pay. So it would be an additional \$3 or \$5 or \$10. We actually leave it open and allow people themselves to designate how much money they would like to apply to fighting Big Money in politics.

So with this approach, we can separate these two issues. One is an issue of fiscal responsibility with which I think there is strong bipartisan support for making cuts, even cuts of programs that we hold dear. Frankly, I am a supporter of public financing and am a co-sponsor of the Fair Elections Act. I support more public financing, but I am also fiscally responsible, and I would make cuts elsewhere. Let's separate that out and say we can save the \$520 million we need to save, but allow the program of public financing to continue as a program that individuals themselves can choose how much to fund when they are filling out their

taxes. I think that is a very critical component with regard to this.

By not capping the amount of voluntary donations, the amount of the fund could even be improved. It could remain solvent and strong because some taxpayers might dedicate \$30, \$100, or \$500. We would make it easy by empowering taxpayers.

I do have a technical fix for the amendment that I would like to offer. This is all happening so quickly, I will get that amendment to you in a moment. But effectively what this would do is, as you know, as it is now structured, all of the money you save going forward and the existing money from the fund is returned to Treasury.

Certainly the intent of my amendment was to do the same thing, but there is some ambiguity about whether the existing money in the fund would be returned to Treasury, which is the intent of the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to modify for a technical correction the copy of the amendment I am sending to the desk.

The CHAIR. If the gentleman would send the modification to the desk.

Mr. POLIS. I withdraw the request to modify my amendment so I can continue with my time. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. So again, with regard to this amendment, it is designed to save the same amount of money because it does, obviously. It simply allocates the money both in the fund; and I offer in terms of a clarification on legislative intent that it is the intent. There is certainly nothing in the language of the amendment that precludes it, as well as any future funds that come in under the regular taxes that are paid. It allows the fund in the future to be funded out of voluntary contributions.

I think if opponents of the Presidential campaign fund want to end the program for budgetary purposes, my amendment gives a reason to maintain the fund. We can, if you believe in the mission of public financing and fighting Big Money interests, also be fiscally responsible by maintaining the fund. Eliminating the fund would continue the trend of shutting out the public's voice in Federal campaigns.

Again, I sympathize with the need to save \$520 million, and I support the need to save \$520 million; and that is a beginning. That is a small beginning for what we need to cut, but we can do so in a way that will allow this concept that was created in the wake of Watergate to continue to exist and work.

I worry about the fate of our democracy with regard to the impact of Big Money on elections, and to get rid of public financing in Presidential campaigns would inflict greater damage on our campaigns and on our democracy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order. I raise a point of order against the amendment because it violates clause 10 of rule XXI, known as the CutGo rule. The amendment proposed increased mandatory spending without an equal or great reduction in existing mandatory spending relative to the underlying bill in violation of the rule.

The CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. POLIS. Yes, I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. POLIS. The point of order is legitimate in the sense that there is an ambiguity with regard to what happens to the money. I would press the point that the legislative intent is to allow the money that exists in the fund to be returned to the Department of the Treasury. We would be happy to work with the gentleman on a technical fix to the amendment that would make that clear. I would argue that it is already clear enough in the sense that certainly nothing is prohibited in terms of returning that money. The formal scoring came back as saving at least, I believe, \$422 million, which is all of the money going forward.

So this is a question of the \$100 million or so that is now in the fund. The legislative intent is to return that to the Treasury which would, therefore, result in identical savings. And we would be happy, to the gentleman's satisfaction and during the course of debate before the votes are called, to clarify that through a technical fix.

The CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. On the most recent clarification by the gentleman from Colorado, the intent of our legislation is to stop this program. Not only would the funds be returned that are already in there, but the program would not go forward.

□ 1310

So, therefore, the administrative costs to the IRS would be eliminated. The gentleman, by continuing the program, increases the net cost because you will continue having the administrative costs that otherwise would be no longer in effect as a result of the underlying bill; and therefore, the point of order would still be appropriate.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado violates clause 10 of rule XXI by proposing an increase in mandatory spending over a relevant period of time.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XXI and clause 4 of rule XXIX, the Chair is authoritatively guided by estimates from the chair of the Committee on the Budget that the net effect of the provisions in the amendment would increase

mandatory spending over a relevant period as compared to the bill.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment on which further proceedings were postponed.

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 7, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—396

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Benishkek
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchson
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cansaco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costello
Courtney
Crawaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culbertson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fincher
Fitpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Green
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harman
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hirono
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Hultz (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moran
Mulvaney

Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling

Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Weiner
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—7

Clarke (NY)
Edwards
Holt

Jackson Lee
(TX)
Lee (CA)

Nadler
Waters

NOT VOTING—31

Baca
Becerra
Bilirakis
Buchanan
Capps
Capuano
Carter
Cooper
Costa
Diaz-Balart
Doggett

Doyle
Emerson
Engel
Frank (MA)
Garamendi
Giffords
Heinrich
Hinche
Hinojosa
Holden
Larson (CT)

Lummis
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Ribble
Ros-Lehtinen
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Speier

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

Stated for:

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 23 I was absent because I was having a root canal.

Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained on January 26, 2011 and missed rollcall vote No. 23 on the amendment to H.R. 359 offered by Representative PETERS. If I had been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 23.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 23, had I been present, I would have “aye.”

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chair, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 23. If present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote No. 23.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, 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. 359) to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, and, pursuant to House Resolution 54, 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. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Walz of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 359 to the Committee on Ways and Means 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. CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.

(a) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘disqualified entity’ means any entity that has not entered into a campaign disclosure agreement with the Department of the Treasury.

“(2) CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.—The term ‘campaign disclosure agreement’

□ 1335

Messrs. HOLT, NADLER, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

means an agreement in which the entity agrees—

“(A) to file disclosure statements with the Internal Revenue Service at such times, and covering such periods, as are required under section 527(j)(2),

“(B) with respect to its receipt of payment for electioneering communications from covered persons on or after January 1, 2013, to include within those disclosure statements—

“(i) the amount, date, and purpose of each payment and the name and address of the covered person making the payment, and

“(ii) the name and address of each disqualified contributor making a payment on or after January 1, 2013, to the covered person (including the occupation and name of employer of such individual) and the amount and date of each payment, and

“(C) to pay damages to the Secretary for failure to comply with these disclosure requirements in an amount equal to 35 percent of the amount that was required to be disclosed.

“(3) DISQUALIFIED CONTRIBUTOR.—The term ‘disqualified contributor’ means—

“(A) any person who makes payments (directly or indirectly) of more than \$100,000 to the covered person during the calendar year, and

“(B) any foreign individual, foreign corporation, or foreign country who makes any payment (directly or indirectly) to the covered person during the calendar year.

A payment that is deposited into an account of a covered person that is not available for electioneering communications shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence.

“(4) ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—The term ‘electioneering communication’ means a communication that—

“(A) refers to a clearly identified candidate for any Federal public office,

“(B) reflects a view on such candidate or on the record of such candidate, and

“(C) is made within 30 days of a general election or a primary election.

“(5) COVERED PERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered person’ means any of the following persons:

“(i) Any foreign individual, corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity or foreign country.

“(ii) Any domestic corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity.

“(iii) Any person described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any person if the aggregate payments for electioneering communications during the calendar year by such person does not exceed \$25,000.”

(b) CONDITION.—Subsection (a) of section 9003 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) agree to not make any payment to a disqualified entity for print, broadcast, cable, or satellite communications.”

(c) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.—Subsection (b) of section 9006 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—Amounts in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to eligible candidates of a political party. No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9005.”

(d) PRESERVATION OF FUND FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.—Subsection (b) of section 9037 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making transfers to the candidate. No amount may be transferred from the account unless the Secretary has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9036, but not before the beginning of the matching payment period. In making such transfers to candidates of the same political party, the Secretary shall seek to achieve an equitable distribution of funds available under subsection (a), and the Secretary shall take into account, in seeking to achieve an equitable distribution, the sequence in which such certifications are received.”

(e) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL COMMITTEE.—Paragraph (3) of section 9008(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) PAYMENTS.—Amounts in the appropriate account maintained under subsection (a) shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to the national committee of a major party or minor party which elects to receive its entitlement under this subsection. Such payments shall be available for use by such committee in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c). No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under subsection (g).”

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

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

□ 1340

Mr. ROSKAM (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), a true champion of transparency and openness in government and our elections.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my colleague and thank him for offering this motion because it's very simple. What this does is allow the American public to finally know who is funding the political ads that they're watching financed by a lot of these shadowy groups.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today our Republican colleagues rejected the idea of having broad transparency by adopting the DISCLOSE Act. What this does is target it in one very important area, an area that the American public de-

serves to know, and that is when commercials, TV commercials, are paid for by special interests, Big Money special interests, including foreign corporations, and corporations that are owned or controlled by foreign governments, whether they be China, Iran, Venezuela, whoever it may be, that the American public has a right to know who is paying for those ads.

It's simple, it's transparent, and in fact our Republican colleagues even recently said they were in favor of more transparency. Speaker BOEHNER said on Meet the Press, and I quote: “I think what we ought to do is we ought to have full disclosure, full disclosure of all the money we raise and how it is spent. I think sunlight is the best disinfectant.” I would hope that would also be true about foreign-controlled corporations trying to secretly finance ads in this country.

Majority Leader CANTOR told Newsweek, and I quote: “Anything that moves us back toward the notion of transparency, real-time reporting of donations and contributions would be helpful toward restoring confidence of the voters.”

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very simple. Let's let the American public know when you have these Big Money special interests, including foreign-controlled corporations, spending this money to influence their vote. Eighty percent of the American people, Democrats, Republicans, and independents, say they want to know. A vote against this motion is a vote to keep the American public in the dark, to continue to allow those shadowy groups, including those controlled by foreign interests, to continue to try and influence the elections in this country without telling a single person. That's wrong. It violates the kind of pledge towards transparency and greater accountability that we heard a lot in this last election.

So I urge my colleagues to act on a bipartisan basis to simply give the public the right to know when those kinds of organizations, including foreign-controlled corporations, are spending gobs of money on TV and not telling the American people who they are or who is financing them.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman. And on the morning after the night we sat here together and listened to the President talk about us working together, we have got a motion to recommit that I think we can all agree upon. As the gentleman spoke about something very uniquely American in our election process, it is that humble idea of someone like myself, a school teacher, football coach, and soldier, with no political connections and no personal wealth, can actually get their friends together and win elections to Congress.

The idea that we should have our elections be influenced by undisclosed foreign money runs counter to everything in this Nation's history. This piece of legislation was a bipartisan piece of legislation that was meant to

curb the excesses in the post-Watergate era. It has been used by every President, including Ronald Reagan, to make sure that our election processes were fair.

So we offer this motion to recommit in the spirit of last night's speech, something we can agree upon together, that foreign corporations should not buy our elections, that any American wishing to run for office should do so on merit and should do so with transparency and the knowledge of the American public.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, support this very simple motion to recommit to keep our elections fair, to keep the American people informed, and to keep this democracy in our hands, not foreign corporations.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, there is really no sense of irony here, is there, that the proponents, the self-described proponents of transparency and openness, in the twinkling of an eye before a vote on an adjournment day come over and say there's your motion to recommit?

This was posted online, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week. The proponents—and this is a modified open rule—the proponents had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on Friday to file an amendment, on Monday to file an amendment, on Tuesday to file an amendment. But the very described people who are now cloaking themselves in a mantle of openness and transparency say, "There you go"—moments ago. Okay, that's the program. I get the program.

What is this ultimately all about? There is a sincere effort on the part of this majority, and I think some folks on the minority as well, to take the President up. There is a real attempt on the part of the proponents of this bill, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, to try and save money, to look out over the entire course of this budget and all of these challenges. And Mr. COLE and the folks that are behind H.R. 359, the underlying bill, are ultimately saying we can save \$617 million over a 10-year period. Mr. Speaker, that's according to the CBO.

So it comes down to a very simple thing. If you want to save the money, you defeat the amendment. If you want to play games on the day that we're all heading out, trying to act like you are full of transparency and openness, support the amendment.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Does the underlying bill cut spending? Does the motion cut spending?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot respond to inquiries regarding the content of a pending proposition.

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.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were 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—yeas 173, nays 228, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—173

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Andrews	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Baldwin	Harman	Peters
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Peterson
Bass (CA)	Higgins	Pingree (ME)
Becerra	Himes	Polis
Berkley	Hirono	Price (NC)
Berman	Holt	Quigley
Bishop (GA)	Honda	Rahall
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Rangel
Blumenauer	Inslee	Reyes
Boren	Israel	Richardson
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Richmond
Bralley (IA)	Jackson Lee	Ross (AR)
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Rothman (NJ)
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Fincher
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Fitzpatrick
Carnahan	Jones	Flake
Carney	Kaptur	Rush
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Kind	T.
Chu	Kissell	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciциlline	Kucinich	Sarbanes
Clarke (MI)	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Clay	Levin	Schrader
Cleaver	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz
Clyburn	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Lofgren, Zoe	Scott, David
Connolly (VA)	Lowey	Serrano
Conyers	Lujan	Sewell
Costello	Lynch	Sherman
Courtney	Maloney	Shuler
Critz	Markey	Sires
Crowley	Matheson	Slaughter
Cuellar	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Cummings	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
Davis (CA)	McCollum	Sutton
Davis (IL)	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	McIntyre	Tierney
DeLauro	McNerney	Tonko
Deutch	Meeks	Towns
Dicks	Michaud	Tsongas
Dingell	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Donnelly (IN)	Miller, George	Velázquez
Edwards	Moore	Visclosky
Ellison	Moran	Walz (MN)
Engel	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Nadler	Schultz
Farr	Napolitano	Waters
Fattah	Neal	Watt
Filner	Oliver	Waxman
Fudge	Owens	Weiner
Gonzalez	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Pascrell	Woolsey
Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)	Wu
Grijalva	Payne	Yarmuth

NAYS—228

Adams	Altmire	Bachus
Aderholt	Amash	Barletta
Akin	Austria	Bartlett
Alexander	Bachmann	Barton (TX)

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

NOT VOTING—33

Baca	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Boswell	Giffords	Lummis
Capps	Heinrich	Manzullo
Capuano	Hinchev	McCarthy (CA)
Cooper	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Costa	Holden	Nunes
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Doggett	King (IA)	Speier
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Tipton
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Welch
Frank (MA)	Latham	Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1406

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, I missed the vote inadvertently due to a constituent meeting in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, because I was having a root canal, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 24, I was with a Medal of Honor winner. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. 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 239, nays 160, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—239

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

Pompeo	Ryan (WI)
Posey	Scalise
Price (GA)	Schiff
Quayle	Schilling
Rahall	Schmidt
Reed	Schock
Rehberg	Schweikert
Reichert	Scott (SC)
Renacci	Scott, Austin
Ribble	Sensenbrenner
Rigell	Sessions
Rivera	Shimkus
Roby	Shuler
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rokita	Southerland
Rooney	Stearns
Ross (AR)	Stivers
Ross (FL)	Stutzman
Royce	Sullivan
Runyan	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)

NAYS—160

Ackerman	Harman
Andrews	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Himes
Barrow	Hirono
Bass (CA)	Holt
Becerra	Honda
Berkley	Hoyer
Berman	Inslee
Bishop (GA)	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Jackson (IL)
Blumenauer	Jackson Lee
Brady (PA)	(TX)
Brown (FL)	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Jones
Carnahan	Kaptur
Carney	Keating
Carson (IN)	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Kind
Chu	Kissell
Cicilline	Kucinich
Clarke (MI)	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Lee (CA)
Cleaver	Levin
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)
Cohen	Lipinski
Connolly (VA)	Lofgren, Zoe
Conyers	Lowe
Costello	Lujan
Courtney	Lynch
Critz	Maloney
Crowley	Markey
Cummings	Matsui
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (IL)	McCollum
DeGette	McDermott
DeLauro	McGovern
Deutch	McIntyre
Dicks	McNerney
Dingell	Meeks
Edwards	Michaud
Ellison	Miller (NC)
Engel	Miller, George
Eshoo	Moore
Farr	Moran
Fattah	Murphy (CT)
Filner	Nadler
Fudge	Napolitano
Gonzalez	Neal
Green, Al	Olver
Green, Gene	Pallone
Grijalva	Pascrell
Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)
Hanabusa	Payne

NOT VOTING—35

Baca	Frank (MA)
Boswell	Garamendi
Braley (IA)	Giffords
Capps	Heinrich
Capuano	Herger
Cooper	Higgins
Costa	Hinche
DeFazio	Hinojosa
Diaz-Balart	Holden
Doggett	King (IA)
Doyle	Larson (CT)
Emerson	Latham

Pelosi	Perlmutter
Peters	Pingree (ME)
Polis	Price (NC)
Quigley	Rangel
Reyes	Richardson
Richardson	Richmond
Rothman (NJ)	Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger	Rush
Ryan (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Sánchez, Loretta	T.
Sarbanes	Schakowsky
Schakowsky	Schrader
Schwartz	Scott (VA)
Scott (VA)	Scott, David
Serrano	Sewell
Sherman	Sires
Slaughter	Smith (WA)
Stark	Sutton
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Tierney	Tonko
Towns	Tsongas
Velázquez	Visclosky
Walz (MN)	Wasserman
Wasserman	Schultz
Waters	Watt
Waxman	Weiner
Wilson (FL)	Woolsey
Wu	Yarmuth

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 25, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I regret missing a floor vote on Wednesday, January 26, 2011 due to a ceremony honoring Staff Sergeant Salvatore Guinta. Had I registered my vote, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall 25, on final passage of H.R. 359—To reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes today because of weather-related conditions. If I had been here, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 24 and "yea" on rollcall No. 25.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 2011 I missed rollcall votes 22 and 23, due to a family emergency. Had I been present on rollcall vote 22, I would have voted "no" or "nay". Had I been present on rollcall vote 23, I would have voted "yes" or "aye." Had I been present on rollcall vote 24, I would have voted "yes" or "aye." Had I been present on rollcall vote 25, I would have voted "no" or "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for several votes taken on the House floor earlier today. As a result, I missed rollcall Votes Nos 23, 24, and 25. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall No. 23: "yea"; rollcall No. 24: "yea"; rollcall No. 25: "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes on January 26, 2011 and would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 23: "yes"; rollcall No. 24: "yes"; rollcall No. 25: "no."

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.J. RES. 22

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors of H.J. Res. 22.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Ethics:

JANUARY 26, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC 20515.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: This letter is to notify you that as of close of business today I am resigning as the Ranking Member of the Committee on Ethics.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, DC, January 26, 2011.

Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: This letter is to advise you that, effective today, I am taking a leave of absence from the Committee on Small Business until my tenure on the Committee on the Budget is completed. It is my understanding from Clause C of Rule 19 of the Democratic Caucus rules (referenced below) that I will continue to accrue seniority during the leave of absence, at the same rate as if I had continued to serve on the Committee on Small Business.

Rule 19, Clause C: "Any Member of the Committee on the Budget shall be entitled to take a leave of absence from service on any committee or subcommittee during the period he or she serves on the Budget Committee and seniority rights of such Member on such committee and on each subcommittee to which such Member was assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if such Member had continued to so serve during the period of the leave of absence."

Accompanying this letter is a letter from the Democratic Leader verifying that my seniority on the Committee on Small Business will continue to accrue during my absence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HEATH SHULER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 62

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Ms. Linda T. Sánchez of California, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. Edwards, and Mr. Pierluisi.

(2) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Peters, Mr. Owens, and Mr. Keating.

(3) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Donnelly of Indiana, Mr. Walz of Minnesota, Mr. Barrow, and Mr. Carnahan.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
Mr. THOMPSON, California
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois
Mr. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
Mr. SCHIFF, California
Mr. BOREN, Oklahoma
Mr. GUTIERREZ, Illinois
Mr. CHANDLER, Kentucky

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. JOHNSON, Texas
Mr. LATOURETTE, Ohio

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. TURNER, Ohio, Chairman
Mr. SHIMKUS, Illinois
Mr. SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
Mr. MILLER, Florida
Mrs. EMERSON, Missouri
Ms. GRANGER, Texas
Mr. BILIRAKIS, Florida

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 5, 112th Congress, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of

the following Members of the House to the House Democracy Partnership:

Mr. DREIER, California, Chairman
Mr. FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
Mrs. BIGGERT, Illinois
Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. BUCHANAN, Florida
Mr. BOUSTANY, Louisiana
Mr. WILSON, South Carolina
Mr. ROSKAM, Illinois
Mr. CRENSHAW, Florida
Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Florida

APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces that the Speaker and President pro tempore of the Senate hereby jointly appoint Dr. Douglas W. Elmendorf as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2015.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, January 23 to 29, is National School Choice Week. Earlier this week in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, students, parents, and legislators from both parties and varying walks of life, from across the commonwealth, gather to rally for school choice in the State capitol.

Every day, tens of thousands of children attend schools where quality education is not being offered. Meanwhile, those that defend the status quo claim that, if we just do more of the same, at some point schools will improve. Throughout the laboratories of democracy in this great Nation, concerned parents are moving forward with a different vision which is better for our children.

So as we continue in this new 112th Congress, let's make a commitment for America's parents that they will not be forced to send their children to low-quality schools without other choices. Let's provide parents with options, whether they are public, private, charter, home, or cyber schools, for the education that is the best fit for their children.

Children don't have the luxury of waiting for change. For today's students, reform only works if it takes place while they are still in school.

I commend those back home that are standing up for our children. And I will do in my part here in Washington to support their efforts, not just this week, but always, in order to ensure that each child has the opportunity to live up to his or her individual learning potential.

□ 1420

A PLAN FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, this House voted to eliminate one of the anchors of democracy: allowing Americans to check off on their IRS filing form \$3—just \$3—to promote and support the democratic process of electing the President of the United States, all in the name of deficit reduction.

But deficit reduction doesn't work without a plan. It doesn't work without thinking about the many State Departments of Transportation that can no longer fix the highways and freeways in your community; or that can promote rail mobility in order to take cars off the road; or that can, in fact, keep the doors of community colleges open; or that can support primary education while State legislatures are struggling to find resources to provide for teachers and students.

So let me say this: I want to work with you on deficit reduction. In fact, I've done it before but not without a plan. I believe that investing in the infrastructure of America is a plan that will allow jobs to be created. That's the serious way of dealing with moving America forward and allowing for the genius of America—having a plan that responds to building America and not making false projections about saving money.

HONORING SHERIFF JAMES A. ALDERDEN

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sheriff James A. Alderden. Sheriff Alderden served as Sheriff of Larimer County in my congressional district from January, 1999, until his recent retirement on January 10, 2011.

Sheriff Alderden served the State of Colorado in various capacities prior to becoming Sheriff of Larimer County. His resume includes periods of work for the Colorado Bureau of Investigations, the Colorado State University Police Department, as well as the Steamboat Springs Police Department. His career is a shining example of dedication to the State of Colorado.

In addition to having a great sense of humor, he is a leader. He has great respect and gives his colleagues great respect. Sheriff Alderden would incorporate all employees into the decision-making process by giving them the respect and authority they deserve to identify problems and to correct them.

As his lasting legacy, he implemented the police department's motto of serving with the acronym PRIDE, which stands for Professionalism, Respect, Integrity, Duty, and Empowerment. Sheriff Alderden embodied these

virtues throughout his career. He also personifies these virtues on a personal level.

It is my great honor to stand here on the House floor honoring Sheriff Jim Alderden and thanking him for his service.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. BRADY, Texas, Chairman
Mr. BURGESS, Texas
Mr. CAMPBELL, California
Mr. DUFFY, Wisconsin
Mr. AMASH, Michigan
Mr. MULVANEY, South Carolina

HONORING HOUSE STAFFER MIKE WIEHE FOR HIS PUBLIC SERVICE

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, as elected officials, all of us who serve in this Chamber have the honor of representing our constituents in public service. And as elected officials, we are also fortunate that some of our best and most able Americans choose to serve their Nation and their communities by working in our offices as congressional staffers.

In my office, I have a staffer who is leaving who I want to recognize here today.

Mike Wiehe first began working for me when I served as Mayor of Dayton and has continued to work for me and for the best interests of his community for the greater part of 12 years now.

Mike is a native of Celina, Ohio, and is a graduate of Celina Senior High School and of Wright State University. He has held literally almost every single position in my office: serving as scheduler, communications director, legislative assistant, military legislative assistant, legislative director, acting chief of staff, and finally, as district director and director of military affairs. He has excelled in each of these roles by always performing his job well and by leading his fellow staffers by example.

Mike's last day in my office will be January 31. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mike for his tremendous service and for the huge sacrifices that he has made over the years in pursuit of public service.

Mike, we wish you all the best in all your future endeavors.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE "RIDE PAST THE WRECKAGE" IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama gave a stirring speech last night, most of which I agreed with, especially the calls for defense cuts; the investments in innovation, education, and infrastructure; and the elimination of oil company subsidies.

But given the sacrifice endured by the American people, I thought Afghanistan got short shrift—a mere two paragraphs.

The American Prospect magazine described the State of the Union as a "ride past the wreckage." I think that was because it applies to the State of the Union's treatment of Afghanistan.

The fact is that the training of Afghan security forces has been slow and ineffective. The inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction said as much this very week. The Taliban remains a vital force in many pockets of Afghanistan, and the head of the Afghan NGO safety office reports a very precarious security situation.

The President was correct when he said that Afghanistan will need to provide better governance, but it's hard to see that happening with President Karzai regularly lashing out at us and, at one point, saying he would choose the Taliban over the United States and the international community.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of being talked down to about this war, tired of being told everything is fine and under control, tired of being urged to stay the course, tired of talk about progress that seems to be little more than an illusion.

The President reiterated last night that we will begin to bring our troops home in July, but there's plenty of evidence to suggest we're ramping up this war instead of winding it down.

Earlier this month, for example, 1,400 additional marine combat forces were deployed, with the possibility of additional mini-surges during the spring, that would push our troop levels in Afghanistan to the 100,000 mark.

We're also using heavily armored tanks for the first time, and there are reports that we're considering expanding the war across the border in an unprecedented way, with risky and dangerous special operations ground raids into Pakistan.

Does this sound like a war that's drawing to a close?

Then in a trip to Afghanistan a few weeks ago, the Vice President suggested to his hosts that the occupation

could extend beyond 2014. "We're not leaving if you don't want us to leave," he said. He should check out recent polling that indicates the Afghan people's deep skepticism, if not downright hostility, regarding the United States' military presence in their country.

Besides, what about what the American people believe? When are we going to respect their point of view? They're the ones paying for this war in blood and treasure, and clear majorities believe that this war has outlived its usefulness and that it's not worth fighting.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the American people. There is only one sensible and humane solution: That is to bring our troops home and bring them home now.

□ 1430

**POLICE OFFICER ANN NONETTE
O'DONNELL, UNIT 429**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Eve, 2010, about 1 month ago, most Americans were with their families and their friends enjoying the holiday season, the joy and happiness of being together at that special time of the year. But holidays do not come for peace officers; they work all the time, especially on holidays. One such officer was Ann O'Donnell. She was a University of Houston police officer. She liked to call herself "Unit 429." She was on patrol December 24, 2010, about 1 o'clock in the morning. She was the first to respond to a possible kidnapping in the Houston area. She sped to the scene, but her vehicle went out of control and she crashed and was killed.

This is a photograph of Officer Ann O'Donnell, 24 years of age. Her father, Jim O'Donnell, who was close to his daughter, normally talked to his daughter sometime between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock in the morning those nights that she worked. On this day, this Christmas Eve, he received no such phone call from his daughter.

Ann was a resident of Houston, Texas, and Galveston, Texas. She had been a peace officer for only 13 months. She loved being a Texas police officer, and Mr. Speaker, she was good at it. She is the daughter of Nonette and Jim O'Donnell. Her father, Jim, said about his daughter, "Ann will never experience the joys of marriage, having her own children to cherish and to grow by her example." As a father of four kids, three of them daughters, three of them about the same age as Ann, I understand the close relationship between a father and a daughter. That is a special relationship. But no parent wants to lose their child before their time.

Ann was a compassionate police officer. She not only arrested the bad guys; once she arrested an underage

minor for an alcohol offense. Rather than send this child to detention, she called the parents and got the parents involved in this child's life. She was from Ball High School in Galveston, Texas. She went to the University of Houston and Galveston College. In her youth, she learned from the Galveston County police officers about being a peace officer. She wanted not only to capture outlaws, but to help the good people of our community.

Mr. Speaker, police officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the fox and the chickens, and Officer O'Donnell was one of those officers. They, like Ann, do society's dirty work, and they go and serve and are first responders to public safety. Ann was such a person.

Ann was the 252nd female police officer killed in the line of duty in this country since 1796. Already this year, in 2011, 14 police officers in our country have given their lives for the rest of us. Ann died protecting and serving the people of Texas, and at Ann's funeral 500 police officers paid her honor in the rain. Harvey Rice of the Houston Chronicle said it best about her funeral, "Officers filed out of the church while the bells tolled 'Hark The Herald Angels Sing.'" The officers re-formed ranks and stood at attention again in the rain as the casket was carried down the steps and placed in a black hearse. At the cemetery, the rain-drenched officers again gathered as a riderless horse followed the casket to the grave site and bagpipes played "Amazing Grace." Officers fired a 21-gun salute, and two buglers played "Taps."

Amazing person, this Officer Ann O'Donnell. We admire her and thank her for being a Texas peace officer, and for her life that she gave for the people. We mourn her loss, but Mr. Speaker, we are grateful that such a person as Officer O'Donnell ever lived.

And that's just the way it is.

**SLAIN MIAMI-DADE POLICE
OFFICERS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to also honor our first responders killed in the line of duty, two brave south Florida police officers shot and killed just this past week. Miami-Dade County veteran detectives 41-year-old Roger Castillo and 44-year-old Amanda Haworth died last Thursday while protecting the community they love.

As part of a fugitive task force working with the U.S. Marshals Service, Officers Castillo and Haworth were members of a professional elite unit whose mission is to go after violent career criminals. Last week, they were attempting to arrest one such violent criminal. They were hunting a fugitive suspected of murdering another man simply for raising his voice with the

suspect. When police knocked on the door of a home where he was believed to be, the suspect opened fire, killing Officers Castillo and Haworth and injuring Officer Diedra Beecher.

Combined, Officers Castillo and Haworth dedicated 44 years to serving the citizens of south Florida. They put their lives on the line every day to make us safer. And last Thursday, these two heroes made the ultimate sacrifice. We lost them to a senseless act of violence by someone with a total disregard for the lives of others. We grieve their loss not only to the community they served, but to the families and loved ones they leave behind.

A 21-year veteran on the force, family members say Detective Roger Castillo loved two things in this world, his family and his job. His wife of 15 years, Debbie, also works as a police officer. Officer Castillo leaves behind his three sons, 14-year-old Anthony, 11-year-old Michael, and 9-year-old Brian. A dedicated father, neighbors said that he was the kind of dad you would see on the front lawn tossing around a football with his boys.

Amanda Haworth spent 23 years on the force. A neighbor said the only thing she loved more than her job was her 13-year-old son, Austin. A single mom, Amanda Haworth would never miss her son's baseball games and would often practice with him in their backyard. Amanda Haworth was the first female detective ever killed in the line of duty in Miami-Dade County.

While I did not have the good fortune of knowing these two detectives, I know this: I know these were two exceptional individuals taken from us and lost too soon. These were incredible parents, ripped from their families before their time. They were excellent public servants trying to make our community a better place to live. We send our thoughts and prayers to heal their families.

To their families and loved ones, I struggle to find words that can offer solace and comfort in your time of distress. The great poet William Wordsworth once said, "Not without hope we suffer and we mourn." Perhaps he meant that we find hope in the belief that our thoughts and prayers will in time heal their families, and in the hope and belief that the children of Officers Castillo and Haworth will grow up knowing that their parents made this sacrifice to make their world and our world a better place. In the meantime, we will suffer and mourn.

After going through our own senseless tragedy with our colleague, GABBY GIFFORDS, we share in the pain of senseless loss and inexplicable violence. Officers Castillo and Haworth will be forever in the hearts of our community.

HOW THE 20-YEAR WAR STARTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, how did the 20-year war get started? It had been long assumed that the United States Government, shortly before Iraq invaded Kuwait in August of 1990, gave Saddam Hussein a green light to attack. A State Department cable recently published by WikiLeaks confirmed that U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie did indeed have a conversation with Saddam Hussein one week prior to Iraq's August 1, 1990, invasion of Kuwait. Amazingly, the released cable was entitled, "Saddam's Message of Friendship to President Bush." In it, Ambassador Glaspie affirmed to Saddam that "the President had instructed her to broaden and deepen our relations with Iraq." As Saddam Hussein outlined Iraq's ongoing border dispute with Kuwait, Ambassador Glaspie was quite clear that, "we took no position on these Arab affairs."

There would have been no reason for Saddam Hussein not to take this assurance at face value. The U.S. was quite supportive of his invasion and war of aggression against Iran in the 1980s. With this approval from the U.S. Government, it wasn't surprising that the invasion occurred. The shock and surprise was how quickly the tables were turned and our friend, Saddam Hussein, all of a sudden became Hitler personified.

The document was classified, supposedly to protect national security, yet this information in no way jeopardized our security. Instead, it served to keep the truth from the American people about an event leading up to our initial military involvement in Iraq and the region that continues to today.

□ 1440

The secrecy of the memo was designed to hide the truth from the American people and keep our government from being embarrassed.

This was the initial event that had led to so much death and destruction—not to mention the financial costs—these past 20 years. Our response and persistent militarism toward Iraq was directly related to 9/11, as our presence on the Arabian Peninsula—and in particular Saudi Arabia—was listed by al Qaeda as a major grievance that outraged the radicals who carried out the heinous attacks against New York and Washington on that fateful day.

Today, the conflict has spread through the Middle East and Central Asia with no end in sight.

The reason this information is so important is that if Congress and the American people had known about this green light incident 20 years ago, they would have been a lot more reluctant to give a green light to our government to pursue the current war—a war that is ongoing and expanding to this very day.

The tough question that remains is was this done deliberately to create the justification to redesign the Middle East, as many neo-conservatives desired, and to secure oil supplies for the West; or was it just a diplomatic blunder followed up by many more strategic military blunders? Regardless, we have blundered into a war that no one seems willing to end.

Julian Assange, the publisher of the WikiLeaks memo, is now considered an enemy of the state. Politicians are calling for drastic punishment and even assassination; and, sadly, the majority of the American people seem to support such moves.

But why should we so fear the truth? Why should our government's lies and mistakes be hidden from the American people in the name of patriotism? Once it becomes acceptable to equate truth with treason, we can no longer call ourselves a free society.

MAKING AMERICA FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President for his message last night, and I especially would like to focus on one aspect of the message.

The President indicated to us that sitting together was important. It has great symbolism, and it's a positive thing; but he also indicated to us that this is not the final step in the process. Sitting together can never, never replace working together. So it is what we do today—last night he said tomorrow—sitting together tonight, he indicated, but working together tomorrow; this is where we have to focus our energies and efforts. We must work together. And if we're going to work together to fulfill what I believe is a great challenge—and that is America first, to make America number one—if we're going to make America first, America number one, we absolutely have to focus on education.

Education is important because the jobs, as we go forward, will require much more education than we have been allowed to have and have good jobs in the past. We must focus on education to have the good jobs that we want. And jobs are a priority for all of us.

Some statistical information is available to help us better understand why we need to focus on education.

Currently, about 25 percent of our students are completing high school. Over the next 10 years, half of all new jobs will require more than a high school education. If we compare our 15-year-olds to 15-year-olds around the world, we find that we are 20 when it comes to science literacy; China is number 13; Korea 3. The U.S. is number 28 when it comes to mathematics literacy among our 15-year-olds; China is number 1; Korea number 3. The U.S. is

ranked 16 when it comes to reading literacy among 15-year-olds, China is number 1, Korea number 2.

We must focus on and maintain an educated workforce. An educated workforce requires that we understand that we have to have quality teachers and that we are going to have to make sure that these teachers will invest in education themselves because they see it as a means by which they can have a livelihood.

I understand that most teachers don't teach simply because they want money. They teach because they want to be with children, and they want to see children learn. This is important. But teachers have to feed their families, too. I support making sure that teachers get a decent day's pay for a hard day's work. I support teachers and making sure that the teachers are available to educate our children.

If we're going to have America first, we have to have a first-rate health care system. We had a great sickness-care system. We were among the best when it came to sickness care. We spent a hundred billion dollars a year treating persons in emergency rooms, in facilities outside of primary care facilities.

But if we're going to be number one, we had to move away from the \$2.5 trillion that we were spending annually on health care, which translates into \$79,000 a second—17.6 percent of GDP—and by 2018 it would have become \$4.4 trillion per year—more than 20 percent of GDP—\$139,000 a second.

To have America first, we've got to educate our people and we've got to have them receive quality health care. Quality health care can never be underestimated because of the way it impacts the workplace.

America can be first. I stand for America first. I love America. And I stand here today to say to my colleagues across the aisle that I am willing and ready to reach out and work with you to help make America first because if America is first, not only is the United States a better place, but the world would be a better place because of the values that we hold so near and dear to us.

We believe in liberty and justice for all. We believe in government of the people, by the people, for the people. We believe that every person ought to succeed on his merits or fail on his demerits. That's what America gives to the world—the notion that there is a fair system that allows anyone to rise to the top, to reach the zenith of life, the best that life can offer. We take this to the world, and I want America to be first so that the world can benefit from what America has to offer.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your message. And I assure you I have taken the challenge that you have accorded us. I will work with others to make sure that we get beyond the symbolism of sitting together and move to working together which will make the difference in the lives of the people in this country and, indirectly, the people around the world.

God bless you, Mr. President, and God bless the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL ERIC M. TORBERT, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS, OF LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to remember and honor Corporal Eric M. Torbert, Jr., of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

On December 18, 2010, Eric was killed by an explosion while conducting combat operations in the Helmand Province of Afghanistan.

In 2007, Eric displayed his willingness and enthusiasm to serve and defend his country by enlisting in the United States Marine Corps at Parris Island, South Carolina. He was then assigned to the 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, California. He deployed to Afghanistan in October in 2010.

Eric understood what it means to live a life with purpose. He served a cause greater than himself. He served the cause of liberty. Eric gave his life to bring hope to all freedom-loving people as did many marines before him in the 1st Marine Division.

Activated aboard the battleship Texas on February 1, 1941, the 1st Marine Division is the oldest, largest, and most decorated division in the United States Marine Corps with nine Presidential Unit Citations. Eric has joined this storied tradition of service and excellence.

Before deploying to Afghanistan, Eric married Marcelle L. Sebastian on June 12, 2010. Marcelle supported Eric when he joined the Marine Corps in 2007 and throughout his entire career. Her steadfast care and sacrificial love for Eric and our Nation deserve our sincerest gratitude.

□ 1450

Eric was a leader. He was a caring husband, a friend, a son, a brother, and a devoted member of a local band. He leaves behind family and friends proud of his service and his distinguished career in the military.

Eric earned a number of awards during his service in the Marine Corps, which demonstrates his commitment to our Nation and his professionalism as a marine. His personal service awards include the Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, and the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon.

May God grant to Eric's family the peace that surpasses all understanding. We grieve their loss. Our prayers and most heartfelt gratitude go out to them, and I offer them my deepest con-

dolences. I am humbled by the dedicated service and sacrifice of their loved one.

Eric's valor and service cost him his life, but his sacrifice will live on forever among the many dedicated heroes this Nation has called to defend freedom. He joins the revered ranks of the many thousands of men and women throughout American history who have given their lives to secure the freedom of the people of the United States of America and the freedom-loving people around the world. He is an inspiration to us all. *Semper Fidelis.*

SUPPORT BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last night the President spoke to Congress and to the Nation about the need for increased funding for biomedical research, both to improve the quality of life of our Nation's citizens, and to generate new economic investment. He is right, and we must heed his call on this initiative.

Cancer research is a vital part of our Nation's biomedical research enterprise, but our Federal commitment to this promising field has not kept up with the rapid pace of scientific innovation. In fact, when you take into account medical inflation, our funding commitment to the National Cancer Institute and the National Institutes of Health has actually been cut over the past 7 years. We can, and must, do better.

We will only see new, promising cancer therapies that increase survival and life quality through a sustained, multi-year commitment of Federal funding for cancer research. There is only one failure in cancer research. It's when you quit or you're forced to quit because of lack of funding. When Federal cancer funding is cut or not sustained over the long term, we lose not only promising cancer research, but we also lose talented cancer researchers.

President Nixon recognized this 40 years ago when he signed the National Cancer Act. At that time, less than 50 percent of cancer patients lived 5 years beyond their diagnosis. Today, with advances in early detection, healthy lifestyles, and new cancer therapies, the survival rate is 65 percent for adults and 80 percent for kids. That would not have happened without a significant investment in Federal research funding. The National Cancer Act led to a continued, sustained investment in cancer research that funded the research community to develop a new generation of smart drugs that help thousands of cancer patients every single day.

Smart drugs are highly targeted to attack fast-growing cancer cells without damaging healthy cells. Drugs like herceptin for breast cancer, avastin for lung cancer, gleevec for gastrointestinal stromal tumors inhibit or

block cancer cell growth. In fact, less than 10 percent of cancer deaths are attributed to the original tumor. It's when cancer metastasizes, when it grows, when it advances to a vital organ the cancer becomes lethal.

All this could not be more important to the community that I serve in western New York. Buffalo, New York, gave the Nation and the world cancer research when the New York State Cancer Laboratory was first established by Dr. Roswell Park in 1897. Roswell Park Cancer Institute continues that mission today. And the research put out by doctors has led to many breakthroughs that alleviate suffering due to cancer every single day.

Roswell Park is one of 40 National Cancer Institute-designated comprehensive cancer centers around the country that are the engine for our Nation's war on cancer. An important part of Buffalo and western New York's future relies upon the success of research completed at Roswell and companies at the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus coming to market, creating new small businesses, and high-quality jobs. If we don't have a sustained investment in cancer research moving forward, the promise of that research and the jobs it will create will be lost. The time to act is now. Cancer is estimated to cost our Nation \$263 billion in 2010 alone, according to the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support a renewed commitment to cancer research because there is no better time than now. Alleviating suffering and death due to cancer in our lifetime should not only be Congress's goal; it should be America's goal. And we should insist on a huge Federal investment toward that goal.

CITY OF HOPE 10,000TH BONE MARROW TRANSPLANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to City of Hope, a renowned biomedical research and treatment center in my district. On January 13, City of Hope reached a milestone few in the world have ever achieved. Doctors performed their 10,000th bone marrow transplant, 34 years after they completed one of the most successful transplants ever, and it was the first.

But this is more than just another milestone. This is a time to remember the thousands of children and adults who have benefited from City of Hope. Patients like Rodrigo Nunez, a Mexican immigrant who, at the age of 17, became ill. After a transplant and the kindness of the community, he graduated from college. He has proudly spent over two decades as a nurse at City of Hope.

Please join me in congratulating City of Hope for their achievement and wish them luck on the next 10,000.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HIGGINS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PITTS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROYCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. CHU, for 5 minutes, today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2 p.m.

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 1 p.m.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent Resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of Staff Sergeant Salvatore Giunta, a native of Hiawatha, Iowa, and the first living recipient of the Medal of Honor since the Vietnam War; the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, 112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 8, 2011, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

226. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Major Defense

Acquisition Programs (DFARS Case 2009-D015) (RIN: 0750-AG63) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

228. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

229. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AD68) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

230. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN:3064-AD60) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

231. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Withdrawal of Regulatory Guide 1.154, "Format and Content of Plant-Specific Pressurized Thermal Shock Safety Analysis Reports for Pressurized Water Reactors" [NRC-2011-XXXX] [7590-01-P] received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

232. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-113, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

233. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser 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.

234. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inmate Discipline Program/Special Housing Units: Subpart Revision and Clarification [Docket No.: BOP-1118-F] (RIN: 1120-AB18) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

235. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0913; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-101-AD; Amendment 39-16545; AD 2010-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

236. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pacific Aerospace Limited Model FU24-954 and FU24A-954 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1021; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-053-AD; Amendment 39-16541; AD 2010-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-300, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1098; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-108-AD; Amendment 39-16532; AD 2010-24-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

238. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0674; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-012-AD; Amendment 39-16546; AD 2010-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

239. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Models B200, B200GT, B300, and B300C Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1242; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-062-AD; Amendment 39-16542; AD 2010-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

240. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Models BR700-710A1-10; BR700-710A2-20; and BR700-710C4-11 Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0614; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-24-AD; Amendment 39-16538; AD 2010-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 25, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

241. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-200C, -200F, -400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0232; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-032-AD; Amendment 39-16549; AD 2010-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

242. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2010-0127; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-242-AD; Amendment 39-16547; AD 2010-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

243. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321-211, -212, -231, and -232 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1201; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-081-AD; Amendment 39-16551; AD 2010-26-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

244. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model S76A, B, and C Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1250; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-075-AD; Amendment 39-16548; AD 2010-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

245. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — DASSAULT AVIATION Model Falcon 10 Airplanes; Model FAN JET FALCON, FAN JET FALCON SERIES C, D, E, F, and G Airplanes; Model MYSTERE-FALCON 200 Airplanes; Model MYSTERE-FALCON 20-C5, 20-D5, 20-E5, and 20-F5 Airplanes; Model FALCON 2000 and FALCON 2000EX Airplanes; and Model MYSTERE-FALCON 50 and MYSTERE-FALCON 900 Airplanes, and FALCON 900EX Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0864; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-202-AD; Amendment 39-16544; AD 2010-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

246. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 777-200 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0430; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-16540; AD 2010-26-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

247. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Adjustment of Monetary Threshold for Reporting Rail Equipment Accidents/Incidents for Calendar Year 2011 [FRA-2008-0136, Notice No. 3] (RIN: 2130-ZA04) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

248. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Emergency Relief Dockets and Procedures for Handling Petitions for Emergency Waiver of Safety Regulations [Docket No.: FRA-2006-24838] (RIN: 2130-AB79) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

249. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Portland, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0719; Airspace Docket No. 10-ANM-8], pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

250. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30762; Amdt. 3407] received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

251. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Feathering Propeller Systems for Light-Sport Aircraft Powered Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0812; Amendment No. 1-66] (RIN: 2120-AJ81) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

252. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Adjustment of Monetary Threshold for Reporting Rail Equipment Accidents/Incidents for Calendar year 2010 [FRA-2008-0136, Notice No. 1] (RIN: 2130-ZA02) received January 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

253. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Yamhill-Carlton Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2010-0002; T.D. TTB-87; Re: Notice No. 104] (RIN: 1513-AB65) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

254. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Expansion of the Santa Maria Valley Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2010-0001; T.D. TTB-88; Re: Notice No. 103] (RIN: 1513-AB31) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

255. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Supersession of Rev. Proc. 2008-52 and Modification of Rev. Proc. 97-27, Procedures for Automatic and non-Automatic Changes in Method of Accounting (Rev. Proc. 2011-14) received January 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

256. A letter from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Regulations and Security Standards, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Air Cargo Security Requirements; Compliance Dates; Amendment [Docket No.: TSA-2004-19515; Amendment Nos. 1544-7, 1546-4, and 1548-4] (RIN: 1625-AA52) received January 18, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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 Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 447. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 448. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 449. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. REICHERT (for himself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 450. A bill to repeal limitations imposed by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on health-related tax benefits under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and to treat high deductible health plans as qualified health plans under such Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Com-

merce, 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. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 451. A bill to ensure that patients receive accurate health care information by prohibiting misleading and deceptive advertising or representation in the provision of health care services, and to require the identification of the license of health care professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LONG, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HALL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. COBLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 452. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and 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. SHULER (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BACA, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 453. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 454. A bill to authorize the United States Capitol Police to reimburse local law enforcement agencies for protective services provided at official public Congressional events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOREN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HALL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CANSECO, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 455. A bill to protect 10th Amendment rights by providing special standing for State government officials to challenge proposed regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 456. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 457. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to remove the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to disapprove after a permit has been issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 404 of such Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

H.R. 458. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to direct certain coeducational elementary and secondary schools to make available information on equality in school athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. REED, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 459. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States before the end of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 460. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 461. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THORNBERY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 462. A bill to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MACK, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 463. A bill to apply the Freedom of Information Act to the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation during any period that such entities are in conservatorship or receivership; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 464. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to the International Fund for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 465. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot project on the use of educational assistance under programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs to defray training costs associated with the purchase of certain franchise enterprises; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BACA:

H.R. 466. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for the travel expenses of a taxpayer's spouse who accompanies the taxpayer on business travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 469. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HECK (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACA, and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 470. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 471. A bill to reauthorize the DC opportunity scholarship program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 472. A bill to reauthorize the Impact Aid Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 473. A bill to provide for the conveyance of approximately 140 acres of land in the Ouachita National Forest in Oklahoma to the Indian Nations Council, Inc., of the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 474. A bill to prohibit the importation for sale of foreign-made flags of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 475. A bill to take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. BRADY of Texas (for himself,

Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ADAMS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction of State and local general sales taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exemption

from employer Social Security taxes with respect to previously unemployed individuals, and to extend the credit for the retention of such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 478. A bill to require that all foreign terrorists with links to terrorist networks who attack the United States or its Government be considered enemy combatants to be tried by military tribunals instead of civilian courts; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 479. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of George Henry White; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 480. A bill to establish programs to aid in the economic, environmental, and public health recovery of the Gulf States from the damage and harm caused by the blowout of the mobile offshore drilling unit Deepwater Horizon and the resulting degradation of the Gulf over time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. CONNOLLY of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 481. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 482. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide a uniform efficiency descriptor for covered water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 483. A bill to create an electronic employment eligibility verification system to ensure that all workers in the United States are legally able to work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. GRJALVA):

H.R. 484. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the personal privacy exemption in the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a credit which is dependent on enactment of State qualified scholarship tax credits and which is

allowed against the Federal income tax for charitable contributions to education investment organizations that provide assistance for elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 486. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 487. A bill to require 100 percent domestic content in green technologies purchased by Federal agencies or by States with Federal funds and in property eligible for the renewable energy production or investment tax credits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DENT, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 488. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 489. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 490. A bill to modify the boundaries of Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico, to transfer certain Bureau of Land Management land for inclusion in the Manzano Mountain Wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 491. A bill to modify the boundaries of Cibola National Forest in the State of New Mexico, to transfer certain Bureau of Land Management land for inclusion in the national forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to require responsible parties to pay the full cost of offshore oil spills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 493. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 494. A bill to authorize the President to reestablish the Civilian Conservation Corps as a means of providing gainful employment to unemployed and underemployed citizens of the United States through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRON of California, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 495. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide immunity for reports of suspected terrorist activity or suspicious behavior and response; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 496. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the carrying of a firearm near a place where a senior Federal official is holding an official public event or carrying out an official or representational duty, or where any person is campaigning for Federal elective office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JONES, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGRON of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 497. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Ronald Wilson Reagan, the 40th President of the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 498. A bill to amend section 1502 of title 5, United States Code, to permit law enforcement officers to be candidates for sheriff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. ROSS of Florida):

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail and at risk individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 500. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the manufacturer limitation on the number of new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles eligible for credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 501. A bill to provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and

Infrastructure, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 502. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund to assist United States businesses with exporting clean energy technology products and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 503. A bill to provide whistleblower protections to certain workers in the offshore oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 504. A bill to provide immunity from civil liability to first responders engaged in lawful efforts to prevent acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 505. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to place limitations on the possession, sale, and other disposition of a firearm by persons convicted of misdemeanor sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 506. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to eliminate Congressional review of newly-passed District laws; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. PETRI (for himself and Mr. WU):

H.R. 507. A bill to increase assessment accuracy to better measure student achievement and provide States with greater flexibility on assessment design; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 508. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the child tax credit and to allow for adjustments for inflation with respect to the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that Act shall not apply to the gray wolf (*canis lupus*); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 510. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit treatment of gray wolves in Idaho and Montana as endangered species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 511. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation of

various injurious species of constrictor snakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 512. A bill to encourage students from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands to become civically engaged through local and Federal government fellowships; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WALSH of Illinois):

H.R. 513. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer individuals detained by the United States at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and certain other enemy belligerents to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 514. A bill to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 relating to access to business records, individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers, and roving wiretaps until December 8, 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 515. A bill to reauthorize the Belarus Democracy Act of 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, 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. WOLF (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 516. A bill to establish a strategy to encourage manufacturing in the United States and for the repatriation of manufacturing jobs off-shored to other countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia):

H.R. 517. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to eliminate the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of a defined area as a dredged or fill material disposal site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Indian tribes to re-

ceive charitable contributions of apparently wholesome food; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLINE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution reaffirming "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States and supporting and encouraging the public display of the national motto in all public buildings, public schools, and other government institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H. Res. 57. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations and other international governmental organizations shall not be allowed to exercise control over the Internet; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 58. A resolution expressing support for designation of the first Saturday in January after Congress reconvenes as "National Congress on your Corner Day"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 59. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the democratic Constitution of the Republic of India and United States-India relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CHU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H. Res. 60. A resolution urging the Secretary of State to remove the People's Mojahedin Organization of Iran from the Department of State's list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on 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. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REED, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACA, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 61. A resolution supporting the contributions of Catholic schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 62. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H. Res. 63. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Student Financial Aid Awareness Month to raise awareness of student financial aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 64. A resolution honoring the life and work of Robert Sargent Shriver; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 65. A resolution recognizing the 16th anniversary of the Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX) program, a program funded by the Government of the United States to provide an opportunity for high school students from the countries of the former Soviet Union to study and live in the United States in order to promote democratic values and institutions in Eurasia, and supporting the mission, goals, and accomplishments of the FLEX program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 66. A resolution supporting the establishment and full funding of a staff exchange program between the House of Representatives and the Parliament of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada, as soon as possible; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. GARDNER):

H. Res. 67. A resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit bills and joint resolutions from containing more than one subject; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 68. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Hockey is For Everyone Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' 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 Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOEBBACH, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. SUTTON):

H. Res. 69. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 7 through February 11, 2011, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H. Res. 70. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution carrying more than one subject; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 71. A resolution honoring the life of Dr. D. James Kennedy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 447.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 448.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8.

By Ms. HIRONO:

H.R. 449.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 8.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 450.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 451.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 452.

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

The repeal of this provision is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHULER:

H.R. 453.

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

Article I, Section 4, of the Constitution expressly provides Congress with the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives. This express grant of power would appear to permit Congress to limit the number of times states can conduct congressional districting and to prescribe how such districting is conducted.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 454.

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

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 455.

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

This bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the people, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 9, Clause 6 which prohibits the regulation of commerce which favors one state over another.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Amendment IX of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 456.

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. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 457.

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

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 458.

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

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 459.

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

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures" and "To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States".

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 460.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 461.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the 10th Amendment.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 462.

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

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 463.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 464.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 465.

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

Clause 1, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution, which states, "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 466.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 467.

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

Article I, § 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BERKLEY:

H.R. 468.

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

Article I, § 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 469.

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

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 470.

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

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 471.

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

Clause 1 and Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States grants the Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 472.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 473.

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

Clause II, Section III, Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 474.

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

Clause III, Section VIII, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOREN:

H.R. 475.

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

Clause I, Section VIII, Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 476.

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

Article I, Section 7: “All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives . . .”

Article I, Section 8: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises. . . .”

Amendment XVI (16th Amendment): “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 477.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 478.

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

The constitutional authority on which this resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 479.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 480.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause (1) and Clause (3).

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 481.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 482.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to its authority under Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 483.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 484.

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

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 485.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 486.

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

Article I, Section 8:

“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;

“To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

“To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

“To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

“To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

“To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

“To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

“To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

“To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

“To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

“To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

“To provide and maintain a Navy;

“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

“To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

“To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

“To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 487.

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

Article 1—The Legislative Branch, Section 8—Powers of Congress:

“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;

“To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

“To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

“To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

“To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

“To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

“To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

“To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

“To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

“To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

“To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

“To provide and maintain a Navy;

“To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

“To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

“To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing

such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

“To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 488.

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

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 489.

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

Article I, Sec. 8, to exercise exclusive legislation over federal lands in addition to the Congressional power to control obstructions to navigable waters, including dams, and the historical doctrine recognizing that the States possess dominion over the beds of all navigable streams within their borders, and the servitude that Congress' power to regulate commerce imposes upon such streams. *United States v. Chandler-Dunbar Co.*, 229 U.S. 53, 73 (U.S. 1913) (recognizing Congressional authority over dams obstructing navigable waters and the re-sale of hydroelectric water power). See also *Arizona v. California*, 283 U.S. 423 (U.S. 1931) (Court deferred to Congress for establishment of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and reasoning that “As the river is navigable and the means which the Act provides are not unrelated to the control of navigation . . . the erection and maintenance of such dam and reservoir are clearly within the powers conferred upon Congress. . . . And the fact that purposes other than navigation will also be served could not invalidate the exercise of the authority conferred, even if those other purposes would not alone have justified an exercise of congressional power.” Finally, the Court has construed Congressional regulation over navigable waters broadly concluding that “that authority is as broad as the needs of commerce. *United States v. Appalachian Power Co.*, 311 U.S., 407, 409-410 (U.S. 1940).

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 490.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 491.

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 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 492.

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

Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 493.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), 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.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 494.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate commerce among the several states), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 495.

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.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: “The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 496.

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. LATTA:

H.R. 497.

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

Clause 6, Section 8, Article 1, which states “The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 498.

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

Amendment I to the United States Constitution, which states “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 499.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which states “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.”

Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution, which states “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 500.

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

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that “All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.”

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 501.

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 Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 502.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 503.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 504.

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

The U.S. Constitution—Article 1, Section 8—“The Congress shall . . . provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States . . .”

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 505.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 506.

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

Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 507.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 508.

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. REHBERG:

H.R. 509.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have

Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

The specific Constitutional Authority cited here is not intended and should not be construed to be exclusive of any other general or specific Constitutional Authority that is otherwise applicable.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 510.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

The specific Constitutional Authority cited here is not intended and should not be construed to be exclusive of any other general or specific Constitutional Authority that is otherwise applicable.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 511.

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

Article 1 Section 8: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;”

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 512.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 513.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8 and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 514.

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

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 515.

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

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests are those given in Article I, Section 5, Clause 2; Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 4; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 516.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 517.

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

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulate commerce, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 518.

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

Article I: Section 8: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes . . .

[and] to regulate Commerce . . . among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 4: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 10: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RIVERA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. WEBSTER.

H.R. 21: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 24: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 27: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 97: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AUSTRIA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 100: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 110: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 127: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 153: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 177: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 178: Mr. WU, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 181: Mr. WU, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 190: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 191: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 192: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 198: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 263: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 300: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 306: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 308: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 317: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 321: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 333: Mr. LANCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 337: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. KELLY.

H.R. 343: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 358: Mr. HARPER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 365: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 371: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 372: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 389: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. SCHILLING, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 397: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 402: Mr. RUSH, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H.R. 410: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 412: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 413: Mr. POLIS, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 414: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 416: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 417: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 431: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 440: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 445: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, Mr. BASS of New Hampshire, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. TIPTON.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H. Res. 19: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 20: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 21: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 40: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. BUERKLE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WEBSTER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. GARRETT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. AKIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HALL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MICA, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS

of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 359

OFFERED BY: MR. WALZ OF MINNESOTA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Mr. Walz of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 359 to the Committee on Ways and Means 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. CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.

(a) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—Section 9003 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DISQUALIFIED ENTITY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘disqualified entity’ means any entity that has not entered into a campaign disclosure agreement with the Department of the Treasury.

“(2) CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.—The term ‘campaign disclosure agreement’ means an agreement in which the entity agrees—

“(A) to file disclosure statements with the Internal Revenue Service at such times, and covering such periods, as are required under section 527(j)(2),

“(B) with respect to its receipt of payment for electioneering communications from covered persons on or after January 1, 2013, to include within those disclosure statements—

“(i) the amount, date, and purpose of each payment and the name and address of the covered person making the payment, and

“(ii) the name and address of each disqualified contributor making a payment on or after January 1, 2013, to the covered person (including the occupation and name of employer of such individual) and the amount and date of each payment, and

“(C) to pay damages to the Secretary for failure to comply with these disclosure requirements in an amount equal to 35 percent of the amount that was required to be disclosed.

“(3) DISQUALIFIED CONTRIBUTOR.—The term ‘disqualified contributor’ means—

“(A) any person who makes payments (directly or indirectly) of more than \$100,000 to the covered person during the calendar year, and

“(B) any foreign individual, foreign corporation, or foreign country who makes any payment (directly or indirectly) to the covered person during the calendar year.

A payment that is deposited into an account of a covered person that is not available for electioneering communications shall not be taken into account for purposes of the preceding sentence.

“(4) ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—The term ‘electioneering communication’ means a communication that—

“(A) refers to a clearly identified candidate for any Federal public office,

“(B) reflects a view on such candidate or on the record of such candidate, and

“(C) is made within 30 days of a general election or a primary election.

“(5) COVERED PERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered person’ means any of the following persons:

“(i) Any foreign individual, corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity or foreign country.

“(ii) Any domestic corporation, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, trust or similar entity.

“(iii) Any person described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any person if the aggregate payments for electioneering communications during the calendar year by such person does not exceed \$25,000.”

(b) CONDITION.—Subsection (a) of section 9003 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

“(4) agree to not make any payment to a disqualified entity for print, broadcast, cable, or satellite communications.”

(c) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.—Subsection (b) of section 9006 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE FUND.—Amounts in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to eligible candidates of a political party. No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9005.”

(d) PRESERVATION OF FUND FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.—Subsection (b) of section 9037 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) PAYMENTS FROM THE MATCHING PAYMENT ACCOUNT.—Amounts in the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making transfers to the candidate. No amount may be transferred from the account unless the Secretary has receipt of a certification from the Commission under section 9036, but not before the beginning of the matching payment period. In making such transfers to candidates of the same political party, the Secretary shall seek to achieve an equitable distribution of funds available under subsection (a), and the Secretary shall take into account, in seeking to achieve an equitable distribution, the sequence in which such certifications are received.”

(e) PRESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL COMMITTEE.—Paragraph (3) of section 9008(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) PAYMENTS.—Amounts in the appropriate account maintained under subsection (a) shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, solely for making expenditures to the national committee of a major party or minor party which elects to receive its entitlement under this subsection. Such payments shall be available for use by such committee in accordance with the provisions of subsection (c). No expenditures may be made from such fund unless the Secretary of the Treasury has receipt of a certification from the Commission under subsection (g).”

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

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 111TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION AND FOLLOWING PUBLI- CATION OF THE FINAL EDITION OF THE CON- GRESSIONAL RECORD OF THE 111TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

December 29, 2010:

H.R. 6398. An Act to require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to fully insure interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts.

H.R. 6517. An Act to extend trade adjustment assistance and certain trade preference programs, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, and for other purposes.

January 2, 2011:

H.R. 847. An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend and improve protections and services to individuals directly impacted by the terrorist attack in New York City on September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

January 4, 2011:

H.R. 81. An Act to amend the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve the conservation of sharks.

H.R. 628. An Act to establish a pilot program in certain United States district courts to encourage enhancement of expertise in patent cases among district judges.

H.R. 1107. An Act to enact certain laws relating to public contracts as title 41, United States Code, "Public Contracts".

H.R. 1746. An Act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the pre-disaster mitigation program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

H.R. 2142. An Act to require quarterly performance assessments of Government programs for purposes of assessing agency performance and improvement, and to establish agency performance improvement officers and the Performance Improvement Council.

H.R. 2751. An Act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the safety of the food supply.

H.R. 4445. An Act to amend Public Law 95-232 to repeal a restriction on treating as Indian country certain lands held in trust for Indian pueblos in New Mexico.

H.R. 4602. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1332 Sharon Copley Road in Sharon Center, Ohio, as the "Emil Bolas Post Office".

H.R. 4748. An Act to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 to require a northern border counternarcotics strategy, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4973. An Act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize volunteer programs and community partnerships for national wildlife refuges, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5116. An Act to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5133. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 331 1st Street in Carlstadt, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Frank T. Carvill and Lance Corporal Michael A. Schwarz Post Office Building".

H.R. 5470. An Act to exclude an external power supply for certain security or life safety alarms and surveillance system components from the application of certain energy efficiency standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

H.R. 5605. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 47 East Fayette Street in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, as the "George C. Marshall Post Office".

H.R. 5606. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 47 South 7th Street in Indiana, Pennsylvania, as the "James M. 'Jimmy' Stewart Post Office Building".

H.R. 5655. An Act to designate the Little River Branch facility of the United States Postal Service located at 140 NE 84th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 5809. An Act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to reauthorize and modify provisions relating to the diesel emissions reduction program.

H.R. 5877. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 655 Centre Street in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts, as the "Lance Corporal Alexander Scott Arredondo, United States Marine Corps Post Office Building".

H.R. 5901. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to authorize the tax court to appoint employees.

H.R. 6392. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5003 Westfields Boulevard in Centreville, Virginia, as the "Colonel George Juskalian Post Office Building".

H.R. 6400. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 111 North 6th Street in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Earl Wilson, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 6412. An Act to amend title 28, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to share criminal records with State sentencing commissions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6510. An Act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Houston, Texas, to the Military Museum of Texas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6533. An Act to implement the recommendations of the Federal Communications Commission report to the Congress regarding low-power FM service, and for other purposes.

January 7, 2011:

H.R. 6523. An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE AD- JOURNMENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

December 29, 2010:

S. 4058. An Act to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgage and mortgage foreclosure.

January 4, 2011:

S. 118. An Act to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for the elderly, and for other purposes.

S. 841. An Act to direct the Secretary of Transportation to study and establish a motor vehicle safety standard that provides for a means of alerting blind and other pedestrians of motor vehicle operation.

S. 1481. An Act to amend section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for persons with disabilities.

S. 3036. An Act to establish the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 3243. An Act to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to administer polygraph

• 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.

examinations to all applicants for law enforcement positions with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to initiate all periodic background reinvestigations of certain law enforcement personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 3447. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve educational assistance for veterans who served in the Armed

Forces after September 11, 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 3481. An Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution.

S. 3592. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Commerce Drive in Tyrone, Georgia, as the "First Lieutenant Robert Wilson Collins Post Office Building".

S. 3874. An Act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to reduce lead in drinking water.

S. 3903. An Act to authorize leases of up to 99 years for lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo.

S. 4036. An Act to clarify the National Credit Union Administration authority to make stabilization fund expenditures without borrowing from the Treasury.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2011

No. 11

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, Lord of history, lead our Senators above all irrelevancies and trivialities to a unity of passion and purpose. Create in them an elevated and refined patriotism that will make them eager to know and do Your will. May the words of their mouths and the meditations of their hearts be acceptable to You, O God, our strength and our Redeemer.

In the awareness that "without a vision the people perish," give our Senators a fresh vision of the United States of America. Also, keep ever before them the dream of the better world that is yet to be.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 26, 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 leader remarks, if any, there will be a period of morning business until 10:30 this morning, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time. The Republicans will control the first half, the majority will control the final half.

At 10:30, the Senate will proceed to consideration of S. Res. 14, a resolution honoring the victims of the tragedy in Tucson, AZ. There will be up to 3½ hours for debate on the resolution prior to a vote. As a result, Senators should expect a rollcall vote about 2:15 today.

Following the vote, we will resume morning business, with 10-minute limitations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 162, S. 163, H.R. 2

Mr. REID. Madam President, there are three bills at the desk due for their second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bills en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 162) to cut \$500,000,000,000 spending in fiscal year 2011.

A bill (S. 163) to require the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

A bill (H.R. 2) to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

Mr. REID. I object to any further proceedings with respect to each of these bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask the time be charged equally against both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

IMPORTANT PUBLIC ISSUES

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise to speak about the issues that I think are most important to the American public. I appreciated the opportunity I had last evening, along with the Presiding Officer, to sit and listen to the

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S249

President's State of the Union Address, which is an annual rite of passage where the President lays out his blueprint and his vision for the next year. In those remarks he did, as he did last year, touch on a number of themes that I think speak to issues that are important for the country to face.

Certainly, there were statements in that speech I agree with, in terms of the things he said we need to be focused on. There are some statements with which I did not agree. But in terms of the broader agenda, what strikes me about the speech is he talked about the need for tax reform, which is something I agree with. I think it is an issue of competitiveness. He talked about medical malpractice reform, which is something many of us have been trying to get to be part of the health care debate in this country for a long time. Unfortunately, that got left on the cutting room floor last year. He talked about strengthening Social Security and entitlement reform, also a critical priority if we are serious about getting spending and debt under control. He also talked about regulatory reform, looking at government reform and the types of actions we might be able to take to streamline or shrink or make more efficient the Federal Government. He also talked about the importance of enacting trade agreements, and I could not agree more. I think trade is a critical part of our economy. Export opportunities for businesses in this country would create economic growth. It would create jobs. Unfortunately, again, those are trade agreements that have been stalled out here for some time in the Congress.

What strikes me about the speech is this. Last year, we heard a lot of the same themes. The President this year, I forgot to mention, talked about a 5-year freeze on spending. Last year, he talked about a 3-year freeze on spending. He talked about trade agreements 1 year ago. Many of those same themes were struck 1 year ago. Yet we have not seen the results of the rhetoric. What I would argue to the American people and to all my colleagues is, it is important that we judge people not by their rhetoric but by their actions. Don't watch what we say, watch what we do. I think that is true of anyone in public life. We all need to be judged by what we do and whether we are following through with what we say we are going to do.

So when the President talks about those priorities, I could not agree more. But, frankly, in order for any of those things to happen, it is going to take Presidential leadership. If we are going to do something on tax reform, if we are going to do something on entitlement reform, if we are going to do something about spending and debt, the President is going to have to step forward with bold proposals in order to accomplish that because bold things, big things, need to be done on a bipartisan basis.

The opposite example of that we saw a year ago, when the health care reform bill was being debated on the floor of the Senate. This is something that impacts literally one-sixth of the American economy. Yet you had a bill that passed the Senate without a single Republican vote. In fact, in most cases Republicans were not included, were not consulted, did not have input into that legislation. So you had a bill that literally impacts one-sixth of the American economy pass out of this Chamber on a party-line vote. That is historic. Because in most cases, if you look throughout our Nation's history, when this country needs to do big things, there is a bipartisan effort to try to get a bill that can attract broad bipartisan support.

So as much as I support many of the things the President said last night, I would argue that the proof is in the pudding. We are going to wait and see now whether his actions comport with his words because the talk about spending and debt rings hollow if, in fact, you are not willing to take on spending in this country, spending in our government, and willing to take on the issue of entitlement reform. In fact, notwithstanding the President's talk last year about a 3-year freeze on spending, we saw the largest buildup, the most massive expansion of government we have seen literally since the 1960s.

The health care bill is a \$2½ trillion new expenditure for the Federal Government when it is fully implemented, at a cost, I believe, to be much larger than that over time when you start seeing these costs pile up and more and more people shifted over into the government program.

Hopefully, we are going to have a vote here in the Senate. I believe we will have a vote. Our leader has indicated that we will get a vote on repealing health care reform. In my view, before this begins to get implemented, it would make sense to throw it overboard and start over and do this right and do it in a way that attracts bipartisan support and actually does something to drive down the cost of health care rather than increasing it because what we have seen already is what we predicted would happen; that is, insurance rates are going up, not down. The massive taxes on that bill, of course, get passed on, so consumers end up paying more for their health care, not less. I would argue that we are going to see some disastrous results from some of the pay-fors in the bill.

The so-called CLASS Act, which is another new entitlement program, is something that even the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, a Democratic chairman, a year ago when this was being debated, said is a Ponzi scheme of the highest order, something Bernie Madoff would be proud of. It has a tail on it that is going to create deficits in the outyears and make the financial fiscal picture we face even worse.

There are so many things about this bill that argue for us starting over and doing it right. But I want to say this morning, because I want to focus specifically on this issue of spending and debt, that much has been made of the fact that we are going to have a vote coming up. On March 4, the continuing resolution expires, at which point we will have to decide what we are going to do in terms of funding the government. I hope that debate or the lead-up to that vote sparks a debate about spending because if we don't start getting spending under control, this problem we have continues to snowball. We have a \$14.3 trillion debt.

The other point I would make is there is another big vote looming sometime between late March and early May—in the April timeframe most likely—where we are going to have to raise the debt limit. We are already \$14.3 trillion in debt as a nation, and we are going to have to extend the nation's borrowing authority above that so that we can finance the government. We have maxed out the credit card. We cannot do this any longer. We don't have the luxury of time. When we are facing a \$14.3 trillion debt, much of which we owe to other countries around the world, we put ourselves at great peril. We put our economy at great peril.

I would argue it is a national security issue, and I am not the only one saying that. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, said a few months back that the greatest threat to America's national security is our national debt. That is the top ranking military official in this country saying it is not the—when we talk about the greatest threat to America's national security, he could have talked about al-Qaida, he could have talked about the Iranian nuclear program, he could have talked about China, he could have talked about North Korea. But what did he say? The greatest threat to America's national security is our national debt. That speaks volumes about what we need to be focused on and what we as public officials here in the Senate need to devote our energies to.

So when we think about that, there are a couple of things that, obviously, we can do. I have advocated, as have others, that we go back to the 2008 spending levels because in the last 2 years, we have seen spending on the non-national security discretionary part of the budget increase by 21 percent, at a time when inflation in the overall economy is 2 percent. So the government has grown at 10 times the rate of inflation in the last 2 years.

When the President talks about freezing spending this year, he is, in my view, dealing with an issue that really—the only analogy I can use—is like closing the barn door after the horse has already gotten out. We have a major problem. We had a dramatic runup in spending in the last 2 years, and freezing it now will enshrine and

lock in to the baseline that massive increase in spending.

If we go back to the 2008 levels, it will be painful, but we don't have the luxury of not dealing with this now. It is going to be painful, but it is going to be necessary if we are serious about providing a better future for our children and grandchildren. The alternative is that we continue to run up these trillion-dollar, \$1.5 trillion deficits year over year over year, adding significantly more to that debt and putting ourselves on a trajectory when I think our economy is in great peril in the future.

That is one aspect of it. We talk about the non-national security discretionary part of the budget. Of course, the national security part of the budget is already being scrutinized and scrubbed. The Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, has made it clear that they are going to try to find savings and efficiencies in there to the tune—in fact, I think they have already determined they can save somewhere on the order of \$150 to \$170 billion in the defense budget over the next 5 years. But then you have this other part of the budget, the entitlement programs—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—which, of course, Medicare and Medicaid are driven by health care costs, and until we figure out what we are going to do on health care to rein that in, to get that cost under control, it is going to be complicated to try to fix. But that being said, I think that is what argues for actually putting remedies in place that will put downward pressure on health care costs, on utilization, so we can bring health care costs back under control.

There are a number of good ideas out there about how to do that. The debt commission made some recommendations, although most in the area of Medicare and Medicaid were largely cosmetic because they couldn't come to an agreement about how to fix health care. Social Security, on the other hand, is available. It can be fixed. I think the debt commission made a series of recommendations that I hope the President and his team will take seriously and come to the Congress. I think Republicans here in Congress are willing to work with him because that is something we can put on a sustainable path. We ought to do it, and we ought to do it now because the longer we wait, the worse the problem becomes.

So you have the entitlement issues, you have the non-national security discretionary spending—things that can be done, that this President, if he is willing to put his rhetoric into action and take leadership, can actually put up as a record of accomplishment for the American people. The alternative is that we continue to add to the \$14.3 trillion debt.

I am not going to sit here and say for a moment that we are not all responsible for this. Obviously, there were previous administrations and previous

Congresses. We have gotten where we are today because we did not make the hard choices when he should have, and now the choices become much harder.

I would also say that in the last 2 years, that debt has grown by over \$3 trillion, largely because of a trillion-dollar stimulus bill that we borrowed from our children and grandchildren, which didn't do anything to create jobs but did add \$1 trillion to the debt, and the health care bill, which, again, many of the costs of that we are going to see into the future, but it has a profound impact on the fiscal picture the country is going to be considering.

What does it mean to finance a \$14.3 trillion debt? Well, it means this: We spend so much on interest that next year the amount we spend on interest will equal the amount we spend on national security. Think about that. The entire security budget to defend this country, that amount of money will be equalled by the amount we spend on interest to finance the debt, and that continues to explode in the years ahead. If for some reason we were to have a runup in interest rates, if something happened in the economy, which, with inflation starting to take off a little bit, generally interest rates would follow that—and at some point in the not too distant future, we could see interest rates tick up. Well, we have been able to manage our debt by the way we financed it and the short-term borrowing. If you saw interest rates reset and go up, it would have an even more profound impact on the amount we pay to finance that debt and the amount we make in interest payments.

Every child in America today under the age of 18 owes \$114,000 because of that debt, and 6 years from now it will be \$196,000. What are we doing to future generations when we saddle them with this enormous debt and put them in a position where they are going to be faced with a lower standard of living and a lower quality of life than what we have experienced simply because we did not have the courage to make the hard decisions that were necessary to get this situation under control.

So I would suggest to my colleagues and to the President after his speech last night that this is not about talk. It is not about rhetoric. It is about action. It is about what the American people asked us to come here and do. I think there were three messages coming out of the election last fall: The American people want us focused on jobs and the economy, they want us focused on spending, and they want us focused on debt.

We are going to have an opportunity in the next few months, when the continuing resolution expires and we look at the issue of funding the government into the future, to deal with the issue of spending. When we get to the debt limit vote that will come up sometime this spring, we will have an opportunity to talk about the debt. But it ought to generate and spark a serious effort here in the Congress, not a cos-

metic one, not a superficial one, not one where we provide lipservice but where we are serious about reining in spending—not just non-national security spending but also looking at the long-term issues that are going to affect this country's balance sheet well into the future, and those are our entitlement programs. It is going to be tough stuff. It is not easy to do this.

I can't help but think that if we had made some of these hard decisions a few years ago, we wouldn't be in the situation we are today. I came here as a freshman Congressman back in 1997. One of the first votes we had—big votes, I should say, on the floor of the House of Representatives at the time—was a vote on a balanced budget amendment, something that I think 38 States have. Our State of South Dakota has a balanced budget amendment, which means our legislature and Governor can't go home until they balance the budget. That vote passed. It takes two-thirds majorities in both the House and the Senate and 38 States to ratify to get a constitutional amendment approved. We got a big, larger than two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives at that time. It came to the Senate, and it failed by one vote. Now, 67 votes here is the magic number to get the two-thirds threshold. It got 66 votes in the Senate 14 years ago.

I can't help but think how much better our financial picture would be today had we taken that step back in 1997 and put a balanced budget amendment—enshrined that into our Constitution and imposed a discipline on the Congress that hasn't existed. Clearly, for politicians here in Washington, it is too easy, when it comes down to making hard choices, to take the easy way, to hand the bill to our children and grandchildren. It is time to stop. We cannot afford this any longer. We are at \$14.3 trillion and adding \$1 trillion every single year.

So this is going to require tough decisions, hard decisions. But I believe this is a great country with great people. We have met big challenges before. I think the American people are ready to step forward and deal with this challenge. I think they are looking for political leadership to do that, to join them in that quest. As I said before, Presidential leadership is critical. It is going to take leadership here in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

We cannot afford to kick the can down the road any farther, to punt the ball to the next generation. It is not fair to them. For generations in this country, we have had a sort of guiding principle; that is, one generation sacrifices so the next generation can have a better life. We may be the first generation that turns that ethic on its ear and asks the next generation to sacrifice because we have not been willing to live within our means.

So I hope we can muster the courage that is necessary, and I am going to do everything I can to continue to shine a

light on this issue when we get into these budget debates. I, frankly, have a series of budget reforms. I think that, absent a constitutional amendment, we ought to be putting some statutory reforms in place that would force downward pressure on spending.

I have a bill that calls for a 2-year or biennial budget where we budget in one year, in the odd-numbered year, and in the even-numbered year we do more oversight. So when people here are running for reelection, instead of worrying about how to spend more money to curry favor with a particular constituency, we will be doing oversight and looking at how we can save money for the next generation. So I would like to get a debate on that. I think we ought to make the budget resolution we pass here binding and give it the teeth and the force of law which it does not have today. I think there are a series of prescriptions that would be worthwhile for us to not only entertain but hopefully implement to really take seriously the challenge that is before us.

I thank the chair for the time, and I look forward to engaging in a debate about spending and about debt and how to better create jobs in this economy for the American people, which is what I think they want us focused on. I hope it will be not just rhetoric but action that follows.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time remains in morning business on the minority side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 6 minutes 47 seconds remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to reserve that time. I do not believe there is another Republican Senator on the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to begin the Democratic side of the morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTING IN AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I listened closely to the speech given by the Senator from South Dakota about the deficit. I was thinking as he gave the speech that it was a good one, but I think a little bit of history is warranted at this moment.

In the year 2000, 11 years ago, President William Jefferson Clinton was leaving office. We had gone through a period of budget surpluses. We were taking the budget surplus generated each year and buying more longevity in Social Security, as appropriate. It was a very positive situation. The national debt of America when President William Jefferson Clinton left office was \$5 trillion. In other words, the ac-

cumulated debt of America from George Washington to the end of William Jefferson Clinton was \$5 trillion. And as President Clinton left office, he said to President Bush: I want to give you, in the next year, a \$120 million surplus in terms of what you can anticipate to happen in the next year. It was a pretty positive situation with a lot of job creation, businesses doing well, homes being built.

Now fast forward from 2000 to 2008, 8 years later. Let's take a snapshot. What was the state of the economy? We were facing unemployment at record levels in numbers growing by the month. We no longer had a national debt of \$5 trillion. Eight years later after President George Bush, that national debt was \$12 trillion, more than doubled in an 8-year period. The obvious question is, what happened? Why were we doing so well 8 years before and had fallen so badly 8 years later?

We had two wars not paid for—we just added those to the national debt—in Iraq and Afghanistan. We had tax cuts even to the wealthiest, something that had literally never occurred in the history of the United States, and that added directly to the debt. We had programs unpaid for, signed by the President into law, very expensive programs, even in the area of Medicare. Accumulate those things with the 9/11 occurrence and the downturn in the economy, and we saw our national debt go from \$5 trillion to \$12 trillion. Instead of President Bush leaving new President Obama a surplus for the next year, they anticipated a \$1.2 trillion deficit as President Bush left office. That is what Barack Obama inherited 24 months ago.

To hear some of the comments being made, one would think President Obama had created the deficit crisis. He inherited the deficit crisis from President George Bush. He said: The first thing we need to do is get the economy up and running. Republicans were virtually no help. Only three Republican Senators joined us in a stimulus bill which is now being mocked and criticized. But, in fact, one-third of the stimulus was in tax cuts, tax cuts to working families to help them through a recession. Another third was a safety net, unemployment insurance, as well as help to State and local governments. The final third was infrastructure, building roads and bridges and things across America for the economy. That is what the stimulus was.

Did it bring us back in a hurry from our recession? No. But it stopped the decline in our economy, and we are bringing ourselves back now as more consumer confidence is being demonstrated than we have seen in a long time.

I was a member of President Obama's deficit commission. For the record, I want people to know that that deficit commission originally was legislation. It was a statute. We were going to enact a law to give this commission

the authority to come up with a report and force Congress to vote on it. Powerful stuff, with a lot of bipartisan support. When this powerful piece of legislation came to the floor of the Senate, seven Republican Senators who were cosponsors of the bill voted against the bill that they cosponsored, this effort to try to deal with our budget deficit in honest terms. After the bill failed, the President said: I will create one by Executive order. I served on it. It was Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson cochairing an effort with 18 members. At the end of the day, 11 of us, including myself, signed on to the final report. I always added the caveat—and I think most would—that I don't agree with all of it, but I think it was the closest we were going to come to facing a terrible crisis.

The crisis is this: Out of every dollar we spend in Washington, we borrow 40 cents. That is unsustainable. Whether we are using that dollar to build a missile or to pay for food stamps doesn't make much difference. We have to borrow 40 cents for every dollar we spend. Where do we borrow the money? One of our major creditors was in town last week, President Hu Jintao of China, a major creditor and a major competitor. Which takes me to the President's State of the Union Address last night.

The Republicans are fixed on one particular area. They believe the sum and substance of all that we do in Washington should be focused on the deficit. I think the deficit is critically important. I voted for the deficit commission report. We have to do things that are unpopular and we have to do them in a sensible and timely way. But it isn't the whole story. What the President tried to remind us last night is that we also have a great American economy. We have to ask ourselves: Will that economy be able to compete in the world of the 21st century? How will we do against competitive nations such as China and Japan and Germany? Those were questions asked by the President last night.

I have heard many Republican Senators and Congressmen since say those investments, that spending, we don't need. What we need is to focus on the deficit.

I think the President got it right. The President is calling for balance, responsible deficit reform, and investment in America that makes a difference in who we are and what we can be. The President talked about the Sputnik moment, long before the Presiding Officer was born, the Sputnik moment, October 4, 1957, when the Soviet Union launched the satellite Sputnik into outer space. It scared us to death. Here this nemesis of the United States in the Cold War, the Soviet Union, with the capacity to develop a bomb that could destroy major parts of America, was now in outer space and we were not. They had a missile that launched a satellite. It was a tiny little thing, about the size of a basketball. It circled the Earth. At that time in October of 1957, a chill set in on Capitol

Hill when people got to thinking, maybe we are not as good as we thought when it comes to math and science and education, if the Russians beat us into outer space.

Congress did something in 1958 in response to that that was historic and considered radical at the time. Congress came up with something called the National Defense Education Act. It was the first time in the history of the country when we had offered college loans to those other than veterans, and it was a program that was going to reach across America and try to put more young people in college. Did it work? Look at the numbers. In 1940, 15 percent of college age students went to college, about a half a million students in college. In 1958, we started the loan programs. By 1960, the number of college age students in college had grown to 3.5 million. Two years later I was one of them.

Now fast forward 10 more years to 1970. By 1970, 7.5 million students in America were in college. Forty percent of college age students were going to college. The investment of this government into the National Defense Education Act and student loans democratized higher education, dramatically increasing the number of students in colleges and universities, and not only prepared us for a man on the Moon and NASA but prepared our economy for more important things to come.

Let me give an example. When Sputnik was circling the globe, our scientists were sitting there upset and frustrated that the Russians were the first in space. Up in Baltimore, there were two scientists at a laboratory, and they decided they would try to track the Sputnik satellite. The Russians, in order to prove they were actually doing something, were emitting a signal from this satellite, this little basketball-sized satellite. These scientists said: Let's see if we can find that signal, the frequency. They did. Then they used—and I will get lost here in a hurry because I am a liberal arts lawyer—the Doppler effect to determine where the satellite was circling the globe and its speed. They told some people at the Department of Defense what they had found. The Department of Defense challenged them and said: If you can tell us where the satellite is and how fast it is moving, could you reverse that equation? We would like to know if we had a satellite in outer space whether we could figure out where your radio receiver was. So they did the calculations and did the work, and they determined it.

The purpose in asking the question was so that we could reach a point in national defense when, if the Russians launched a missile with a bomb on it toward the United States, we could tell where it came from and launch one in return. We did this calculation, and we started the development of this in 1958, where we could figure out where the receiving station was on Earth, if there was a transmitting satellite. If it

sounds as if it might have led to something, it did. It led to a situation today where I can carry in my pocket a BlackBerry which has a GPS. GPS came out of that calculation. Now someone can basically determine where DURBIN is by where his cell phone is. That has become common technology and science, but it was research by the Federal Government that led us 50 years later to this moment.

I say that because the President was trying to make that point last night. When it comes to the future of our economy and where we will be and whether we will be competitive, we need to invest—it is not a bad word, it is a good word—in our country: in people so they have the education and training, so they can compete; in businesses so they have basic research and the kind of incentives for innovation so they can move forward in growing their businesses and increasing the number of employees; and in building the infrastructure of America that makes a difference.

There was a company a few decades ago that became very popular named Lands End. Most people know it. It has since sold to Sears. They own it today. But when Lands End was thriving, it was located in a small town in Wisconsin. A lot of people wondered how they could run a big mail order operation out of a small town in Wisconsin. The answer was they had put together enough infrastructure that it worked. There were enough highways and enough ways to provide their product by mail and other delivery all around the United States.

Now we are in a new generation of challenges. That generation is calling for technology. The President talked about advancing the technology of computer reach to make sure we have high speed computer accessibility across the United States. That technology, innovation, and education is going to build a platform for us to be competitive. I think the President got it right. We deal honestly with the deficit, but we don't do it so quickly that we make the recession worse. And we invest in our people so that we are ready to compete in the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his as usual right-on-the-money words about the President's speech. I anticipate eagerly the speech of my colleague from Rhode Island who graciously yielded to me.

I rise to commend President Obama on the pitch perfect State of the Union he delivered last night. His speech was smart and balanced, forward thinking, and unabashedly upbeat about the future of our country.

Fundamentally, the President spoke about the need to preserve the American dream, to bequeath its promise to the next generation as our parents bequeathed it to us. The American dream

is very simple. It means there is a strong likelihood that you will be doing better 10 years from now than you are doing today and an even greater likelihood that your children will be doing better than you did.

Many people in America think that dream is in peril today. Some people even fear that America is in decline, that our greatest period of prosperity is behind us. To these purveyors of gloom and doom, to those who are sour and dour and think America and its government can't do anything right, the President sent a clear message: You could not be more wrong about America. We are and will remain the most economically vibrant, the most culturally vibrant country in the world, with the best system. We are the only country on Earth that tells a young man or woman, 12 or 13 or 14 years old, whether their family has been in this country 12 or 6 generations or whether they are a new immigrant, you can achieve the stars. No other country has that. That is a precious part of our birthright that remains alive and well today, as we see in the successes of so many.

It is true that we live in a much different world today than the generation that preceded us. The rules have changed, and it is tougher to get ahead. Unemployment is unacceptably high, and the competition for jobs is real. The middle class feels squeezed. But, as the President said, this should not discourage us. It should challenge us.

Last night, the President explained how we can rise to that challenge. He outlined how we can outinnovate, outeducate, and outbuild the rest of the world, tapping the creativity and imagination of our populous.

He urged us to invest in clean energy technology and other cutting-edge industries and challenged us to put a million alternative-fuel vehicles on the road by 2015. Thanks to the ingenuity of researchers such as those at the GM fuel cell facility in Honeoye Falls, NY, I believe we can achieve this ambitious goal. I am also hopeful we can take up and pass clean energy legislation in the months ahead.

The President also called on Congress to reform No Child Left Behind in order to restore America's global leadership in education. I am particularly pleased that the President enthusiastically endorsed a permanent extension of the \$2,500 college tuition tax credit I authored 2 years ago. I would like it to be even higher, to go to \$3,000 this year.

It is no secret that much of our Nation's infrastructure is in disrepair and that too many Americans do not have access to high-speed Internet or high-speed rail. For America to stay ahead of our foreign competitors, we need to improve the ways in which we transport people and information.

Since the days of Henry Clay, with the internal improvements, when our Nation builds infrastructure, economic growth follows, and this has clearly always been a government function. The

President clearly understands this fact and spoke to it last night.

The President did not just focus on growing jobs, the economy, and middle-class paychecks last night. He showed an acute awareness of the need to rein in Federal spending to get our Nation's fiscal house in order. I echo his call to consolidate or eliminate unnecessary government programs and to revisit and revise regulations that have long outgrown their usefulness. Of course, we need to find a balance, but I am confident that more can and will be done to make our government more agile and efficient.

The President had the right blend: Yes, cut out the waste, even eliminate wasteful and inefficient and duplicative programs, but do not throw out the baby with the bathwater or, as he said, do not throw the engine off the airplane when the plane is overweight. So the combination of growth, investment in our future, and innovation, with fiscal moderation and reining in waste, is just pitch perfect for the American people.

Lastly, I applaud the President for addressing one of the most critical matters facing the country: our broken immigration system. As you know, I have championed comprehensive immigration reform for some time, and the President seemed to endorse many aspects of the approach. He likes the approach, bipartisan, that Senator GRAHAM and I put together. He has told us that on several occasions. So I look forward to working with him as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as we map a path to comprehensive reform in the 112th Congress.

Some pundits and handicappers said Congress seemed subdued, even restrained last night. Well, if last night's speech did not seem like the usual partisan pep rally, that is because it was not. The President's speech was not meant to appeal to Democrats or Republicans or even Independents. It was meant to appeal to Americans. In that, the President succeeded overwhelmingly. The fact that we sat together side by side, Democrats and Republicans, was a fine fit with the President's appeal to the whole of America, not to one side or the other.

The address last night embodied so many of the values and ideals that unite us as Americans. It displayed the kind of optimism we relish, thrive on, and believe in. It was a great speech, a wonderful moment of comity. I expect this moment will not fade soon, and I hope so too.

I yield the floor for my colleague from Rhode Island.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I compliment my distinguished colleague from New York on his remarks. I would like to add a few observations of my own, but first I want to echo very much what he said. What the President did last night was to point a finger toward the future, and some peo-

ple were just capable of seeing the finger. But for most people, they saw where he was pointing, and he has pointed us toward an important future for our country. These are the issues we are going to have to address in the decades ahead, and we have to be prepared now. I want to touch on about three areas he pointed to. The first, of course, is infrastructure. I am not the only person in America who has noticed our crumbling infrastructure. Everybody who drives on our roads, everybody who goes across our bridges, everybody who has been to our water and sewage plants knows we have underinvested in those areas for decades.

As the President pointed out last night, America's own engineers give America a D for the status of our infrastructure. The Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that we have \$662 billion in total capital needs for clean water and drinking water investments over the next 10 years—\$662 billion that we need to put into our water and water treatment system in the next 10 years. By contrast, in the so-called stimulus bill, we put in \$6 billion; 1 percent of what we need. We have a lot of work we still have to do to make sure America has the clean water treatment and drinking water it needs.

The infrastructure question is not just about infrastructure the Romans could have built. It is not just about roads and bridges and waterworks. The President referred to a Sputnik moment many years ago and President Kennedy's drive to get us up into space and to accelerate our space program.

When President Kennedy pushed to put a man on the Moon within 10 years and bring him safely home, what that delivered was not just a man on the Moon. What it delivered was the technology that allowed a company called COMSAT, a public-private corporation, to put up into space the satellite technology that became the infrastructure of our modern communications system. That was done because of that call to action.

It is not just our communications system that is core infrastructure, as well as our roads and our bridges and our waterworks, it is also our information technology system, particularly in health care. When we build a robust health information infrastructure—so that as an American you are no longer carrying your cardboard file-covered records from appointment to appointment, no longer having to explain who you are and what you have and what medications you are on and why you are there for the umpteenth time because the doctor has not seen your file because it is not available to him electronically—when we fix all that so your pharmacy, your specialist, the laboratories you go to, the hospital, if you have had to visit one, are all connected to your primary care provider who is directing the care for your condition, that is a piece of infrastructure

that, like our health care infrastructure, will enable enormous growth in the private sector.

That is what infrastructure does. Roads are not valuable because people go out with picks and shovels and bulldozers and asphalt pavers and make them. They are valuable because once they are made, commerce runs across them and the private sector expands. That is just as true of communications and information technology and broadband and our energy grid. We need to invest in infrastructure, and we need to think about our modern infrastructure, not just the infrastructure the Romans could build.

The other point the President made that was critically important is that American manufacturing is not now competing on a level playing field with our foreign opponents. Many people have said this was a very "America first" speech; that the President seemed more nationalistic than he has been before. I suspect that is because in his years as President, it has been driven home to him how many disadvantages our foreign competition puts our manufacturers at. It is not fair. It creates immense disabilities for them and real handicaps, and we have to put American manufacturing back on a level playing field with their competitors around the globe.

I can go to the Cranston Print Works Company in Rhode Island, which is one of the last remaining vestiges of the vaunted Rhode Island textile industry. It was Rhode Island's textile industry that started the industrial revolution. Rhode Island's textile industry propelled Rhode Island to have more millionaires per capita than any other State in the country. Now it has winnowed away, winnowed away, and companies such as Cranston Print Works that has been able to hang on and survive and be successful keenly know how bad the disadvantages are.

You could have their CEO, George Shuster, give you a speech about how in almost every dimension of their operations they are at a disadvantage, and very often a disadvantage that America has created, against their foreign competition. I just want to mention one.

I have introduced the Offshoring Prevention Act because if George Shuster were to take his facility in Rhode Island and move it overseas, he could choose the year he declared his profits and defer them to the most advantageous tax year. When he stays in Rhode Island, he has to declare his profits in that year no matter what. There is no reason on Earth we should reward an American company that moves its processes overseas with a tax deferral advantage that they do not get when they are here at home. My Offshoring Prevention Act would prevent that.

The last thing I want to say—because I see my distinguished colleague from Arizona on the Senate floor and I want to make sure I leave him time—is just

a word about our long-term debt. I was immensely gratified the President took a firm position to defend Social Security. We who are familiar with the actual facts know that Social Security has never contributed a dime to our deficit, never contributed a dime to our debt, and that it is solvent for more than a quarter century ahead of us. It is not an immediate problem, and with very small adjustments it can be never a problem.

In States such as Rhode Island and New York, and I suspect Arizona as well, we have people who count on Social Security. Social Security gives us freedom. Social Security gives our seniors freedom from want and freedom from fear. It gives them freedom from privation and freedom from poverty. It gives the younger generation freedom to pursue their own dreams, knowing their parents will have a dignified old age because of Social Security, and they can take risks and seek opportunities they would never otherwise be able to take if they knew they were the only support for their parents in their old age, if the only thing that stood between their parents and penury was them. Thankfully, Social Security gives that liberty to young people across this country, as well as the freedom it gives to old people. So I am delighted he took this stand and that Social Security will not be improperly thrown under the bus of the important debt and deficit reduction work we need to do.

With that, I will yield. I see, again, Senator McCAIN on the Senate floor. He is a distinguished Senator and a great friend, and I do not want to take time from him.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

HONORING THE VICTIMS AND HEROES OF THE SHOOTING ON JANUARY 8, 2011, IN TUCSON, ARIZONA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 14) honoring the victims and heroes of the shooting on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Madam President, this resolution states that we honor the victims and heroes of the shooting on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, AZ. As we all know, and the Nation and the world knows, on January 8, a gunman opened fire at a "Congress on Your Corner" event hosted by Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS in Tucson, AZ, killing 6 and wounding 13 others.

Among those who lost their lives were 9-year-old Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, Judge John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman.

Christina-Taylor Green was the 9-year-old daughter of John and Roxanna Green. She was born on September 11, 2001. She was a third grader, with an avid interest in government, who was recently elected to the student council at Mesa Verde Elementary School.

Dorothy Morris was 76 years old. She attended the January 8 event with George, her husband of over 50 years, with whom she had two daughters and who was also critically injured as he tried to shield her from the shooting.

John Roll, whom I will talk about later on, is a Pennsylvania native who was 63 years old. He began his professional career as a bailiff in 1972. He was appointed to the Federal bench in 1991 and became a chief judge for the District of Arizona in 2006. He was a devoted husband to his wife Maureen, father to his three sons, and grandfather to five grandchildren. He heroically attempted to shield Ron Barber from additional gunfire.

Phyllis Schneck, the proud mother of three and grandmother of seven and great-grandmother, from New Jersey and spending the winter in Arizona, was a 79-year-old church volunteer and New York Giants fan.

Dorwan Stoddard, a 76-year-old retired construction worker and volunteer at the Mountain Avenue Church of Christ, is credited with shielding his wife Mavy, a long-time friend whom he married while they were in their sixties and who was also injured in the shooting.

Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman was 30 years old, engaged to be married, and served as director of community outreach to Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS and was a social worker before serving with Representative GIFFORDS.

We all know GABRIELLE GIFFORDS was the target of the attack and was critically injured. Overnight, we received extremely good news in that her condition has been upgraded from critical to good. That is incredible news and is heartening to all of us.

Thirteen others were also wounded in the shooting, including Ron Barber and Pamela Simon, who were both staffers to Representative GIFFORDS, and several individuals, including Patricia Maisch, Army COL Bill Badger, retired, was also wounded in the shooting. Roger Sulzgeber, Joseph Zimudie, Daniel Hernandez, Jr., Anna Ballis and Dr. Steven Rayle helped apprehend the gunman and assist the injured, thereby risking their lives for the safety of others.

Some of the actions that took place during this tragedy have been carried extensively in the media. The reaction of the people of Tucson and in Arizona to this tragedy has been incredibly uplifting and encouraging to all of us.

There are so many stories of courage and bravery associated with this action. The quick reaction of our police and other first responders was remarkable, not to mention the incredible and extremely rapid care provided by the doctors and nurses and caregivers in Tucson. So in this great tragedy that has taken place, we can be comforted with the knowledge that our citizens reacted in the way that Americans do—with heroism, with courage, and with sacrifice.

I think it is entirely appropriate that this resolution be passed as one of the first acts of the new 112th Congress of the Senate and House. I wish to thank all Americans for their concern, their prayers and the sympathy and support they have extended not only to the victims and their families but also to the people of Arizona.

There will be discussion for weeks and months ahead as to how it was possible for this event to take place. I don't pretend to know all the answers. It was clearly a deranged individual, an individual who perhaps we could argue, while I can't say for certain, his mental illness should have been brought to the attention of the proper authorities. We do have a law that provides for such an action in the State of Arizona. At the same time, the question needs to be asked: The actions that we now have become very aware of, was the possibility of those actions brought to the attention of the proper people so they could take action?

The fact is it happened. The fact is we who are elected representatives will continue to have contact with our constituents. We will do so and not be deterred by the actions of this deranged individual. We cannot allow the actions of a deranged individual to prevent us from interacting, in a fundamental way, with our constituents. They deserve it. I am confident we will be able to continue the practice of townhall meetings, "Congress on Your Corner," the kinds of activities that are, in some ways, not entirely unique to the United States of America but certainly are not practiced in most parts of the world.

So we are encouraged by the news concerning GABRIELLE GIFFORDS and we will harbor the hope and pray that she will return to her duties in the Congress, representing the people of southern Arizona. We pray for the family of Judge John Roll and those others who gave their lives. Senator KYL and I attended the various memorial services and events surrounding this tragedy in Tucson and we come away obviously with deep sorrow over the event, yet at the same time with a great deal of pride and appreciation for our fellow citizens in Arizona and in Tucson who have reacted in a heroic and giving and loving and sharing fashion.

So I guess we will be voting on this issue sometime this afternoon, and I know other colleagues will be speaking on behalf of this resolution.

(The remarks of Mr. McCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 188 are

printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time being charged to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Madam President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. S. Res. 14.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I want to thank Majority Leader REID and our colleagues from Arizona, Senators KYL and MCCAIN, for bringing this important resolution to the floor of the Senate. It has been over 2 weeks, but our shock and sadness over what happened on that beautiful Saturday morning in Tucson is still very real. They were just ordinary Americans, engaged in what we might call the dialog of democracy, when a gunman stepped in and began firing. Within seconds Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS and a dozen innocent bystanders lay injured, and six irreplaceable lives were ended.

Most of us never had the good fortune to meet Judge John Roll, Gabe Zimmerman, Phyllis Schneck, Dot Morris, Dorwan Stoddard, or that beautiful little girl, Christina Green. While they shared the Earth with us, we did not know them. But we have come to know them in the last 2 weeks. They were good and decent people who loved their families, tried to help others, and believed in the promise of this great Nation.

We mourn their loss. GABBY GIFFORDS, our colleague in the House, believes in the promise of America's democracy. She believes in it so passionately that she chose to run for Congress, even though she probably could have found a more comfortable and even more financially rewarding life. She believed in democracy so much that she was one of those Members of Congress who would hop on an airplane and fly across America on a weekly basis to be back home in her district in Arizona.

She believed in this country so deeply that she continued to reach out to her constituents even after the end of a spirited campaign when a lot of Members of Congress were trying to find at least a few weeks to take it easy before they got back into the swing of things.

She was concerned about her safety. But she was dedicated to her job and her Nation and certainly the people she represented. We are grateful to the doctors and all of the medical profes-

sionals who worked wonders to save her life and to heal those who were hurt. We are grateful to the first responders and ordinary citizens who acted with such extraordinary courage to help the victims, tackle the gunman, and prevent an even more devastating loss of life.

We offer our deepest condolences to the heartbroken families and friends of those who were lost and all those who were wounded in body and spirit by this tragedy. We pray that time and God in His infinite mercy will bring them comfort and peace.

A few days ago, we were encouraged to learn that Congresswoman GIFFORDS was moving to a rehab hospital in Houston to begin a new phase of her recovery. Yesterday her overall medical condition was upgraded to "good," certainly good news. Soon we need to begin the next phase in our national discussion of this tragedy, in order to lessen the prospects of such violence in the future.

We cannot simply mourn and move on. We have to have the courage to face this tragedy squarely. It appears this terrible carnage was caused by a man with a history of mental illness and a gun. It is not the first time. In 1981, President Ronald Reagan was shot by a mentally ill man with a gun. Nearly 4 years ago, a mentally ill student shot and killed 32 people at Virginia Tech. On Valentine's Day 2008, a former student with a history of mental instability walked into the lecture hall at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, armed with a shotgun and three handguns. He killed six people including himself and injured 21 others.

In 1998, a man with a serious mental illness walked into this building, the Capitol, and before it ended he had shot and killed two members of the Capitol Police force. Some are going to argue you cannot stop a disturbed person who is intent on committing an act of violence. To some extent that is certainly true. But you can take steps to limit the harm that person can cause by keeping the deadliest of weapons out of that person's hands. The gunman in Tucson used a semiautomatic handgun with a high-capacity ammunition clip capable of holding over 30 rounds. He fired off 31 shots in a matter of seconds before he had to reload and was tackled by brave citizens.

If he had had to reload sooner, say, after 10 rounds, at least 9 people in Tucson would not have been shot. High-capacity clips were used to commit mass murder at Virginia Tech, Fort Hood in Texas, and in Tucson. There is no legitimate sporting or self-defense purpose for such high-capacity weaponry. Hundreds of homeowners do not need to fire 31 rounds in a matter of seconds.

High-capacity clips were once illegal under the 1994 Federal assault weapons ban signed by President Clinton, supported by Presidents Reagan, Carter, and Ford. But that law expired 7 years ago in 2004.

Even former Vice President Dick Cheney, a hunter, and an outspoken second amendment rights advocate, has said in his words, "maybe it is appropriate" to reinstate the ban on high-capacity clips in the wake of the Tucson tragedy.

We also need to plug the holes in the Federal background check system to make it harder for people with a history of serious mental illness or substance abuse from getting guns. This man who was charged with the murders in Tucson is someone who was rejected by our military because of his mental condition. He was also told to leave a community college because they feared that he was a danger to himself and others. And yet he could purchase a weapon and a high-capacity clip in Arizona, in America.

No one is proposing to take guns away from responsible hunters and law-abiding citizens. The Supreme Court has made it clear, individuals have the right to own guns and I respect that decision. But the Supreme Court has also said that the second amendment is "not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever, in any manner whatsoever, and for whatever purpose."

We ought to be able to agree to keep the deadliest weapons out of the hands of people who are seriously unstable. President Obama gave a very moving speech in Tucson about Christina Green, the little third grader who had just been elected to her student council and often wore red, white, and blue in honor of her country.

The President said, "I want to live up to her expectations. I want our democracy to be as good as Christina imagined it. I want America to be as good as she imagined it."

I hope we will put political agendas aside and put our heads together so we can lessen the chances of another tragedy such as Tucson. That would be the very best memorial we could build to those who lost their lives, and the best we could do for America to do our job to keep it safe.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to give some brief remarks about the resolution we are considering today. First and foremost, this resolution condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the horrific attack that took place earlier this month in Tucson, AZ, while my friend and colleague GABRIELLE GIFFORDS was giving time to her constituents through a "Congress at Your Corner" event, an event that many of us in the Congress host

for our constituents, for them to come speak to us about issues that matter to them most.

During that attack, many lives were lost. We express our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the families and the friends and the loved ones who lost their loved ones during that attack.

Each of those who are honored today will be remembered for all they gave to their communities and all they have done, including a great judge, John Roll, and community members Dorothy Morris, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and a great public servant, Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman. They are all in our thoughts and prayers.

President Obama took the time to really talk about one life that was lost that affected me most deeply, and that was about Christina-Taylor Green, the 9-year-old girl who went to the "Congress at Your Corner" event to learn about public service, to see her Congressman do her job, to hear what she had to say.

That young girl and her life and the image President Obama talked about in his speech not only in Tucson but in his speech last night I thought affected all of us because his speech was about the hope and the dreams that every child in America has for this country, for our democracy, the true aspirations that Christina had for this government, the expectations she had for us.

I believe last night President Obama gave a call to action to all of us about who we should be as Americans, what this country stands for, why we are all public servants, and why we are here to do our jobs. I think it is the image and the life of Christina that gives us hope for the future about what we can be and what we can do together, and I think that is what last night's speech was most about.

I want to take a moment to talk about my dear friend GABBY, whose courage and whose strength has been extraordinary and is something that not only inspires me but I think inspires every one of the young people here today and all of us in this country because she is surviving and she is determined to overcome this horrific attack against her and our democracy and against all of us. Every day she recovers is one more day where her strength is there as a bright light for all of us, as a reminder of what we are all capable of and a reminder of what is best in each of us. I am going to go visit GABBY this weekend and sit with her and give her the well wishes and the prayers of all of us here.

Having her seat remain open last night was a stark reminder of what can be so easily lost, and the importance of our presence in that Chamber to do the people's business, that we are there not for ourselves, we are not there as Democrats or Republicans, but we are there as public servants, to do the will of the American people, to do our jobs, and to represent the people we are sent here to represent.

So I thank GABBY and her extraordinary husband Mark, whose love for

her truly is pulling her every day across the finish line, for their courage and their dedication, and I wish to let them know we will continue to pray for their recovery, we will continue to pray for all those who were injured and are recovering, and we pray for all the families who have lost their loved ones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate time on the resolution be extended to 2:30 p.m., that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect, and that the vote on adoption of the resolution occur at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all quorum calls during the remainder of the debate on S. Res. 14 be charged equally to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. 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. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke to the events of January 8 in Tucson, AZ, specifically referencing the people we are honoring by the resolution that is before us today. At 2:30 this afternoon, we will have an opportunity to act as a body, Democrats and Republicans from all parts of our country, to recognize the people who were injured, the families of those who were killed, and, of course, the heroes of the tragic Tucson shooting.

On that morning of January 8, Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS arrived at a Tucson Safeway store for her "Congress on Your Corner" event. She was there to meet with constituents, which is something she enjoyed doing very much. This was the first such event of the year. She had hosted others previously.

She was joined by members of her staff. Among them were Pam Simon, Ron Barber, Gabriel Zimmerman, and Daniel Hernandez, an intern. They stood alongside as Congresswoman GIFFORDS greeted her constituents who had lined up to speak with her. One of those individuals was Judge John Roll, chief judge of the U.S. District Court of Arizona, a personal friend of mine. Like most mornings, he had attended mass. Then he decided to stop by the Safeway to thank the Congresswoman for her assistance in dealing with the court's overwhelming caseload. Also attending the event was 9-year-old Christina-Taylor Green, who, like Congresswoman GIFFORDS, had recently won elected office. This third grader had recently been elected to the student council by Mesa Verde Elementary School. Dorothy Morris and her husband George, a retired marine, were

attending the event together. And Phyllis Schneck, a great grandmother who spent the winters in Tucson but was actually from New Jersey, was there as well, as were Dorwan and Mavy Stoddard. As all of these people were waiting to speak to Congresswoman GIFFORDS, a gunman approached and shot the Congresswoman in the head, then turning his gun on the others in line. Gabriel Zimmerman, Judge Roll, Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, Phyllis Schneck, and Dorwan Stoddard were all killed. George Morris, Mavy Stoddard, Pamela Simon, Ron Barber, and the Congresswoman were injured, along with eight others.

Those who were killed had much more to offer in their lives.

Gabe, the Congresswoman's director of community outreach, was only 30 years old. He was engaged to be married. According to news reports, he was killed while rushing to assist others. He worked closely with my Tucson staff.

Judge Roll was not only a very distinguished and respected jurist but was known most of all in the Tucson community for his kindness and courtesy. He was killed as he tried to protect Ron Barber, who had been shot just moments before.

Christina-Taylor Green, as I mentioned, was only 9 years old, a third grader.

Dorothy Morris was married for 50 years to George, and he was injured trying to protect his wife. The couple has two daughters. I met one of them when I visited with George in the facility in which he is recuperating, where I was last Friday.

Phyllis, like others in this group, was a volunteer at her church. She was also known for her cooking.

Dorwan Stoddard I mentioned was also a church volunteer, and he, too, was shot as he dove to the ground to cover his wife, who escaped with wounds to her legs. I had an opportunity to visit with her again Friday as well.

As we know, the gunman was prepared to take more lives. His plans for more bloodshed were thwarted by brave and selfless citizens. Their stories have been documented in the media in the past few weeks, but a few of their heroic acts are worth recounting here.

After a bullet grazed his head and took him to the ground, Bill Badger, a 74-year-old retired Army colonel—and in good shape, I might add—got up and he helped hold the gunman down until the police arrived.

Anna Ballis was shopping that morning at Safeway. She was leaving the store when the shooting began. According to reports, she rushed to the aid of Barber after a bullet hit an artery in his leg. Anna is the mother of two U.S. marines who have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan multiple times. I mentioned yesterday visiting Ron Barber in the hospital, holding Anna's hand, repeating over and over again how she had saved his life.

Such multiple acts of bravery and kindness.

Daniel Hernandez was in the gallery at the State of the Union speech last night. He is a 21-year-old intern for Congresswoman GIFFORDS. He rushed to her aid right after the incident. He had some training in first aid and applied pressure to her wounds, which prevented her from bleeding more than she did. He stayed with her even after emergency service personnel arrived.

Sixty-one-year-old Patricia Maisch grabbed the magazine of additional ammunition the gunman was hoping to reload in his weapon and then administered first aid to a shooting victim.

Steve Rayle, a doctor and former emergency room physician, helped subdue the gunman until law enforcement arrived, and then he, too, helped to care for the injured.

As the gunman was trying to reload his weapon, Roger Salzgeber wrestled him down from behind.

Joseph Zamudio ran toward the scene from a nearby store when he heard the shots being fired and helped subdue the gunman again until law enforcement officers arrived.

We are obviously grateful for these acts of bravery. We are proud of the people I have mentioned but also all of the emergency workers who quickly arrived on the scene and provided life-saving aid and comfort to the injured in the very crucial moments following the attack.

I must mention also the incredible team of professionals, the surgeons and other highly skilled personnel at University Medical Center. We are proud of that facility in southern Arizona, and they certainly showed their competence in dealing with all of the wounded and some who died.

It has now been more than 2 weeks since the tragedy, and the families who lost loved ones are obviously still grieving. We all pray that they find comfort in the days ahead, and we hope and pray that the wounded will soon make full recoveries. In recent days, we have received some good news in that regard as those who were wounded are beginning to recover and leave the hospital. Our friend and colleague GABBY GIFFORDS, although she remains in serious condition, we are heartened to hear positive reports from her doctors, and we wish her the very best as she begins a new phase of her recovery in Houston.

The tragedy in Tucson was a shock to us all. It is difficult to comprehend that such horror could be visited upon such fine individuals and their families. In some respects, however, we see once again how it has brought out the best in good people.

In honor of the victims and the heroes of this tragic event, Senator MCCAIN and I ask our colleagues in the Senate to pass S. Res. 14. We can do little to bring solace to those who lost loved ones, but we can affirm that this body is united in its grief for the fallen, its admiration for the heroes, and prayers for the injured.

Mr. President, I note 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, I would like to express my strong support for the resolution on the floor honoring the victims and the heroes of the Tucson shooting, and I thank Senators KYL and MCCAIN for submitting it.

Let me take this opportunity to express once again my sympathy to the families of those who lost their lives that morning and to join with all those who are persevering in prayer for the injured, including Congresswoman GIFFORDS, whose condition, thankfully, still appears to be improving day by day.

We will never forget the heroism of those who sacrificed their own safety that morning in Tucson for the good of those around them nor the dedication of those who attended to the wounded immediately after the shooting both at the scene and in the hospital rooms in the days that followed.

We thank all of them for giving us, in the midst of this horrific event, some reason for hope and a powerful example of service to follow.

It is my hope that today's resolution will help in some way to preserve the memory of the dead, the injured, and the heroes of Tucson.

Hopefully, out of this terrible national tragedy the rest of us can draw strength and inspiration, grow in concern for those around us, and deepen our sense of purpose about the work we do here every day.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. President, for 2 years I have insisted again and again that the two parties can and should work together on legislation that would spur the economy, create an environment for good private sector jobs, and put our Nation on a stronger footing for the future. Last night, the President did the same. So this afternoon I would like to accept the President's offer to work together just as I did after last year's State of the Union.

I agree with the President that we can and should work together to increase, without Federal mandates, production of more domestic sources of energy, including nuclear, clean coal, and natural gas; on strengthening and protecting our borders and enforcing immigration laws; on increasing U.S. exports by completing free-trade agreements with South Korea but also Panama and Colombia; on medical liability

reform to rein in frivolous lawsuits; on finding a bipartisan solution to strengthen Social Security for future generations of Americans; on finishing the job in Iraq and Afghanistan; and on simplifying the individual Tax Code and reducing our corporate tax rates, which are making it harder and harder for U.S. companies to compete around the world.

Working together in all these areas would help the economy by encouraging the creation of private sector jobs, improving security, and helping us keep our commitments to our children and our parents. I take the President at his word when he says he is eager to cooperate with us on doing all of it.

But achieving each of these things should be an end unto itself. It cannot be contingent on some cynical bargain whereby one party agrees to secure the border as long as the other party agrees to amnesty for illegal immigrants; where one side agrees to increase domestic energy exploration as long as the other side agrees to cripple the economy with higher fuel prices; where one side agrees to fight terror as long as the other side agrees to artificial timelines and preordained withdrawal dates—in other words, a bargain whereby the party offering to work together has no real intention of working together at all. And too often that has been the approach this President and his party have taken over the last 2 years.

Take health care. For more than a year, we offered to work with the White House and Democrats on a bill that would incorporate the best thinking on both sides. They refused every step of the way. In the end, they got the bill they wanted: a massive government-driven system that creates an unknowable number of new bureaucratic entities and two massive new government entitlements, which is already leading people to lose the care they like, which nearly two-thirds of U.S. doctors surveyed predict will lead to worse care, and which is causing already struggling businesses to struggle even more with a mountain—a mountain—of new mandates and fees. It is only after this disastrous bill has become law that the President says he is now interested in making it better, even as he belittles the legitimate concerns so many Americans continue to have about it.

He has taken the same approach to spending and debt. Two years ago, the President came to Congress and told the country we needed to invest in the future through a trillion-dollar stimulus that was supposed to be a model of transparency and efficiency. Within a year, this bill, which was sold to us as the answer to our Nation's economic woes, had become a national punch line, a tragic waste of money. And 2 years after that investment in our future was signed into law, what do we have? Nearly \$3.5 trillion more in debt and nearly 3 million more Americans out of work.

These out-of-work Americans do not want to sit around and wait for the Democratic vision of the future to appear, compliments of the experts in Washington. They are not particularly moved by someone's vision of what America could look like 40 years from now if only they hand over more of their paychecks or more of their freedoms now. They want a job. They want Washington to stop trying to help them and let them help themselves.

So the President talks a good game, but call us skeptical, because when all of the applause is over and the speeches are through, the debt is higher, more and more wasteful spending and job-stifling regulations come to light, and millions of Americans are still asking the same simple, persistent question: Mr. President, where are the jobs?

The President made some good suggestions on areas where we could work together, and we stand ready to do so, just as we have in the past. But we have now seen enough to know that what the President says and what the President does are two very different things. He has called for investments in energy before and we got the stimulus. He called for working with us on trade. We are still waiting. He said before we need to get serious about the debt, even as it reached dizzying new heights as a result of his policies. He speaks like one who recognizes that spending is out of control, and yet his response is to propose that we lock in spending levels we already know are completely unsustainable. This isn't progress. This is an admission of defeat. Americans don't want a spending freeze at unsustainable levels. They want cuts—dramatic cuts—and I hope the President will work with us on achieving them soon.

To put it simply, the President still sounds as though he is trying to have it both ways. His tone may be changing, but based on past performance we will remain skeptical until we see actual results. Republicans have pledged to the voters that we will do everything we can to cut wasteful government spending, work to lower the debt, get government out of the way of economic growth, and to work to repeal the health care bill, even as we replace that health care bill with the kind of commonsense reforms people actually want. The President has shown he is willing to talk about some of these things. Let's hope he surprises us by showing a new willingness to do more than that—to actually work with us on achieving real results.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that all time has been used under the order that is now before the Senate. If it has not, let's pretend it has and let's start the vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the vote will be changed to 2:25.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 1 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Akaka	Franken	Mikulski
Alexander	Gillibrand	Moran
Ayotte	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Hatch	Paul
Bingaman	Hoeven	Portman
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Pryor
Blunt	Inhofe	Reed
Boozman	Inouye	Reid
Boxer	Isakson	Risch
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Roberts
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kerry	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Sessions
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Kohl	Shelby
Chambliss	Kyl	Snowe
Coats	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Cooms	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Whitehouse
DeMint	McCaskill	Wicker
Durbin	McConnell	Wyden
Ensign	Menendez	
Enzi	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Rockefeller	Webb
-----------	-------------	------

The resolution (S. Res. 14) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 14

Whereas on January 8, 2011, a gunman opened fire at a "Congress on your Corner" event hosted by Representative Gabrielle Giffords in Tucson, Arizona, killing 6 and wounding 13 others;

Whereas Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan

Stoddard, and Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman lost their lives in this attack;

Whereas Christina-Taylor Green, the 9-year-old daughter of John and Roxanna Green, was born on September 11, 2001, and was a third grader with an avid interest in government who was recently elected to the student council at Mesa Verde Elementary School;

Whereas Dorothy Morris, who was 76 years old, attended the January 8 event with George, her husband of over 50 years with whom she had 2 daughters, and who was also critically injured as he tried to shield her from the shooting;

Whereas John Roll, a Pennsylvania native who was 63 years old, began his professional career as a bailiff in 1972, was appointed to the Federal bench in 1991, and became chief judge for the District of Arizona in 2006, was a devoted husband to his wife Maureen, father to his 3 sons, and grandfather to his 5 grandchildren, and heroically attempted to shield Ron Barber from additional gunfire;

Whereas Phyllis Schneck, a proud mother of 3, grandmother of 7, and great-grandmother from New Jersey, was spending the winter in Arizona, and was a 79-year-old church volunteer and New York Giants fan;

Whereas Dorwan Stoddard, a 76-year-old retired construction worker and volunteer at the Mountain Avenue Church of Christ, is credited with shielding his wife Mavy, a longtime friend whom he married while they were in their 60s, who was also injured in the shooting;

Whereas Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman, who was 30 years old and engaged to be married, served as Director of Community Outreach to Representative Gabrielle Giffords, and was a social worker before serving with Representative Giffords;

Whereas Representative Gabrielle Giffords was a target of this attack, and was critically injured;

Whereas 13 others were also wounded in the shooting, including Ron Barber and Pamela Simon, both staffers to Representative Giffords; and

Whereas several individuals, including Patricia Maisch, Army Col. Bill Badger (Retired), who was also wounded in the shooting, Roger Salzgeber, Joseph Zamudio, Daniel Hernandez, Jr., Anna Ballis, and Dr. Steven Rayle helped apprehend the gunman and assist the injured, thereby risking their lives for the safety of others, and should be commended for their bravery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns in the strongest possible terms the horrific attack which occurred at the "Congress on your Corner" event hosted by Representative Gabrielle Giffords in Tucson, Arizona, on January 8, 2011;

(2) offers its heartfelt condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who were killed in that attack;

(3) expresses its hope for the rapid and complete recovery of those wounded in the shooting;

(4) honors the memory of Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman;

(5) applauds the bravery and quick thinking exhibited by those individuals who prevented the gunman from potentially taking more lives and helped to save those who had been wounded;

(6) recognizes the service of the first responders who raced to the scene and the health care professionals who tended to the victims once they reached the hospital, whose service and skill saved lives;

(7) reaffirms the bedrock principle of American democracy and representative government, which is memorialized in the First

Amendment of the Constitution and which Representative Gabrielle Giffords herself read in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 6, 2011, of "the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances";

(8) stands firm in its belief in a democracy in which all can participate and in which intimidation and threats of violence cannot silence the voices of any American;

(9) honors the service and leadership of Representative Gabrielle Giffords, a distinguished member of the House of Representatives, as she courageously fights to recover; and

(10) when adjourning today, shall do so out of respect to the victims of this attack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume morning business.

PASSING OF ANTHONY AND NICOLE RIGGAN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I come to the floor to honor CPT Martin Anthony Riggan, Jr., and his wife Nicole Riggan. Their journey on this Earth was cut short but it was one filled with honor, purpose, and distinction.

Anthony was one of those individuals whom everyone knew would grow up to be exceptional, and he did. I have known him since he was a small child. We went to church together. I think it was in maybe the seventh grade when he approached me the first time about going to the U.S. Air Force Academy. I have followed his path since he graduated from Pulaski Academy High School in Little Rock in 2003, where he served as class president, Honor Council president, and was a representative on the Varsity Football Leadership Council. During this time, Anthony received numerous awards for his character, service to others, and hard work.

Then he fulfilled his lifelong dream to attend the United States Air Force Academy where he continued to receive accolades for performance and leadership. As a member of the Board of Visitors at the Air Force Academy, I was able to visit the academy from time to time. I enjoyed seeing the facilities and visiting with the brass, but honestly I most enjoyed getting to visit with Anthony in Colorado. During these times, he reminded me about the true definition of selfless service.

In his senior year, Anthony was selected to be Group 1 Commander for

the Cadet Wing, overseeing 1,200 cadets and their activities. He was also named cadet colonel, the highest rank possible for a cadet at the academy. He shared with me how excited he was to be graduating and how proud he was to serve our Nation in our military. I was proud of all he was achieving and he was certainly representing Arkansas well.

Following graduation, Anthony began undergraduate pilot training in Columbus, MS, flying the T-6 Texan, the T-38 Talon and the B-1B Lancer Strategic Bomber. He received the Top Gun Award for Formation Flying and was presented with the Leadership Award by the local Air Force association. Classified as "exceptionally qualified" to pilot the B-1, Anthony was scheduled to deploy this month to Qatar.

In life, Anthony's favorite copilot was his wife Nicole. She shared his strong faith and purpose. After graduating from Colorado's Lewis-Palmer High School as valedictorian, Nicole participated in Serteen, a volunteer program for teens and in mission trips to Peru and Guatemala.

She went on to study theater education at the University of Northern Colorado, graduating magna cum laude. She pursued her theater career and continued leadership roles in Bible studies and youth groups. During this time, many of Anthony and Nicole's friends and families found guidance through the devotionals they regularly sent.

Today we continue to find encouragement and inspiration through the selfless lives they lived. I will miss my friend Anthony and his lovely wife Nicole, and I look forward to the day when I see them again.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

A CAN-DO AMERICA

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, whenever a Senator, such as Senator PRYOR from Arkansas, has to announce to the Senate the loss of a near personal friend, especially one he has been friends with, and with their parents, for years, it is always a tremendous loss.

We are coming up in a couple of days on the 25th anniversary of another great loss in this country, when the Space Shuttle Challenger exploded before our eyes on our television screens on January, 28, 1986. It was such a shock to the Nation, and it hit deep in our psyche because the symbol of America's technological prowess was the space shuttle in the early infancy

of the program. The Challenger was only the 25th flight of the space shuttle that the Nation witnessed. In that rerun over and over of the close-up view of those solid rocket boosters going off in different directions 10 miles high in the Florida sky, the Nation witnessed that extraordinary loss.

I will never forget the memorial service in Houston at the Johnson Space Center, when the President of the United States—as sometimes happens in times of grief—became not the President of the United States, not the Commander in Chief, but the comforter in chief. And that was again vividly illustrated a few weeks ago as President Obama delivered that ringing and highly emotional speech in Tucson, AZ. So 25 years ago, as all the crews gathered there at the Johnson Space Center, President Reagan touched the Nation as the comforter in chief and pointed out that despite that tragedy, those brave souls were doing what America has in our genes. By nature, we are explorers and adventurers, and we don't ever give that up. Otherwise, we become a second-rate Nation.

Look at the history of America as explorers. Remember the criticism we read about in our history books concerning President Thomas Jefferson when he wanted to spend a paltry couple of thousand dollars on an expedition called the Lewis and Clark expedition, to see if they could find the passage to the Pacific coast. As a result of that mission, from which miraculously they returned and most of them were alive, they brought back all the artifacts of what this broad land contained.

Remember when Tom Hanks played Jim Lovell in "Apollo 13." "Apollo 13" was one of the most successful American space ventures not because they didn't land on the Moon, because they couldn't. Most of the spacecraft on the way to the Moon blew up. We thought we had three dead astronauts who were going to drift in space until they ran out of consumables. And it was that incredible story about how all of America's aerospace expertise resided with the astronaut who had stayed behind. He had been training, but he was exposed to the measles and so he was replaced. So then he was there, with all that knowledge and training for the mission and he could go into the simulator and they were able to simulate in real time how they were going to convert that motor of the lunar lander to get the space ship kicked out of lunar orbit and back on a trajectory to Earth. And remember after they got back—as Tom Hanks is playing Jim Lovell, the commander, in the movie—someone in the audience asks the commander of the now safely returned crew of Apollo 13: Well, is there really the money to continue to explore space? And Lovell's answer is: What would it have been like if Columbus had returned from America and they never went back to follow in his footsteps as an explorer?

So it is, during this time of tragedy, and hearing an individual Senator, Senator PRYOR, talk about the loss of loved ones and family friends and young people with bright futures, and the reflection in a day or so of the anniversary of the Challenger tragedy and the loss of seven lives, including the teacher, Christa McAuliffe, who was going to teach that lesson plan to the classrooms from space, we are once again reminded that because we dare to venture, because we are by nature explorers, there are risks, and sometimes the price to be paid is with human life. But that is not a reason not to take the risk and to boldly venture forth.

This is a good reminder for us as Americans as we face so many uncertainties—whether it be financial and our future of trying to get out of the recession, or whether it be the uncertain future in Afghanistan or Pakistan, or how the leadership of al-Qaida is being morphed into other countries, such as Yemen or Somalia, or the constant uncertainty of whether we will have a job tomorrow, or whether we can retrain for the new kinds of jobs that are coming on line.

There are a lot of uncertainties—the uncertainties of our energy future. Can we remain dependent on 70 percent of our daily consumption of oil coming from places such as the Persian Gulf and Nigeria and Venezuela? No. It is time for us to venture forth, to explore new realms, to develop new technologies and to be creative. And, of course, as the President spoke last night, we can't do that unless we have an educated workforce, which is so necessary for us to be creative. It is that creativity, that Yankee ingenuity of Americans, that keeps us competitive in the global marketplace today because we can outinvent, we can outcreate. That is the change America has.

As we reflect upon the tragedies, the individual tragedies that we have, the collective tragedy that we had as a nation—25 years ago with Challenger, several years ago with the loss of Columbia, the losses we had most recently that are seared into our hearts in Tucson—the hope that springs forth for those who are wounded, that they would come back to lead normal lives, these are our challenges. Keep at it. Keep at it.

I say this also. Because it is a time of uncertainty, a lot of pundits are having fun because it appears that NASA is in disarray. NASA should not be in disarray. We have a blueprint. We have a roadmap for the future in the NASA bill that passed this Congress—one of the few that passed in the Congress before the lameduck session. It simply says let's continue to encourage the commercial companies to develop a service of taking astronauts and cargo to and from the space station and let's see if we can do that safely, as determined by NASA, but more efficiently and, therefore, more cheaply, given the constraints of budgets.

But, at the same time, we then allow NASA to do what it does best, which is to venture out and explore the heavens. In so doing, we are going to build a new rocket that will take large components up and that will fulfill the President's goal, which is to go to Mars.

The President specifically set a timetable of 2025 to land and return safely on an asteroid. That is no easy feat, given how fast an asteroid flies through space. But it will give us new technologies, as we develop, to go to Mars.

Think of the unbelievable time it would take us under conventional technology—10 months to get to Mars. Then, once you got to Mars, you pretty well have to stay on the surface of Mars for 1 year, until the planets are realigned, revolving about the Sun, so Mars comes in closer to the Earth for the 10-month trip back. That is why we need new technologies. An astronaut who flew seven times, Dr. Franklin Chang-Diaz, a plasma physicist from MIT, is developing a plasma rocket that will take us to Mars in 39 days. Then, with that short time flying, at 400,000 miles per hour by plasma thrust, we could stay on the surface 1 month, to return to Earth without having to stay 1 year.

These are exciting new technologies. A pilot project of that plasma rocket, with the acronym VASIMR, is being developed to fly on the space station and provide a continuous pulse that will keep the space station boosted, instead of it having, in the degrading of its orbit for conventional technology, to keep boosting it.

Not only is the sky the limit, not only is the stratosphere the limit, the heavens are the limit if we as Americans will assume this can-do posture that is so typical of the personalities of explorers and adventurers; in other words, the personalities of we, the Americans.

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. BEGICH. 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.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 366, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 366) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs

under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 366) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRAGIC EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI ON JANUARY 12, 2010

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 26, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 26) recognizing the anniversary of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, honoring those who lost their lives in that earthquake, and expressing continued solidarity with the Haitian people.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 26

Whereas on January 12, 2010, an earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter scale struck the country of Haiti;

Whereas, according to the United States Geological Survey, the epicenter of the earthquake was located approximately 15 miles southwest of Port-au-Prince, the capital of Haiti;

Whereas, according to the United States Geological Survey, the earthquake was followed by 59 aftershocks of magnitude 4.5 on the Richter scale or greater, with the most severe measuring a magnitude of 6.0 on the Richter scale;

Whereas, according to the Government of Haiti, more than 230,000 people died as a result of the earthquake, including 103 citizens of the United States;

Whereas an untold number of international aid personnel also died as a result of the earthquake, including more than 100 United Nations personnel;

Whereas, according to the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration—

(1) an estimated 3,000,000 people, or nearly 1/3 of the population of Haiti, have been directly affected by the disaster; and

(2) an estimated 1,300,000 people were displaced from their homes to settlements;

Whereas casualty numbers and infrastructure damage, including damage to roads, ports, hospitals, and residential dwellings, place the earthquake as the worst cataclysm to hit Haiti in more than 200 years and, proportionally, as one of the worst natural disasters in the world in modern times;

Whereas the Post Disaster Needs Assessment, which was conducted by the Government of Haiti, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other experts, estimates that damage and economic losses totaled \$7,800,000,000, which is equal to approximately 120 percent of the gross domestic product of Haiti in 2009;

Whereas the Post Disaster Needs Assessment estimates that \$11,500,000,000 is needed during the next 3 years for the reconstruction of Haiti and to lay the groundwork for long-term development;

Whereas Haiti was the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere before the January 2010 earthquake, when—

(1) more than 70 percent of Haitians lived on less than \$2 per day; and

(2) Haiti was ranked of 149th out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index;

Whereas, before the earthquake, Haiti was in the process of recovering from a catastrophic series of hurricanes and tropical storms, food shortages, rising commodity prices, and political instability, but was showing encouraging signs of improvement;

Whereas President Barack Obama vowed the “unwavering support” of the United States and pledged a “swift, coordinated and aggressive effort to save lives and support the recovery in Haiti”;

Whereas Senate Resolution 392, which was agreed to on January 21, 2010, by unanimous consent—

(1) expressed the profound sympathy and unwavering support of the Senate for the people of Haiti; and

(2) urged all nations to commit to assisting the people of Haiti with their long-term needs;

Whereas the response to the tragedy from the global community, and especially from the countries of the Western Hemisphere, has been overwhelmingly positive;

Whereas the initial emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development and United States Southern Command, was swift and resolute;

Whereas individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations throughout the United States and the international community responded to the crisis by supporting Haiti and its people through innovative ways, such as fundraising through text messaging;

Whereas more than \$2,700,000,000 is estimated to have been raised from private donations in response to the tragedy in Haiti;

Whereas the Haitian diaspora community in the United States, which was integral to emergency relief efforts—

(1) has annually contributed significant monetary support to Haiti through remittances; and

(2) continues to seek opportunities to partner with the United States Agency for International Development and other Federal agencies to rebuild Haiti;

Whereas Haiti continues to suffer from extreme poverty, gross inequality, a deficit of political leadership at all levels, and weak or corrupt state institutions;

Whereas significant long-term challenges remain as Haiti works to recover and rebuild;

Whereas the International Organization for Migration estimates that approximately 800,000 people remain in spontaneous and organized camps in Haiti;

Whereas, according to numerous nongovernmental organizations and United States contractors, the pace of reconstruction in Haiti has lagged significantly behind the original emergency relief phase;

Whereas there is an acute need—

(1) to increase local capacity in health care and education; and

(2) to focus international attention on employment opportunities, rubble removal, permanent and sustainable shelter, reconstruction of roads, safety and security, and fundamental human rights in Haiti, especially in temporary camps and shelters;

Whereas the alleged irregularities and fraud that occurred in the election held in Haiti on November 28, 2010, have imperiled the credibility of the electoral process, undermined the recovery effort, and further destabilized security throughout Haiti;

Whereas political leadership is required to ensure that a democratically elected government, which is respected by the people of Haiti and recognized by the international community, is prepared to assume office on February 7, 2011, or shortly thereafter;

Whereas, on October 19, 2010, an outbreak of cholera was detected in the lower Artibonite region of Haiti;

Whereas initial efforts to contain the epidemic were disrupted by Hurricane Tomas and resulting widespread flooding, which led to the spreading and entrenchment of the disease throughout Haiti;

Whereas, according to the Haitian Ministry of Public Health and Population, between the outbreak in October 2010 and January 21, 2011—

(1) more than 3,850 people have died from cholera in Haiti; and

(2) more than 194,000 people in Haiti have been affected by the disease;

Whereas, according to the Pan American Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cholera could spread to as many as 400,000 people within the first year of the epidemic, potentially causing 8,000 deaths at the current case fatality rate;

Whereas the United States has provided \$40,000,000 worth of assistance to combat the cholera epidemic, primarily through the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, to assist with stockpiling health commodities, equipping cholera treatments centers, providing public information, and developing a safe and sustainable water and sanitation system;

Whereas the efforts to combat the cholera epidemic have helped to drive the mortality rate from cholera down from 7 percent to 1 percent of all contracted cases during the 3-month period ending on January 21, 2011;

Whereas, during the first year following the January 12, 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the people of Haiti have demonstrated unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage;

Whereas at the conference of international donors entitled “Towards a New Future for Haiti”, which was held on March 31, 2010, 59 donors pledged approximately \$5,570,000,000 (including nearly \$1,200,000,000 pledged by donors from the United States) to support the Action Plan for National Recovery and Development of the Government of Haiti;

Whereas the United Nations Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti estimates that approximately 63 percent of the recovery and development funds pledged for 2010 have been disbursed; and

Whereas Haiti requires sustained assistance from the United States and the international community in order to confront the ongoing cholera epidemic and promote reconstruction and development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors those who lost their lives as a result of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010;

(2) honors the sacrifices of the men and women of the Government of Haiti, the Government of the United States, the United Nations, and the international community in their responses to those affected by the earthquake;

(3) expresses continued solidarity with the people of Haiti as they work to rebuild their neighborhoods, livelihoods, and country;

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to support the long-term reconstruction of Haiti, in partnership with the Government of Haiti and in coordination with other donors;

(5) supports the efforts of the Executive Branch to prevent the spread of cholera, treat persons who contract the disease, provide technical assistance to the Haitian Ministry of Public Health, and improve long-term water, sanitation, and health systems;

(6) expresses support for the United States Embassy team in Port-au-Prince, members of the United States Coast Guard, United States Armed Forces, other United States Government personnel, and all members of international organizations who have persevered through adverse local conditions and continue to serve Haiti and the Haitian people;

(7) supports the continued effort of the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission, under the leadership of former President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister Bellerive, in its efforts to improve coordination, build state capacity, and bring donors and the Government of Haiti together to effectively lead the reconstruction process;

(8) urges the international community—

(A) to call on the leaders of Haiti to immediately reach a democratic resolution to the current electoral crisis to enable the newly elected leaders of the Government of Haiti to take office by February 7, 2011, or shortly thereafter;

(B) to continue to focus assistance on the priorities of the Government of Haiti;

(C) to develop, improve, and scale-up communications and participatory mechanisms to more substantially involve Haitian civil society at all stages of the cholera and post-earthquake responses; and

(D) to give priority to programs that protect and involve vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons, children, and persons with disabilities;

(9) urges aid agencies—

(A) to train and use Haitian local and national authorities in the delivery of assistance; and

(B) to enhance their coordination and consultation with the Haitian people and key Haitian Government ministries to ensure the effectiveness of aid; and

(10) expresses support for—

(A) the continuation of the work of United States agencies, nongovernmental organizations, private volunteer organizations, regional institutions, and United Nations agencies to confront the consequences of the crises affecting Haiti;

(B) comprehensive assessments of the long-term needs for confronting the cholera epidemic in Haiti, including the construction of adequate water and sanitation infrastructure; and

(C) the continuation of humanitarian and development efforts between the Government of the United States and the Government of Haiti, the Haitian Diaspora, and international actors who support the goal of a better future for Haiti.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 192

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I understand that S. 192, introduced earlier today by Senator DEMINT, is at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 192) to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read the second time on the next legislative day.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Douglas W. Elmendorf as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2015.

The Chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 111-25, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission for the life of the commission: The Honorable ORRIN HATCH of Utah vice Robert Bennett.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDGE JOHN ROLL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I heard this morning the tributes that were made by Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Senator JOHN KYL about the role that was played by the very heroic judge who lost his life in the tragedy that took place in Tucson.

Shortly after the tragedy, the offices of Senators MCCAIN and KYL reached out to my committee—the committee on which I am ranking member and Senator BOXER is chairman. They talked about how they would go about honoring Judge John Roll by naming the new courthouse that will be constructed in Yuma, AZ, after him.

Many of us have come to know the work of Judge Roll after his tragic, heroic death in the recent shooting where he died protecting Ron Barber, Congresswoman GIFFORDS' district director, and sacrificing himself. My office knew about him before, about Judge Roll's work on behalf of the judicial system in Arizona.

Judge Roll contacted my committee staff last year, after a GAO report criticizing the way Arizona was utilizing their courthouse space. This is a letter from Judge Roll to us:

On behalf of the district of Arizona, I strongly disagree with many of the conclusions in the report, particularly as they relate to Arizona and its attempts to cope with an ever-burgeoning criminal caseload largely arising from border enforcement.

He hoped his response to the report would be helpful to us. It was. We have learned that the problems they have in Arizona on the border are something they have never experienced before. It has put their judicial system into real problems, and consequently this judge was taking a leadership role in reaching out to us to let us know that GAO report was not accurate.

We have had a chance to talk with both Senator MCCAIN and Senator KYL. I sat down with Senator BOXER, who is the chairman of our committee, and talked about what we might be able to do in a very expeditious way. I believe the decision to name the Yuma, AZ, courthouse after Judge Roll is a fitting tribute to a man who served his State with distinction.

The courthouse is a new courthouse, government construction, to help alleviate some of the overcrowding going on in Arizona right now, primarily because of the problems that exist on the border.

I do not know of any time in the years I have been here that a bill has been introduced and then discharged the same day. We all feel strongly enough that this needs to be handled in this way. It is the very least we can do.

Judge Roll was highly regarded by his colleagues and clearly took his judgeship seriously, doing more than simply deciding cases and going home. He was an active advocate for the judicial system in Arizona. I believe we would have had this courthouse named after him upon his retirement had his life not been tragically taken.

Today Senators MCCAIN and KYL introduced S. 188, and I am happy to announce that Senator BOXER and I have discharged S. 188 to the floor on this same day. Anything else I do not think would have been appropriate.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I come to the floor pretty regularly to read letters from Ohioans, from people in my State, about things in their lives that are important to them. I think in this institution we—all of us, myself included—too often forget the pain of so many people at home who have lost jobs, who have lost hopes, who have lost health care.

I think often about—as I know the Senator from Oregon does—how difficult it would be for a parent to explain to their son or daughter: I lost my job and we lost our health insurance and now we may have to move.

Nobody has worked harder in the Senate than the Presiding Officer from Oregon on fixing HAMP and reforming some of the programs that can help people stay in their homes. I appreciate the work the Presiding Officer does.

My letters today are from people all over Ohio about health insurance. It was a long fight to be able to take on the insurance companies and basically say to the insurance companies: You are not going to run this health care system the way you have, excluding people with preexisting conditions, denying claims after they have turned in their insurance after they have been sick, dealing with all the problems people have.

The business model for health insurance in this country too often has been the insurance companies hire a bunch of bureaucrats to keep people from buying insurance—the preexisting condition exclusion—and then hire a bunch of people on the other end, when someone gets sick and turns in their insurance claims, to try to deny them their claims. I understand insurance companies do that. I do not even blame insurance companies because they are all competing with one another. They may have to do that. But the fact is, it does not work for our health care system.

That is what we fixed last year, and that is what Ohioans understand. I guess I—I do not want to say “resent,” but in some ways I do resent when I see conservative Washington politicians, who, for 20 or 25 years, have had taxpayer-financed health insurance for them and their families, and now they want to vote—in the House of Representatives, and some do here—to take away benefits for senior citizens or take away benefits for small businesses or young people who have a preexisting condition or others.

I will not take too long, but I wish to read three or four stories or maybe a handful more than that.

Laura—I will only mention first names. These are letters from people in Ohio who have written me. Laura, from Dayton, in Montgomery County in southwest Ohio, writes:

My youngest nephew has juvenile diabetes and he just started college in-state. Due to the new health care law, he will be able to stay on my older sister's health care insurance plan when he graduates from college.

My third oldest nephew can now go back on my second oldest sister's insurance plan.

It appears [that some in Congress care] more about money than the American people. Please fight for me so I won't have to worry about losing my health insurance plan if I get seriously ill in the future.

This story comes from Christine in Medina County, up close to where I live. It is a county south of Cleveland. She writes:

My name is Christine and I want to tell you the story of Carol . . . my mom. . . .

Nine years ago, my father was downsized. His position of over 40 years was eliminated and so was my parents' health coverage. My father was only a few months shy of retirement so Medicare was available to him and my mom was on COBRA. My mom's employer of over 20 years had just recently shut its doors and while she found work through a temp agency, it was only part-time and she didn't qualify for benefits.

A few months later my mom was diagnosed with Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma and Emphysema.

Fortunately, her life was not in immediate danger and their lives were coasting along until her COBRA ran out.

COBRA is a plan you pay a lot of money for. Actually, you pay the employer's and the employee's side—yours and the employer's—to get coverage for up to 18 months after you lose your job and your insurance.

Christine writes:

. . . have you ever tried to find healthcare coverage for someone with a history of cancer and emphysema? I can, so from personal experience, it's infuriating, but I was able to find it. It would . . . cost her \$1,400 per month—

Mr. President, \$1,400 per month— with a \$4,000 deductible per year.

That means she would pay insurance—\$1,400 a month. She would not be able to collect on any of her bills until she had already paid an additional \$4,000 out of her pocket.

This was more than my parents were bringing home each month so needless to say whatever savings and retirement they had was used up quickly. What other option did [they] have?

During this time, my mom's health deteriorated. She required chemo and several hospital stays due to her lung collapsing. . . . I remember sitting with her in the hospital and listening to how worried she was about how she was going to pay [her] bill.

As if these kinds of illnesses are not bad enough in the stress it causes to a family, the anxiety it causes to a family, on top of that, they just wonder: What do we do about insurance? We know people get sicker and recover more slowly when they have that kind of anxiety about paying the bills.

My parents are good people. My dad is a veteran. They worked their entire lives and sacrificed to give me and my older sisters a better life than they had. They were fortunate to have 3 tireless advocates always looking out for them. Not everyone has that.

She then goes on:

State and Federal programs are what helped my parents. Without them, I honestly don't know where they'd be today.

My hope is that you'll remember my mom and everyone like her. Their lives are depending on it.

She says: State and Federal programs are what helped my mother.

This whole attitude of let's repeal the health care bill and then get the government out of it, and letting individuals take care of themselves is the American way—no, it is not. The American way is Medicare, is Medicaid, is Social Security, is private enterprise, is individualism, is helping one another, is a spirit of community in our communities. It is all that, and it is not get government out of our lives. They are against Social Security and they are against Medicare. Those are not the American values I was raised with and most people I know were raised with.

Michael from Twinsburg, north of Akron, in northeast Ohio, writes:

. . . my 22 year old son—a college student—was kicked off my insurance plan because of his age last year. It now costs \$460 a month to insure him.

In January, he will be added back to my policy and it will cost nothing. There is no additional charge to add my son. This is due to the health insurance legislation.

Please [talk about] these good things. Most people do not know this and other good things.

Keep in mind, as I read these, this kind of benefit that goes to Michael's son. If the people in this body and in the other body—the people in the House of Representatives who actually voted to repeal the health care bill—if they have their way—and these are mostly people who they themselves are getting taxpayer-financed health insurance—they want to deny to Michael and his son, they want to deny those kinds of benefits we have voted for, while they, at the same time, are getting taxpayer-financed health insurance. I guess one word would be hypocritical, another would be callous, another would be cold. I do not understand that way of thinking from some of my colleagues.

Steve from Groveport, in Franklin County, Columbus, the center of the State, writes:

I believe the new health care law is one of the greatest things ever done for the middle class. . . .

I am so tired of hearing that [many in] this country [are] against it. Every poll I've seen shows it's split . . . down the middle. The other side . . . has got to be heard!

Steve wrote this a couple weeks ago. I think what we have seen has changed, as people learn more about these benefits. For instance, come January 1, every senior in America can go to the doctor and get, without copays and deductibles, a physical or can get a mammography test or can get screened for osteoporosis or can get colorectal screening.

Seniors also, in the so-called doughnut hole, where they continue to pay a premium but do not get a benefit—under the Bush-constructed health care bill, there is this huge hole that costs people a lot of money—because of the health care bill, because it is law, because the Senator from Oregon and I and others voted for it and the Presi-

dent signed it, those seniors now will see their drug costs during that period cut entirely in half, not taxpayer-subsidized cut in half but the drug companies giving up half of what they were paid.

This is from Donald in Hardin County, northwest of Columbus:

I know firsthand that the lack of necessary medical and dental services for children and students of all ages has created a serious impediment to the learning process. Families with access to a regular source of medical care are more likely to keep the entire family healthy and create a better learning environment within the home.

The health care reforms you helped pass are vital to the nation's economic recovery and a crucial ingredient for great public schools. . . . Moreover, passage of this reform was a moral imperative. . . .

Donald, in addition to what he writes about young people—there is an effort in the Ohio legislature where I believe 30 Republican legislators have legislation to cancel or eliminate universal all-day kindergarten—as if cutting back on children of that age, when children's brains are developing, and they are growing and maturing, especially at those crucial ages of 3, 4, 5, 6 years old—to pull the rug out from under them makes absolutely no sense.

The last letter I will read is from Rachael, who lives in Cincinnati, in southwest Ohio:

I simply wanted to thank you for the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan. It is . . . very important . . . to me.

Your support for health care reform is greatly appreciated. Health insurance for my pre-existing condition will become one less thing I need to worry about. Thank you, thank you, thank you!

I can now concentrate solely on finding a job to replace the one I lost in January. . . .

Again, I hear people say—I have heard this for years. President Bush said it a few times, others have said it: Everybody in this country gets health care. If something is wrong, you go to the hospital, you go to the emergency room.

Well, the emergency room does not take care of you if you have chronic asthma, the emergency room does not take care of you if you have cancer. The emergency room will take care of you if you go in with a heart attack, but the emergency room does not take care of you if you need preventive care to keep you out of the hospital, to make you less likely to have that heart attack.

I read these letters about health insurance. I don't want to debate health insurance legislation anymore. I don't think we need to talk about this. We have passed the law. We have made things better. We have given people who have insurance better insurance now because of these consumer protections. People without insurance now will get assistance. People who have insurance and were about to get thrown off can keep it now.

We need to focus on the real problems in this country that we haven't addressed well enough, one of which is job creation. I am hopeful my colleagues will back off this whole idea of

let's keep debating health insurance and let's keep relitigating this and let's keep rediscussing it and let's try to repeal it. Instead, we can fix some things, as the President said last night, make some minor changes in it. But let's go back to what we need to do: create jobs in this country and help manufacturing.

My State is the third largest manufacturing State in the country. We need to do a lot to make sure that as we innovate, as we do the best innovation in the world and do the best research and development, that those jobs stay in the United States and don't get outsourced. That is our mission, to make sure these jobs are created here.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:45 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 8:25 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. HAGAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following resolutions en bloc:

A Wyden-Grassley-McCaskill resolution relative to secret holds, which is at the desk; a Udall of Colorado resolution regarding waiving the reading of an amendment, which is at the desk; S. Res. 8, Senator HARKIN; S. Res. 10, Senator UDALL of New Mexico with a substitute amendment, which is at the desk; and S. Res. 21, Senator MERKLEY, with a substitute amendment, which is at the desk; that there be up to 8 hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, for the purpose of debating these resolutions concurrently; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the substitute amendment to S. Res. 10 be agreed to and the substitute amendment to S. Res. 21 be agreed to; the Senate then proceed to vote in relation to the resolutions in the order listed above with no intervening action or debate; that

the following resolutions be subject to a 60-vote threshold for adoption: Wyden-Grassley-McCaskill resolution and Udall of Colorado resolution; that the following remaining resolutions be subject to a threshold of two-thirds of those voting for adoption: S. Res. 8; S. Res. 10, as amended; and S. Res. 21, as amended; that there be no amendments, motions or points of order in order to any of these resolutions prior to the vote in relation to the resolution, except for the substitute amendments to S. Res. 10 and S. Res. 21 listed above; further, that if a resolution fails to achieve the listed threshold for adoption, it be returned to its previous status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have had a number of conversations this evening with my counterpart, the Republican leader. We on this side have a caucus scheduled for tomorrow at 12:30 and so do the Republicans. These votes are all going to occur after we finish our caucuses anyway, so there are going to be no votes in the morning. The debate will start in the morning. We are going to come in at 10 o'clock. There will be no morning business. It has been suggested we come in at 10:30 because of the inclement weather, and that is fine. There will be no morning business in the morning, and then we will vote immediately on these matters set forth in this agreement.

The weather reports are that the Sun is going to be shining. Tomorrow it will be cold, and we know the streets are bad. But as I have indicated, we are not going to have the votes until tomorrow afternoon, so we hope it will all work out. Senator MCCONNELL and I will visit this issue again if anything untoward happens. We know it would be better if we didn't have this bad weather, but we are not all fortunate enough to live in southern Nevada. Sometimes bad weather does come. That being the case, we have been out of session now for several weeks. We have this organizational stuff that we have to get out of the way so we can start having matters referred out of the committees. So as inconvenient as it is for everyone, we need to move forward.

BOMBING OF SAINTS CHURCH

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, shortly after midnight Mass during the early hours of New Year's Day, a heinous suicide bombing attack at the Saints Church in Alexandria, Egypt, killed 21 innocent worshippers and injured dozens of others.

My condolences go out to the families of the victims and to the Coptic community. This was a devastating loss for the Christian community in Egypt and Christian communities around the world, including in my home State of Illinois.

I urge the Egyptian government to work swiftly and within the rule of law

to bring those responsible for this heinous crime to justice.

The Obama administration already has offered U.S. law enforcement assistance, which I encourage Egypt to accept—particularly in light of findings that indicate al-Qaida or other international terrorism networks were involved.

Unfortunately, this bombing attack is not an isolated incident in Egypt. Just about one year ago, three men armed with automatic weapons killed six Christian churchgoers as they emerged from a Christmas Mass service in the Egyptian town of Naga Hammadi, along with one Muslim off-duty police officer.

While I commend the Egyptian government's quick arrest and ongoing prosecution of the four suspects in that case, the fact that these incidents of violence against their own Christian community have continued in Egypt is very worrying.

Coptic Christians have been practicing their faith in Egypt since antiquity. Egypt is home to some of the oldest Christian schools in the world, where students have been taught theology and the text of the Bible. Coptic Christians are an important part of Egyptian society and make up approximately ten percent of Egypt's population. Protecting them and other religious minorities from acts of violence should be a top priority for the Egyptian government.

The New Year's bombing in Egypt is, unfortunately, also part of a disturbing pattern of violence against religious minorities in the Middle East.

For example, on October 31, 2010, Our Lady of Salvation Church in Iraq was the victim of a vicious attack by an al-Qaida affiliate, where over 50 innocent lives were taken.

Such despicable acts of aggression should not be tolerated. They force minority communities, who deserve greater protection, to live in fear of random acts of violence.

Such violence and discrimination cause members of minority communities to become refugees in their own country or to seek refuge in other countries. The ability of religious minorities to worship freely and safely should be a basic tenet of any modern society.

It is incumbent on Egypt, as a leader in the Middle East, to promote an atmosphere of tolerance where members of all religions are given an equal opportunity to thrive and participate in the life of the country.

Earlier, Senator WHITEHOUSE joined me in a letter to President Mubarak expressing our concern for the protection of minority communities in Egypt, including the lack of representation that Coptic Christians have in government as well as the government's failure to fully prosecute those responsible for acts of violence against Coptic Christians in the past.

We are concerned that the current situation may embolden extremists

and foster increasing religious intolerance and sectarian violence.

I have joined Senator ROBERT MENENDEZ on a resolution condemning the New Year's Day attack in Egypt and expressing condolences to all Egyptians who have suffered from terrorist attacks in the past.

Egypt has a reputation as a peaceful, moderate Arab state, where, as provided under its laws, all faiths are free to practice their religion without fear of retribution or violence. Egypt is a leader in the region and a close friend of the United States. But there is no place in Egyptian society for the kind of extremists who attacked and killed peaceful churchgoers on New Year's Day.

I again express my deepest condolences to the members of Saints Church and join all of America in prayers for the victims of this tragedy.

REMEMBERING SARGENT SHRIVER

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a hero of mine, Robert Sargent Shriver. He was a man of real courage, extraordinary idealism, committed to serving this country, and a dear friend.

As a veteran of World War II, the founding director of the Peace Corps, and the driving force behind Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty, Sarge believed in the good things government can do for people. Among his many accomplishments, he gave us the Head Start program, the Job Corps and Legal Services for the Poor, and the Volunteers in Service to America. Later in life he became the U.S. Ambassador to France, and then president of the Special Olympics, an organization founded by his remarkable wife Eunice Kennedy Shriver.

Sargent Shriver's impact on American life was profound. Through the many programs he championed, Sarge had a direct and lasting effect on the lives of millions of Americans. He was wholly committed to helping people and to the ideals he believed our country ought to stand for, and he was tireless and unrelenting in his pursuit of those goals.

The Peace Corps, one of Sarge's most important and long-lasting accomplishments, enables young Americans to serve their country by building understanding between cultures and working to improve the lives of others in developing countries. Shriver's spirit lives on through the Peace Corps, and it is incumbent on all of us to ensure that the agency fulfills his vision, and the vision of President Kennedy.

My friend Bono, a committed advocate in the fight against global poverty, was himself inspired by President Kennedy's call to action and by Sargent Shriver's work to put it into effect. He recently wrote an op-ed which appeared in the New York Times entitled, "What I Learned From Sargent Shriver." In honor of Sarge, I ask

unanimous consent that a copy be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 2011]

WHAT I LEARNED FROM SARGENT SHRIVER

(By Bono)

The Irish are still mesmerized by the mythical place that is America, but in the '60s our fascination got out of hand. I was not old enough to remember the sacrifices of the great generation who saved Europe in the Second World War, or to quite comprehend what was going on in Vietnam. But what I do remember, and cannot forget, is watching a man walk on the moon in 1969 and thinking here is a nation that finds joy in the impossible.

The Irish saw the Kennedys as our own royal family out on loan to America. A million of them turned out on J.F.K.'s homecoming to see these patrician public servants who, despite their station, had no patience for the status quo. (They also loved that the Kennedys looked more WASP than any "Prod," our familiar term for Protestant.)

I remember Bobby's rolled-up sleeves, Jack's juttied jaw and the message—a call to action—that the world didn't have to be the way it was. Science and faith had found a perfect rhyme.

In the background, but hardly in the shadows, was Robert Sargent Shriver. A diamond intelligence, too bright to keep in the darkness. He was not Robert or Bob, he was Sarge, and for all the love in him, he knew that love was a tough word. Easy to say, tough to see it through. Love, yes, and peace, too, in no small measure; this was the '60s but you wouldn't know it just by looking at him. No long hair in the Shriver house, or rock 'n' roll. He and his beautiful bride, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, would go to Mass every day—as much an act of rebellion against brutal modernity as it was an act of worship. Love, yes, but love as a brave act, a bold act, requiring toughness and sacrifice.

His faith demanded action, from him, from all of us. For the Word to become flesh, we had to become the eyes, the ears, the hands of a just God. Injustice could, in the words of the old spiritual, "Be Overcome." Robert Sargent sang, "Make me a channel of your peace," and became the song.

Make me a channel of your peace:
Where there is hatred let me bring your love.
Where there is injury, your pardon, Lord,
And where there's doubt, true faith in you.
Oh, Master grant that I may never seek,
So much to be consoled as to console.
To be understood as to understand,
To be loved as to love with all my soul.
Make me a channel of your peace,
Where there's despair in life, let me bring hope.

Where there is darkness, only light,
And where there's sadness, ever joy.

The Peace Corps was Jack Kennedy's creation but embodied Sargent Shriver's spirit. Lyndon Johnson declared war on poverty but Sarge led the charge. These, and the Special Olympics, were as dramatic an incarnation of the ideas at the heart of America as the space program.

Robert Sargent Shriver changed the world more than a few times and, I am happy to say, changed my world forever. In the late '90s, when the Jubilee 2000 campaign—which aimed to cancel the debts that the poorest nations owed to the richest—asked me to help in the United States, I called on the Shriver clan for help and advice. What I got were those things in spades, and a call to arms like a thump in the back.

In the years since, Bobby Shriver—Sarge's oldest son and—I co-founded three fighting units in the war against global poverty: DATA, ONE and (RED). We may not yet know what it will take to finish the fight and silence suffering in our time, but we are flat out trying to live up to Sarge's drill.

I have beautiful memories of Bobby and me sitting with his father and mother at the Shriver's kitchen table—the same team that gazed over J.F.K.'s shoulder—looking over our paltry attempts at speechifying, prodding and pushing us toward comprehensibility and credibility, a challenge when your son starts hanging round with a bleeding-heart Irish rock star.

Toward the end, when I visited Sarge as a frail man, I was astonished by his good spirits and good humor. He had the room around him laughing out loud. I thought it a fitting final victory in a life that embodied service and transcended, so often, grave duty, that he had a certain weightlessness about him. Even then, his job nearly done, his light shone undiminished, and brightened us all.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING BRUCE RANDOLPH SCHOOL

• Mr. BENNET. Madam President, today I congratulate Bruce Randolph School in Denver, which President Obama recognized in the State of the Union Address for its remarkable turnaround.

Just 3 years ago, Bruce Randolph was one of the lowest performing schools in my home State of Colorado, but last May, 97 percent of the seniors graduated, including many who will be the first in their families to go to college.

I remember as superintendent working with the principal at the time, Kristin Waters, to get these turnaround efforts off the ground, and it is tremendous to see all the progress that has been made on behalf of the students at Bruce Randolph.

The Bruce Randolph community has seen firsthand that school turnarounds are possible, and with hard work and flexibility, we can improve our schools to better prepare our kids for success in college and the 21st century job market. We truly can improve the lives of our kids when teachers, parents, principals and communities come together.

And now we need to work together to bring similar turnaround efforts to other low-performing schools in Colorado and across the country. To build on successes like these, we need to put politics aside, listen to the ideas and aspirations of those closest to our kids, and work together to reform our public schools in a way that supports talented teaching, closes the achievement gap and equips our kids with the skills they are going to need to compete for the jobs of the 21st century.

On a more personal note, for me, for one moment, in a place that sometimes feels so removed from the work being done in classrooms across the country, having the children and teachers of Bruce Randolph invoked as an example of what is possible in public education was very powerful.

Congratulations again to teachers, parents, students and the principal at Bruce Randolph School. This is a great honor for all those involved in the turnaround effort and the continued success at Bruce Randolph School.●

WELLS WOOD TURNING &
FINISHING, INC.

● Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I have the privilege of hearing countless small business success stories from hard-working entrepreneurs across the country. And these stories are all the more gratifying when they involve companies located in my home State of Maine. Today I recognize the extraordinary achievements of Wells Wood Turning & Finishing, Inc., a small firm which recently celebrated several major milestones in the company's history.

Wells Wood Turning, located in the western Maine town of Buckfield, specializes in turning, finishing, and manufacturing a variety of custom wood products. Wells fashions a number of traditional wooden handles, knobs, and table legs, in addition to all manner of custom craft turnings, like bird houses, salt and pepper shakers, and napkin rings. The company also produces wooden toy parts, and miniature and promotional baseball bats. Wells Wood Turning primarily uses white birch in the construction of its products, but also utilizes other species of wood, such as ash, maple, and hickory.

In December, Wells Wood Turning marked two significant milestones. First was the company's 25th anniversary, which is a major accomplishment in any industry, much less Maine's competitive wood products industry. And December 24 marked the company's 18th year without a lost time accident at its plant, a truly remarkable feat. These milestones are a testament to the company's skilled workforce and their diligent efforts to promote a strong and safe working environment. I congratulate Tom Wallace, the company's president, and everyone at Wells Wood Turning for their dedicated service and impeccable record of quality and safety over the past quarter century.

A member of the Maine Wood Products Association and the Wood Products Manufacturers Association, Wells Wood Turning & Finishing has proven itself to be an exemplary small business. With a commitment to serving the customer by providing striking wood products, designed to the customers' specifications and in a timely manner, Wells Wood Turning has earned a reputation for fine craftsmanship. I again thank Tom Wallace and everyone at Wells Wood Turning for their strong work ethic and extraordinary safety record, and wish them continued success.●

REMEMBERING GENERAL VANG
PAO

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, today I commemorate the recent passing of an iconic figure from a bygone era—a man who, with the help of his loyal Hmong people, kept what some estimate to be as many as 70,000 North Vietnamese soldiers from deploying through Laos to kill Americans during the Vietnam war.

General Vang Pao, the military leader of the mountain-dwelling Laotian Hmong during this era, was already at war with Pathet-Lao communist forces in Laos when the United States began working with him. The goal of the U.S. in Laos at the time was to prevent North Vietnamese from using Laos as a supply line for their attacks on South Vietnam along what was known as the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Unfortunately for the Hmong, who lived in the mountainous jungles between Laos and North Vietnam, their homes were located along this trail.

Vang Pao told the New York Times in 2008 that "There were three missions that were very important that were given to us and to me . . . One was stopping the flow of the North Vietnamese troops through the Ho Chi Minh Trail to go to the south through Laos. Second was to rescue any American pilots during the Vietnam War. Third, to protect the Americans that navigated the B-52s and the jets to bomb North Vietnam."

Bill Lair, Vang Pao's contact with the CIA, recounted Vang Pao saying, "You give us the weapons, and we'll fight the communists." And so began a covert war in Laos in which thousands of Vang Pao's Hmong soldiers gave their lives, always persevering despite very heavy casualties.

To his mountain people and even to some of his CIA contacts, Vang Pao had a larger-than-life status. He shared meager food rations with his troops, commanded from the field instead of his headquarters, and led troops on the frontlines of battles, where he suffered bullet wounds to his arm and chest.

Vang Pao was known to have stated, "If we die, we die together. Nobody will be left behind." These words proved tragic as the Vietnam war came to an end. U.S. forces evacuated Vang Pao and his leadership but were unable to mount an evacuation of the majority of his people. Vang Pao and his top associates were forced to leave Laos as over 20,000 of their compatriots stood on an airstrip in the mountains, waiting to be evacuated by their U.S. supporters as the enemy quickly approached. The evacuation never occurred. Thousands were left behind and killed as communist forces completed their invasion.

Today, many Hmong reside in poverty-stricken resettlement villages in Laos. A few thousand still remain in the mountains, where there are allegations that they have been persecuted in recent years. And many have resettled in the United States. Minnesota, Cali-

fornia, Wisconsin, and Rhode Island are proud to have Hmong call our States their home.

In 1997, the Clinton administration authorized a plaque to be placed at Arlington National Cemetery stating that the valor of General Vang Pao's troops would never be forgotten. As my colleague from Minnesota told Minnesota's Star Tribune, there would be a few thousand more names on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial were it not for the efforts of the Hmong. Today, we in the Senate and thousands of Hmong throughout the world remember the bravery and dedication Vang Pao and his troops exercised while fighting to uphold democracy and protect the lives of so many young Americans at War in Southeast Asia.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a treaty which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION
OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY
THAT WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE
ORDER 13396 ON FEBRUARY
7, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO THE
SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION
TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—PM 3

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2011.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council

in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. In March 2007, the Ouagadougou Political Agreement was signed by the two primary protagonists in Côte d'Ivoire's conflict. As demonstrated by recent events surrounding the presidential election in Côte d'Ivoire, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 26, 2011.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, announced that pursuant to section 114(b) of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development Act (2 U.S.C. 1103), the Democratic leader appoints the following Member to the Board of Trustees for the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for a term of 6 years: TERRI A. SEWELL of Alabama.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 162. A bill to cut \$500,000,000,000 in spending in fiscal year 2011.

S. 163. A bill to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

H.R. 2. An act to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME ON JANUARY 25, 2011

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 2. An act to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

S. 162. A bill to cut \$500,000,000,000 in spending in fiscal year 2011.

S. 163. A bill to require that the Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 192. A bill to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related pro-

visions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

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-123. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-625 "Department of Health Functions Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-124. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-626 "Performance Parking Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-125. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-627 "Extension of Time Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-126. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-628 "Fiscal Year 2011 Income Tax Secured Revenue Refunding Bond Issuance Temporary Approval Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-127. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-629 "Fiscal Year 2011 Income Tax Secured Revenue Bond and General Obligation Bond Issuance Temporary Approval Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-128. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-630 "Veterans License Plates Authorization Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-129. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-631 "Artist Protection Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-130. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-632 "Samuel J. Simmons NCBA Estates No. 1 Limited Partnership Real Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-131. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-634 "District of Columbia Uniform Law Commission Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-132. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-635 "Saving D.C. Homes from Foreclosure Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-133. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-636 "Alternative Money Lending and Services Reform Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-134. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-637 "Computation of Gross Income Clarification Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-135. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-638 "Annual Financial Reporting Modernization Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-136. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-639 "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 0441, S.O. 09-8516, Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-137. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-640 "Settlement Payment Integrity Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-138. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-641 "14W and Anthony Bowen YMCA Project Tax Abatement Implementation Clarification Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-139. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-642 "Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-140. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-643 "Capital Access Program Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-141. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-644 "Closing of G Street, S.E., adjacent to Square 1104, S.O. 06-5665, Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-142. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-645 "Processing Sales Tax Clarification Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-143. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-646 "Reverend Donald Robinson Field Designation Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-144. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-647 "District of Columbia Good Time Credits Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-145. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-648 "Miss B's Center, the Bernice Elizabeth Fonteneau Building Designation Act of 2010"; to the Committee on

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-146. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-649 "Rental Housing Commission Reform Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-147. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-650 "Rental Housing Act Extension Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-148. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-149. 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 "Notice of Re-Issuance of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Applicability Determination for the Carlsbad Energy Center Project, Carlsbad, CA" (FRL No. 9256-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-150. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Evaluation of the Rural PACE Provider Grant Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-151. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicaid Program: Final Fiscal Year 2009 and Preliminary Fiscal Year 2011 Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotments, and Final Fiscal Year 2009 and Preliminary Fiscal Year 2011 Institutions for Mental Diseases Disproportionate Share Hospital Limits" (RIN0938-AQ44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-152. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Programs; Additional Screening Requirements, Application Fees, Temporary Enrollment Moratoria, Payment Suspensions and Compliance Plans for Providers and Suppliers" (RIN0938-AQ20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-153. 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 "Affordable Care Act Nondiscrimination Provisions Applicable to Insured Group Health Plans" (Notice 2011-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-154. 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 "Initial Guidance on the Application of Section 162(m)(6)" (Notice

2011-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-155. 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 "Over-the-Counter Drugs—Additional Guidance" (Notice 2011-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-156. 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 "Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2011-7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-157. 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 "Modification of Notice 2010-71" (Notice 2011-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-158. 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 "Permitted Disparity in Employer-Provided Contributions or Benefits" (Revenue Ruling 2011-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-159. 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 "Inflation Adjusted Items for 2011" (Rev. Proc. 2011-12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-160. 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 "Update of CC:INTL No-Rule Revenue Procedure, Rev. Proc. 2010-7" (Revenue Procedure 2011-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-161. 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 "Amendments to the Section 7216 Regulations—Disclosure or Use of Information By Preparers of Returns" ((RIN1545-B186)(TD 9478)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-162. 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 2010-0190-2010-0197); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-163. 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 2011-0001-2011-0006); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-164. A communication from the Program Manager, Office of the National Coordi-

nator for Health Information Technology, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of the Permanent Certification Program for Health Information Technology" (RIN0991-AB59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-165. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy and Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-49; Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2005-49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-166. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy and Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Public Access to the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System" ((RIN9000-AL96)(FAC 2005-49)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-167. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy and Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-49; Introduction" (FAC 2005-49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-168. A communication from the Executive Director of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's annual FAIR Act Inventory Summary for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-169. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2010 through September 30, 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-170. A communication from the Regulatory Officer, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2010 Tariff-Rate Quota Year" (7 CFR Part 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-171. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prevention of Payments to Deceased Persons" (RIN0560-AH91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-172. A communication from the Regulatory Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Required Scale Tests" (RIN0580-AB10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of

the President of the Senate on January 19, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-173. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza" (Docket No. APHIS-2006-0074) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mefenoxam; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 8855-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluazifop-P-butyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 8861-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-176. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluazinam; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 8859-3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-177. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sulfentrazone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 8860-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-178. A communication from the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Oversight of Caron Markets Working Group's report entitled "Report on the Oversight of Existing and Prospective Carbon Markets" received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-179. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidelines for Awarding Clean Water Act Section 319 Base Grants to Indian Tribes" (FRL No. 9247-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-180. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Rules and Regulations for Control of Air Pollution; Permitting of Grandfathered and Electing Electric Generating Facilities"

(FRL No. 9248-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-181. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Testing of Certain High Production Volume Chemicals; Second Group of Chemicals" (FRL No. 8846-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-182. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alaska; Adequacy of Alaska Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Permit Program" (FRL No. 9247-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-183. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired, Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units" (FRL No. 9255-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-184. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of One-Year Extension for Attaining the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the New Jersey Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Moderate Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9255-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-185. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of One-Year Extension for Attaining the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania portions of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Moderate Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9251-7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-186. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9250-6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-187. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation

Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation 1" (FRL No. 9209-3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-188. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Adoption of the Revised Lead Standards and Related Reference Conditions, and Update of Appendices" (FRL No. 9255-9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-189. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Adoption of Control Techniques Guidelines for Flat Wood Paneling Coatings" (FRL No. 9256-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-190. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Testing of Certain High Production Volume Chemicals; Second Group of Chemicals; Technical Correction" (FRL No. 8862-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-191. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District and Placer County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9249-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-192. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9249-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-193. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Limitation of Approval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Provisions Concerning Greenhouse Gas Emitting-Sources in State Implementation Plans; Alabama" (FRL No. 9259-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-194. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air

Quality Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Approval of Section 110(a)(1) Maintenance Plan for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards for the Nashville, Tennessee area" (FRL No. 9259-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-195. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Limitation of Approval of Prevention of Significant Deterioration Provisions Concerning Greenhouse Gas Emitting-Sources in State Implementation Plans; Mississippi" (FRL No. 9259-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-196. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Waste Management System; Identifying and Listing Hazardous Waste Exclusion" (FRL No. 9259-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-197. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; The Milwaukee-Racine and Sheboygan Areas; Determination of Attainment of the 1997 8-hour Ozone Standard; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" (FRL No. 9258-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-198. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Format and Content of Plant-Specific Pressurized Thermal Shock Safety Analysis Reports for Pressurized Water Reactors" (Regulatory Guide 1.154) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-199. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife Parks, National Wildlife Refuge Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2010-2011 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations—Additions" (RIN1018-AX20) as received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-200. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice of Availability of the Models for Plant-Specific Adoption of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-513, Revision 3, "Revise PWR Operability Requirements and Actions for RCS Leakage Instrumentation" (NRC-2009-0444) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-201. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nuclear Criticality Safety Standards for Fuels and Materials Facilities" (Regulatory Guide 3.71,

Revision 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-202. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-611 "Wayne Place Senior Living Limited Partnership Real Property Tax Exemption Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-203. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-612 "2323 Pennsylvania Avenue Southeast Redevelopment Project Real Property Limited Tax Abatement Assistance Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-204. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-613 "Thirteenth Church of Christ Real Property Tax Relief and Exemption Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-205. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-614 "800 Kenilworth Avenue Northeast Redevelopment Project Real Property Limited Tax Abatement Assistance Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-206. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-615 "Randall School Disposition Restatement Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-207. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-616 "Cooperative Housing Association Economic Interest Recordation Tax Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-208. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-617 "African American Civil War Memorial Freedom Foundation, Inc., African-American Civil War Museum Approval Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-209. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18-633 "Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-210. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2009-027, Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel" ((RIN9000-AL60)(FAC 2005-48)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-211. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2009-031, Terminating Contracts" ((RIN9000-AL56)(FAC 2005-48)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-212. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2011-005, Repeal of the Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Program" ((RIN9000-AL87)(FAC 2005-48)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-213. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2009-018, Payrolls and Basic Records" ((RIN9000-AL53)(FAC 2005-48)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 25, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-214. A communication from the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-215. A communication from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to mileage reimbursement rates for Federal employees who use privately owned vehicles while on official travel; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-216. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a nomination in the position of Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-217. 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-218. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Indian Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Funding Requirements for Contract Support Costs of Self-Determination Contracts Fiscal Year 2009 Report"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-219. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Government Contracting, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Women-Owned Small Business Federal Contract Program" (RIN3245-AG06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2011; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-220. A communication from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Veteran-Owned Small Business Verification Guidelines" (RIN2900-AM78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 24, 2011; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 188. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 189. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense, in awarding a contract for the KC-X Aerial Refueling Aircraft Program, to consider any unfair competitive advantage that an offeror may possess; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 190. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to prohibit the imposition of new tolls on the Federal-aid system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 191. A bill to direct the Department of Homeland Security to undertake a study on emergency communications; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. KIRK, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 192. A bill to repeal the job-killing health care law and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; read the first time.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 193. A bill to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 194. A bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REID of Nevada (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KOHL, and Ms. SNOWE)):

S. 195. A bill to reinstate Federal matching of State spending of child support incentive payments; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 196. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for participation in the Exchange of the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, political appointees, and congressional staff; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 197. A bill to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health

care delivery system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 198. A bill to require the return and redistribution among State transportation departments of certain unexpended highway funding; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 199. A bill to require the obligation of certain highway funding within a 3-year period; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 200. A bill for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 201. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 202. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States before the end of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 203. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to institute research into the special circumstances associated with oil spill prevention and response in Arctic waters, including assessment of impacts on Arctic marine mammals and other wildlife, marine debris research and removal, and risk assessment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 204. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to permit funds in the Oil Spill Liability Trust to be used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and other Federal agencies for certain research, prevention, and response capabilities with respect to discharges of oil, for environmental studies, and for grant programs to communities affected by oil spills on the outer Continental Shelf, and to provide funding for such uses and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH:

S. 205. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that oil produced from Federal leases in certain Arctic waters be transported by pipeline to on-shore facilities and to provide for the sharing of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues from areas in the Alaska Adjacent Zone; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ENSIGN):

S. 206. A bill to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 207. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the 100 percent exclusion for gain on certain small business stock; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 209. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to transfer individuals detained by the United States at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and certain other enemy belligerents to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 210. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to eliminate the mandatory printing of bills and resolutions for the use of offices of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. BURR, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. KIRK):

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. Res. 26. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, honoring those who lost their lives in that earthquake, and expressing continued solidarity with the Haitian people; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WEBB:

S. Res. 27. A resolution designating January 26, 2011, as "National Kawasaki Disease Awareness Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, a bill to strengthen the economic competitiveness of the United States.

S. 7

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 7, a bill to reform the Federal tax code.

S. 18

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as

cosponsors of S. 18, a bill to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of \$600 or more to corporations and for other purposes.

S. 19

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 19, a bill to restore American's individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 20

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 20, a bill to protect American job creation by striking the job-killing Federal employer mandate.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to secure the United States against cyber attack, to enhance American competitiveness and create jobs in the information technology industry, and to protect the identities and sensitive information of American citizens and businesses.

S. 32

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to prohibit the transfer or possession of large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and for other purposes.

S. 34

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 34, a bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of firearms and explosives licenses to known or suspected dangerous terrorists.

S. 35

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 35, a bill to establish background check procedures for gun shows.

S. 44

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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. 49

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 49, a bill to amend the Federal anti-trust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads.

S. 72

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 72, a bill to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of \$600 or more to corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 75

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 75, a bill to restore the rule that agreements between manufacturers and retailers, distributors, or wholesalers to set the minimum price below which the manufacturer's product or service cannot be sold violates the Sherman Act.

S. 81

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 81, a bill to direct unused appropriations for Senate Official Personnel and Office Expense Accounts to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 10, a resolution to improve the debate and consideration of legislative matters and nominations in the Senate.

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 20, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should immediately approve the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, and the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement.

S. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 21, a resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide procedures for extended debate.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 188. A bill to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 98 West First Street, Yuma, Arizona, as the "John M. Roll United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to introduce legislation to name the United States courthouse in Yuma, AZ, the John M. Roll United States Courthouse. Is that legislation at the desk?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I am pleased to introduce legislation, along with Senator KYL, that would designate the soon-to-be-constructed Federal courthouse in Yuma, AZ, to be named in honor of Chief Judge John Roll, who died tragically during the senseless act of violence against Congresswoman GIFFORDS and other Arizonans in Tucson earlier this month. I had the distinct privilege of knowing and working with Chief Judge Roll for many years. In fact, it was my honor to recommend him to President George Herbert Walker Bush for nomination to the Federal bench in 1991. He served with distinction. Most recently, Judge Roll became known by so many in the State of Arizona, the Judicial Conference, and many in Congress as a tireless advocate for the plaintiffs, defendants, and judges in Arizona by working to secure additional funding and resources to assist the court in its heavy caseload.

The morning of the shooting, Judge Roll was in line to speak to Congresswoman GIFFORDS, who was also a friend, about his efforts to have the Ninth Circuit declared a judicial emergency in the District of Arizona. He died doing what he did each and every day: working to guarantee the Federal courts in our State were capable of handling the growing caseload, while ensuring swift justice for all.

Judge Roll exemplified the qualities all Presidents should seek in candidates for the Federal bench: intelligence, humility, integrity, and fidelity to the law. He embodied all these qualities and many more. Additionally, he was known as a kind neighbor, a dedicated father and husband, and a loyal friend. He will now be known also as a hero.

The Arizona Daily Star reported on January 20, 2011:

Surveillance footage of the January 8 shooting campaign in Tucson showed that Judge Roll used his body as a shield to cover the wounded Ron Barber. Roll then took a bullet to the back and lost his life in the process.

"The judge is a hero," Pima County sheriff's Bureau Chief Rick Kastigar said.

The article states that the suspected gunman:

. . . shot Barber, Giffords' district director. Almost simultaneously, Roll moved Barber toward the ground and both crawled beneath

a table, Kastigar said. Roll then got on top of Barber.

"Judge Roll is responsible for directing Mr. Barber out of the line of fire and helped save his life," Kastigar said.

Barber told the Arizona Daily Star:

That just gives me more admiration for the judge than I ever had. . . . John Roll was a dear, dear man.

Barber and Judge Roll had been friends for many years, dating back to their days as college students at the University of Arizona. Most recently, they worked together with the Arizona congressional delegation to secure funding for a new Federal courthouse in Yuma, AZ, to alleviate the congestion at the Tucson Federal courthouse. In fact, Judge Roll had just reviewed the architectural drawings of the new courthouse weeks before his death and told my office he was very pleased with the design.

It is the hope of myself and Senator KYL and every Member of the Arizona delegation that the architectural designs will soon include the name of Chief Judge John Roll prominently on the building. This esteemed jurist, friend, and hero deserves this honor and much more. Our State has lost a good man, a true and able advocate for justice for all, and a great Arizonan. For this reason, I ask my fellow Senators to join me in passing this legislation to allow the new Yuma Federal courthouse to be proudly known as the John M. Roll United States Courthouse.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, my State has lost an outstanding jurist, a true and able public servant, and a great Arizonan in Judge John M. Roll. In his honor, my Arizona colleague, Senator MCCAIN, and I propose naming the soon-to-be constructed Yuma Federal courthouse the "Judge John M. Roll United States Courthouse."

Judge John Roll was the top proponent for the addition of a new courthouse in Yuma, which is intended to help deal with the vast number of Federal cases in the underserved Yuma sector. He was involved in nearly every aspect of its approval, working tirelessly to overcome the many obstacles that arose during the process and spending countless hours poring over designs and meeting with architects and contractors. Without Judge Roll's energy and enthusiasm the project may not have been accomplished.

We name special places after special people not just to thank them, although we do, but to honor the qualities that make them exceptional and distinct.

I had the privilege and honor of working with Judge John Roll for many years. He was known for his fairness to all who appeared in his courtroom, both plaintiffs and defendants. As chief judge, he was a vigorous advocate, working to guarantee the Federal courts in Arizona were capable of handling their extraordinary caseload. In fact, he died protecting the life of a member of Representative GIFFORD's

staff with whom he had just been discussing the need to designate the need for more judges as a judicial emergency.

We are eternally grateful for his many years of public service. I believe naming the courthouse in his honor befits the rich legacy he leaves behind.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in honor of my friend Judge John Roll.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 193. A bill to extend the sunset of certain provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Congress now faces a deadline to take action on the expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act. The bill I introduce today, the USA PATRIOT Act Sunset Extension Act of 2011, will preserve law enforcement techniques that are set to expire on February 28, 2011, and extend them to December 2013. This bill will also promote transparency and expand privacy and civil liberties safeguards in current law. It increases judicial oversight of government surveillance powers that capture information on Americans. This is a package of reforms that all Americans should support. In fact, a bipartisan group of Senators on the Judiciary Committee voted in favor of it in the last Congress.

In the 111th Congress, the Judiciary Committee reported virtually identical legislation, S. 1692, with bipartisan support, including the votes of Senators KYL and CORNYN. Subsequent negotiations produced a package that was endorsed by the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence. Because Congress did not act on that negotiated package of reforms, but instead passed an extension of the expiring authorities until February 28, 2011, I took steps to see that key portions of the package were implemented administratively by the Department of Justice.

Even with this progress, enacting the USA PATRIOT Act Sunset Extension Act of 2011 remains imperative for several reasons. First, surveillance authorities are set to expire in a matter of weeks. We should not play politics with national security by delaying debate over these issues until the 11th hour. I am prepared to extend the sunsets on the three expiring provisions to December 2013, the same sunset date I included in S.1692RS, the bill I introduced in the 111th Congress. Earlier this month, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives to extend the expiring provisions only until February 2012, an expiration date chosen deliberately to try to force a debate over national security in an election year. My bill sets a longer sunset period, which law enforcement strongly favors.

Second, the Senate should pass the USA PATRIOT Act Sunset Extension Act of 2011 to codify the steps forward that the Attorney General has taken

by implementing parts of the bill administratively. The reforms adopted by this Attorney General could be undone by a future Attorney General with the stroke of a pen. We must ensure that the progress in accountability and transparency that we achieved last year is not lost simply because it was never written into the statute.

Third, we must enact the parts of the bill that the Attorney General did not or could not adopt because they require a change in the statute. Chief among these is adding a new sunset on National Security Letters. Second is repealing the presumption in favor of the government that a judge must honor when he or she reviews an application for a section 215 order for business records. The government does not need this presumption. In fact, the Attorney General endorsed the repeal of the presumption when he expressed his support for the bill in the prior Congress.

When this bill was considered by the Judiciary Committee in the 111th Congress, it received a bipartisan vote. Members of the committee agreed to continue discussions over a handful of provisions to ensure that the final language promoted transparency, protected civil liberties, and aided law enforcement. I appreciate the votes of Senators KYL and CORNYN in favor of the reported bill. In the weeks following the 2009 markup, this bipartisan group of Senators worked closely with me and Senator FEINSTEIN to reach an agreement on language that each Senator supported, and that the Department of Justice endorsed. In a letter dated November 9, 2009, the Attorney General strongly endorsed the bill and stated unequivocally that the bill did not pose any operational concerns. That support was reaffirmed in a letter from the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to Senate and House leadership on February 19, 2010.

The bill I introduce today is virtually identical to the product of those negotiations. It includes only two non-controversial updates. First, the new bill updates the deadlines by which the Department of Justice must issue public reports. This modification simply reflects the fact that more than 1 year has passed since the original dates were written into the bill. Second, the section of the bill that previously required the Department of Justice to establish minimization procedures for National Security Letters is redrafted to reflect that fact that the Department adopted such procedures in October 2010. Otherwise, this bill is the same in substance as that which was supported by a bipartisan majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2009.

We must move quickly, in advance of the looming deadline, to pass this bipartisan package. We can preserve the authorities currently in place, which give law enforcement the tools it needs to protect national security. And we can ensure that inspectors general, the

Congress, and the public maintain vigilant oversight of the government, making sure these authorities are used properly and within Constitutional bounds. I urge all Senators to support the USA PATRIOT Act Sunset Extension Act of 2011.

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. 193

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 “USA PATRIOT Act Sunset Extension Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. SUNSETS.

(a) SECTIONS 206 AND 215 SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 50 U.S.C. 1805 note, 50 U.S.C. 1861 note, and 50 U.S.C. 1862 note) is amended by striking “February, 28, 2011” and inserting “ December 31, 2013”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended by section 3 of this Act, is amended—

(i) in the table of contents in the first section, by striking the items relating to title V and sections 501, 502, and 503 and inserting the following:

“TITLE V—ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PURPOSES

“Sec. 501. Definitions.

“Sec. 502. Access to certain business records for foreign intelligence and international terrorism investigations.”;

(ii) in title V (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.)—

(I) in the title heading, by striking “AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS”; and

(II) by striking section 503; and

(iii) in section 601(a)(1)(D) (50 U.S.C. 1871(a)(1)(D)), by striking “section 501;” and inserting “section 502 or under section 501 pursuant to section 102(b)(2) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 50 U.S.C. 1861 note);”.

(B) APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 404 OF THE FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008.—Section 404(b)(4)(A) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-261; 122 Stat. 2477) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting “, except that paragraph (1)(D) of such section 601(a) shall be applied as if it read as follows:

“(D) access to records under section 502 or under section 501 pursuant to section 102(b)(2) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 50 U.S.C. 1861 note);”.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall take effect on December 31, 2013.

(b) INDIVIDUAL TERRORISTS AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS.—

(1) EXTENSION OF SUNSET.—Section 6001(b) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) SUNSET.—

“(1) REPEAL.—Subparagraph (C) of section 101(b)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(b)(1)), as

added by subsection (a), is repealed effective December 31, 2013.

“(2) TRANSITION PROVISION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), subparagraph (C) of section 101(b)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(b)(1)) shall continue to apply on and after December 31, 2013, with respect to any particular foreign intelligence investigation or with respect to any particular offense or potential offense that began or occurred before December 31, 2013.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 601(a)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871(a)(2)) is amended by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “pursuant to subsection (b)(2) of section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 50 U.S.C. 1801 note);”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect on December 31, 2013.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.—

(1) REPEAL.—Effective on December 31, 2013—

(A) section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as such provision read on October 25, 2001;

(B) section 1114(a)(5) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)) is amended to read as such provision read on October 25, 2001;

(C) subsections (a) and (b) of section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) are amended to read as subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of the second of the 2 sections designated as section 624 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) (relating to disclosure to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for counterintelligence purposes), as added by section 601 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-93; 109 Stat. 974), read on October 25, 2001;

(D) section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is repealed; and

(E) section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436) is amended to read as such provision read on October 25, 2001.

(2) TRANSITION PROVISION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the provisions of law referred to in paragraph (1), as in effect on December 30, 2013, shall continue to apply on and after December 31, 2013, with respect to any particular foreign intelligence investigation or with respect to any particular offense or potential offense that began or occurred before December 31, 2013.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Effective December 31, 2013—

(A) section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in subsections (a), (c), and (d), by striking “or 627(a)” each place it appears; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1)(A), as amended by section 6(b) of this Act, by striking “section 626 or 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u and 1681v)” and inserting “section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u)”;

(B) section 118(c) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (18 U.S.C. 3511 note) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(C) the table of sections for the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended by striking the item relating to section 627.

SEC. 3. ORDERS FOR ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS AND TANGIBLE THINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS” after “CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a statement of facts showing” and inserting “a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon by the applicant to justify the belief of the applicant”; and

(ii) by striking “clandestine intelligence activities,” and all that follows and inserting “clandestine intelligence activities;”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) if the records sought are the circulation records or patron lists of a library (as defined in section 213(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122(1)), a statement of facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the records sought—

“(i) are relevant to an authorized investigation (other than a threat assessment) conducted in accordance with subsection (a)(2) to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities; and

“(ii) (I) pertain to a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power;

“(II) are relevant to the activities of a suspected agent of a foreign power who is the subject of such authorized investigation; or

“(III) pertain to an individual in contact with, or known to, a suspected agent of a foreign power; and

“(C) a statement of proposed minimization procedures.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by inserting “and that the proposed minimization procedures meet the definition of minimization procedures under subsection (g)” after “subsections (a) and (b)”;

(B) by inserting “, and directing that the minimization procedures be followed” after “release of tangible things”; and

(C) by striking the second sentence.

(b) TRANSITION PROCEDURES.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by this Act, an order entered under section 501(c)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(c)(1)) that is in effect on the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall remain in effect until the expiration of the order.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 503. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title, the terms ‘Attorney General’, ‘foreign intelligence information’, ‘international terrorism’, ‘person’, ‘United States’, and ‘United States person’ have the meanings given such terms in section 101.”.

(2) TITLE HEADING.—Title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended in the title heading by inserting “AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS” after “CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS”.

(3) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking the items relating to title V and section 501 and inserting the following:

“TITLE V—ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS AND OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PURPOSES

“Sec. 501. Access to certain business records and other tangible things for foreign intelligence purposes and international terrorism investigations.”; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 502 the following:

“Sec. 503. Definitions.”.

SEC. 4. ORDERS FOR PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PURPOSES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Section 402(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “a certification by the applicant” and inserting “a statement of the facts and circumstances relied upon by the applicant to justify the belief of the applicant”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) a statement of whether minimization procedures are being proposed and, if so, a statement of the proposed minimization procedures.”.

(b) MINIMIZATION.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 401 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The term ‘minimization procedures’ means—

“(A) specific procedures, that are reasonably designed in light of the purpose and technique of an order for the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device, to minimize the retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of nonpublicly available information known to concern unconsenting United States persons consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information;

“(B) procedures that require that nonpublicly available information, which is not foreign intelligence information shall not be disseminated in a manner that identifies any United States person, without such person’s consent, unless such person’s identity is necessary to understand foreign intelligence information or assess its importance; and

“(C) notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), procedures that allow for the retention and dissemination of information that is evidence of a crime which has been, is being, or is about to be committed and that is to be retained or disseminated for law enforcement purposes.”.

(2) PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—Section 402 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(1), by striking “the judge finds” and all that follows and inserting the following: “the judge finds—

“(A) that the application satisfies the requirements of this section; and

“(B) that, if there are exceptional circumstances justifying the use of minimization procedures in a particular case, the proposed minimization procedures meet the definition of minimization procedures under this title.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) At or before the end of the period of time for which the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device is approved under an order or an extension under this section, the judge may assess compli-

ance with any applicable minimization procedures by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was retained or disseminated.”.

(3) EMERGENCIES.—Section 403 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) If the Attorney General authorizes the emergency installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device under this section, the Attorney General shall require that minimization procedures be followed, if appropriate.”.

(4) USE OF INFORMATION.—Section 405(a)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1845(a)(1)) is amended by striking “provisions of this section” and inserting “minimization procedures required under this title”.

(c) TRANSITION PROCEDURES.—

(1) ORDERS IN EFFECT.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by this Act, an order entered under section 402(d)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842(d)(1)) that is in effect on the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall remain in effect until the expiration of the order.

(2) EXTENSIONS.—A request for an extension of an order referred to in paragraph (1) shall be subject to the requirements of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), as amended by this Act.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under paragraph (3) is provided, no wire or electronic communication service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a), shall disclose to any person that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under this section.

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that, absent a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection, there may result—

“(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A wire or electronic communication service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(B) PERSONS NECESSARY FOR COMPLIANCE.—Upon a request by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, those persons to whom disclosure will be made under subparagraph (A)(i) or to whom such disclosure was made before the request shall be identified to the Director or the designee.

“(C) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(D) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(3) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A wire or electronic communications service provider that receives a request under subsection (a) shall have the right to judicial review of any applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—A request under subsection (a) shall state that if the recipient wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement, the recipient shall notify the Government.

“(C) INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS.—If a recipient of a request under subsection (a) makes a notification under subparagraph (B), the Government shall initiate judicial review under the procedures established in section 3511 of this title, unless an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation makes a notification under paragraph (4).

“(4) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a recipient has submitted a notification under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the wire or electronic service provider, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”.

(b) IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under paragraph (3) is provided, no consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request or order under subsection (a), (b), or (c), shall disclose or specify in any consumer report, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subsection (a), (b), or (c).

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that, absent a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection, there may result—

“(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request or order under subsection (a), (b), or (c) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request or order;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request or order; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(B) PERSONS NECESSARY FOR COMPLIANCE.—Upon a request by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, those persons to whom disclosure will be made under subparagraph (A)(i) or to whom such disclosure was made before the request shall be identified to the Director or the designee.

“(C) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request or order is issued under subsection (a), (b), or (c) in the same manner as the person to whom the request or order is issued.

“(D) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(3) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency that receives a request or order under subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall have the right to judicial review of any applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—A request or order under subsection (a), (b), or (c) shall state that if the recipient wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement, the recipient shall notify the Government.

“(C) INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS.—If a recipient of a request or order under subsection (a), (b), or (c) makes a notification under subparagraph (B), the Government shall initiate judicial review under the procedures established in section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, unless an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation makes a notification under paragraph (4).

“(4) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request or order for which a consumer reporting agency has submitted a notification under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”

(c) DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM PURPOSES.—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under paragraph (3) is provided, no consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a), shall disclose to any person or specify in any consumer report, that a government agency has sought or obtained access to information under subsection (a).

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of a government agency authorized to conduct investigations of, or intelligence or counterintelligence activities or analysis related to, international terrorism, or a designee, certifies that, absent a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection, there may result—

“(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the government agency authorized to conduct investigations of, or intelligence or counterintelligence activities or analysis related to, international terrorism, or a designee.

“(B) PERSONS NECESSARY FOR COMPLIANCE.—Upon a request by the head of a government agency authorized to conduct investigations of, or intelligence or counterintelligence activities or analysis related to, international terrorism, or a designee, those persons to whom disclosure will be made under subparagraph (A)(i) or to whom such disclosure was made before the request shall be identified to the head of the government agency or the designee.

“(C) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(D) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(3) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A consumer reporting agency that receives a request under subsection (a) shall have the right to judicial review of any applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—A request under subsection (a) shall state that if the recipient wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement, the recipient shall notify the government.

“(C) INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS.—If a recipient of a request under subsection (a) makes a notification under subparagraph (B), the government shall initiate judicial review under the procedures established in section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, unless an appropriate official of the government agency authorized to conduct investigations of, or intelligence or counterintelligence activities or analysis related to, international terrorism makes a notification under paragraph (4).

“(4) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a consumer reporting agency has submitted a notification under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the government agency

authorized to conduct investigations of, or intelligence or counterintelligence activities or analysis related to, international terrorism shall promptly notify the consumer reporting agency, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”

(d) FINANCIAL RECORDS.—Section 1114(a)(5) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“(D) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(i) PROHIBITION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subclause (II) and notice of the right to judicial review under clause (iii) is provided, no financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subparagraph (A), shall disclose to any person that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained access to information or records under subparagraph (A).

“(II) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subclause (I) shall apply if the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee of the Director whose rank shall be no lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge of a Bureau field office, certifies that, absent a prohibition of disclosure under this subparagraph, there may result—

“(aa) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(bb) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(cc) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(dd) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subparagraph (A) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(aa) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(bb) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(cc) other persons as permitted by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director.

“(II) PERSONS NECESSARY FOR COMPLIANCE.—Upon a request by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the designee of the Director, those persons to whom disclosure will be made under subclause (I)(aa) or to whom such disclosure was made before the request shall be identified to the Director or the designee.

“(III) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subclause (I) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under subparagraph (A) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(IV) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subclause (I) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(iii) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A financial institution that receives a request under subparagraph (A) shall have the right to judicial review of any applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(II) NOTIFICATION.—A request under subparagraph (A) shall state that if the recipient wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement, the recipient shall notify the Government.

“(III) INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS.—If a recipient of a request under subparagraph (A) makes a notification under subclause (II), the Government shall initiate judicial review under the procedures established in section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, unless an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation makes a notification under clause (iv).

“(iv) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a financial institution has submitted a notification under clause (iii)(II), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall promptly notify the financial institution, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”

(e) REQUESTS BY AUTHORIZED INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES.—Section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436), is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN DISCLOSURE.—

“(1) PROHIBITION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a certification is issued under subparagraph (B) and notice of the right to judicial review under paragraph (3) is provided, no governmental or private entity, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a), shall disclose to any person that an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) has sought or obtained access to information under subsection (a).

“(B) CERTIFICATION.—The requirements of subparagraph (A) shall apply if the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, certifies that, absent a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection, there may result—

“(i) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(ii) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(iii) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(iv) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A governmental or private entity, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, that receives a request under subsection (a) may disclose information otherwise subject to any applicable nondisclosure requirement to—

“(i) those persons to whom disclosure is necessary in order to comply with the request;

“(ii) an attorney in order to obtain legal advice or assistance regarding the request; or

“(iii) other persons as permitted by the head of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a).

“(B) PERSONS NECESSARY FOR COMPLIANCE.—Upon a request by the head of an authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a), or a designee, those persons to whom disclosure will be made under subparagraph (A)(i) or to whom such disclosure was made before the request shall be identified to the head of the authorized investigative agency or the designee.

“(C) NONDISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.—A person to whom disclosure is made under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to the nondisclosure requirements applicable to a person to whom a request is issued under sub-

section (a) in the same manner as the person to whom the request is issued.

“(D) NOTICE.—Any recipient that discloses to a person described in subparagraph (A) information otherwise subject to a nondisclosure requirement shall inform the person of the applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(3) RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A governmental or private entity that receives a request under subsection (a) shall have the right to judicial review of any applicable nondisclosure requirement.

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—A request under subsection (a) shall state that if the recipient wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement, the recipient shall notify the Government.

“(C) INITIATION OF PROCEEDINGS.—If a recipient of a request under subsection (a) makes a notification under subparagraph (B), the Government shall initiate judicial review under the procedures established in section 3511 of title 18, United States Code, unless an appropriate official of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) makes a notification under paragraph (4).

“(4) TERMINATION.—In the case of any request for which a governmental or private entity has submitted a notification under paragraph (3)(B), if the facts supporting a nondisclosure requirement cease to exist, an appropriate official of the authorized investigative agency described in subsection (a) shall promptly notify the governmental or private entity, or officer, employee, or agent thereof, subject to the nondisclosure requirement that the nondisclosure requirement is no longer in effect.”

SEC. 6. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF FISA ORDERS AND NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) FISA.—Section 501(f)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking “a production order” and inserting “a production order or nondisclosure order”; and

(ii) by striking “Not less than 1 year” and all that follows; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “production order or nondisclosure”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking clause (ii); and

(B) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(b) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.—Section 3511(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) NONDISCLOSURE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) NOTICE.—If a recipient of a request or order for a report, records, or other information under section 2709 of this title, section 626 or 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u and 1681v), section 1114 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436), wishes to have a court review a nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the request or order, the recipient shall notify the Government.

“(B) APPLICATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notification under subparagraph (A), the Government shall apply for an order prohibiting the disclosure of the existence or contents of the relevant request or order. An application under this subparagraph may be filed in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the recipient of the order is doing business or in the district court of the United States for any judicial district within which the authorized investigation that is the basis for the request or

order is being conducted. The applicable nondisclosure requirement shall remain in effect during the pendency of proceedings relating to the requirement.

“(C) CONSIDERATION.—A district court of the United States that receives an application under subparagraph (B) should rule expeditiously, and shall, subject to paragraph (3), issue a nondisclosure order that includes conditions appropriate to the circumstances.

“(2) APPLICATION CONTENTS.—An application for a nondisclosure order or extension thereof under this subsection shall include a certification from the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, an Assistant Attorney General, or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or in the case of a request by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government other than the Department of Justice, the head or deputy head of the department, agency, or instrumentality, containing a statement of specific and articulable facts indicating that, absent a prohibition of disclosure under this subsection, there may result—

“(A) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(B) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(C) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(D) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.

“(3) STANDARD.—A district court of the United States shall issue a nondisclosure requirement order or extension thereof under this subsection if the court determines, giving substantial weight to the certification under paragraph (2) that there is reason to believe that disclosure of the information subject to the nondisclosure requirement during the applicable time period will result in—

“(A) a danger to the national security of the United States;

“(B) interference with a criminal, counterterrorism, or counterintelligence investigation;

“(C) interference with diplomatic relations; or

“(D) danger to the life or physical safety of any person.”

(c) MINIMIZATION.—Section 501(g)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)(1)) is amended by striking “Not later than” and all that follows and inserting “At or before the end of the period of time for the production of tangible things under an order approved under this section or at any time after the production of tangible things under an order approved under this section, a judge may assess compliance with the minimization procedures by reviewing the circumstances under which information concerning United States persons was retained or disseminated.”

SEC. 7. CERTIFICATION FOR ACCESS TO TELEPHONE TOLL AND TRANSACTIONAL RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office designated by the Director, may make a certification under subsection (b) only upon a written statement, which shall be retained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of specific facts showing that there

are reasonable grounds to believe that the information sought is relevant to the authorized investigation described in subsection (b).”.

(b) **IDENTITY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CREDIT REPORTS.**—Section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), as amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (h);

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) **WRITTEN STATEMENT.**—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office designated by the Director, may make a certification under subsection (a) or (b) only upon a written statement, which shall be retained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of specific facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information sought is relevant to the authorized investigation described in subsection (a) or (b), as the case may be.”.

(c) **DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES FOR COUNTERTERRORISM PURPOSES.**—Section 627(b) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “FORM OF CERTIFICATION” and inserting “CERTIFICATION”;

(2) by striking “The certification” and inserting the following:

“(1) **FORM OF CERTIFICATION.**—The certification”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **WRITTEN STATEMENT.**—A supervisory official or officer described in paragraph (1) may make a certification under subsection (a) only upon a written statement, which shall be retained by the government agency, of specific facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information sought is relevant to the authorized investigation described in subsection (a).”.

(d) **FINANCIAL RECORDS.**—Section 1114(a)(5) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)), as amended by this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (C);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

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

“(B) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or a designee in a position not lower than Deputy Assistant Director at Bureau headquarters or a Special Agent in Charge in a Bureau field office designated by the Director, may make a certification under subparagraph (A) only upon a written statement, which shall be retained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of specific facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information sought is relevant to the authorized investigation described in subparagraph (A).”.

(e) **REQUESTS BY AUTHORIZED INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES.**—Section 802(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) A department or agency head, deputy department or agency head, or senior official described in paragraph (3)(A) may make a certification under paragraph (3)(A) only upon a written statement, which shall be retained by the authorized investigative agency, of specific facts showing that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the information sought is relevant to the authorized inquiry or investigation described in paragraph (3)(A)(ii).”.

(f) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **OBSTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS.**—Section 1510(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 2709(c)(1) of this title, section 626(d)(1) or 627(c)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(d)(1) or 1681v(c)(1)), section 1114(a)(3)(A) or 1114(a)(5)(D)(i) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(3)(A) or 3414(a)(5)(D)(i)),” and inserting “section 2709(d)(1) of this title, section 626(e)(1) or 627(c)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u(e)(1) and 1681v(c)(1)), section 1114(a)(3)(A) or 1114(a)(5)(D)(i) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(3)(A) and 3414(a)(5)(D)(i)).”.

(2) **SEMIANNUAL REPORTS.**—Section 507(b) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 415b(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (4).

SEC. 8. PUBLIC REPORTING ON NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 118(c) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (18 U.S.C. 3511 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **REPORTS ON REQUESTS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘applicable period’ means—

“(i) with respect to the first report submitted under paragraph (2) or (3), the period beginning 180 days after the date of enactment of the USA PATRIOT Act Sunset Extension Act of 2011 and ending on December 31, 2011; and

“(ii) with respect to the second report submitted under paragraph (2) or (3), and each report thereafter, the 6-month period ending on the last day of the second month before the date for submission of the report; and

“(B) the term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

“(2) **CLASSIFIED FORM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1, 2012, and every 6 months thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report fully informing the committees concerning the requests made under section 2709(a) of title 18, United States Code, section 1114(a)(5)(A) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A)), section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v), or section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436) during the applicable period.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall include, for each provision of law described in subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the number of authorized requests under the provision, including requests for subscriber information; and

“(ii) the number of authorized requests under the provision—

“(I) that relate to a United States person;

“(II) that relate to a person that is not a United States person;

“(III) that relate to a person that is—

“(aa) the subject of an authorized national security investigation; or

“(bb) an individual who has been in contact with or otherwise directly linked to the subject of an authorized national security investigation; and

“(IV) that relate to a person that is not known to be the subject of an authorized national security investigation or to have been

in contact with or otherwise directly linked to the subject of an authorized national security investigation.

“(3) **UNCLASSIFIED FORM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 1, 2012, and every 6 months thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report fully informing the committees concerning the aggregate total of all requests identified under paragraph (2) during the applicable period ending on the last day of the second month before the date for submission of the report. Each report under this subparagraph shall be in unclassified form.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—Each report under subparagraph (A) shall include the aggregate total of requests—

“(i) that relate to a United States person;

“(ii) that relate to a person that is not a United States person;

“(iii) that relate to a person that is—

“(I) the subject of an authorized national security investigation; or

“(II) an individual who has been in contact with or otherwise directly linked to the subject of an authorized national security investigation; and

“(iv) that relate to a person that is not known to be the subject of an authorized national security investigation or to have been in contact with or otherwise directly linked to the subject of an authorized national security investigation.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 9. PUBLIC REPORTING ON THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title VI of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **SEC. 602. ANNUAL UNCLASSIFIED REPORT.**

“Not later than June 30, 2012, and every year thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, and with due regard for the protection of classified information from unauthorized disclosure, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives an unclassified report summarizing how the authorities under this Act are used, including the impact of the use of the authorities under this Act on the privacy of United States persons (as defined in section 101).”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in the first section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 601 the following:

“Sec. 602. Annual unclassified report.”.

SEC. 10. AUDITS.

(a) **TANGIBLE THINGS.**—Section 106A of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 120 Stat. 200) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2006” and inserting “2011”;

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) with respect to calendar years 2007 through 2011, an examination of the minimization procedures used in relation to orders under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) and whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CALENDAR YEARS 2007, 2008, AND 2009.—Not later than September 30, 2011, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2007, 2008, and 2009.

“(4) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 AND 2011.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2010 and 2011.”;

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on January 1, 2007 and ending on December 31, 2011, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence community outside of the Department of Justice that used information acquired under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) in the intelligence activities of the element of the intelligence community shall—

“(A) assess the importance of the information to the intelligence activities of the element of the intelligence community;

“(B) examine the manner in which that information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the element of the intelligence community;

“(C) describe any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to orders under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 as the orders relate to the element of the intelligence community; and

“(D) examine any minimization procedures used by the element of the intelligence community under title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

“(2) SUBMISSION DATES FOR ASSESSMENT.—

“(A) CALENDAR YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2009.—Not later than September 30, 2011, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence community that conducts an assessment under this subsection shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representative a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2007 through 2009.

“(B) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 AND 2011.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence

community that conducts an assessment under this subsection shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2010 and 2011.”;

(5) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(ii) by inserting “and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that submits a report under this section” after “Justice”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the reports submitted under subsection (c)(1) and (c)(2)” and inserting “any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(6) in subsection (f) as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking “The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) and (c)(2)” and inserting “Each report submitted under subsection (c)”;

(B) by striking “subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “subsection (e)(2)”;

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a); and

“(2) the term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”;

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS.—Section 119 of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-177; 120 Stat. 219) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “2006” and inserting “2011”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “(as such term is defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)))”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) CALENDAR YEARS 2007, 2008, AND 2009.—Not later than September 30, 2011, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2007, 2008, and 2009.

“(4) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 AND 2011.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report containing the results of the audit conducted under subsection (a) for calendar years 2010 and 2011.”;

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a);

“(2) the term ‘national security letter’ means a request for information under—

“(A) section 2709(a) of title 18, United States Code (to access certain communication service provider records);

“(B) section 1114(a)(5)(A) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(a)(5)(A)) (to obtain financial institution customer records);

“(C) section 802 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 436) (to obtain financial information, records, and consumer reports);

“(D) section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u) (to obtain certain financial information and consumer reports); or

“(E) section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v) (to obtain credit agency consumer records for counterterrorism investigations); and

“(3) the term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”;

(4) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively;

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on January 1, 2007 and ending on December 31, 2011, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence community outside of the Department of Justice that issued national security letters in the intelligence activities of the element of the intelligence community shall—

“(A) examine the use of national security letters by the element of the intelligence community during the period;

“(B) describe any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to the use of national security letters by the element of the intelligence community, including any improper or illegal use of such authority;

“(C) assess the importance of information received under the national security letters to the intelligence activities of the element of the intelligence community; and

“(D) examine the manner in which information received under the national security letters was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated.

“(2) SUBMISSION DATES FOR ASSESSMENT.—

“(A) CALENDAR YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2009.—Not later than September 30, 2011, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence community that conducts an assessment under this subsection shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2007 through 2009.

“(B) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 AND 2011.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Inspector General of any element of the intelligence community that conducts an assessment under this subsection shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2010 and 2011.”;

(6) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (4)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “a report under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(ii) by inserting “and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that submits a report under this section” after “Justice”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “the reports submitted under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “any report submitted under subsection (c) or (d)”;

(7) in subsection (f), as redesignated by paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “The reports submitted under subsections (c)(1) or (c)(2)” and inserting “Each report submitted under subsection (c)”;

(B) by striking “subsection (d)(2)” and inserting “subsection (e)(2)”.

(C) PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.—

(1) AUDITS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall perform comprehensive audits of the effectiveness and use, including any improper or illegal use, of pen registers and trap and trace devices under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1841 et seq.) during the period beginning on January 1, 2007 and ending on December 31, 2011.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The audits required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an examination of the use of pen registers and trap and trace devices under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for calendar years 2007 through 2011;

(B) an examination of the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device on emergency bases under section 403 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1843);

(C) any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to the use of a pen register or trap and trace device under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, including any improper or illegal use of the authority provided under that title; and

(D) an examination of the effectiveness of the authority under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 as an investigative tool, including—

(i) the importance of the information acquired to the intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(ii) the manner in which the information is collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including any direct access to the information provided to any other department, agency, or instrumentality of Federal, State, local, or tribal governments or any private sector entity;

(iii) with respect to calendar years 2010 and 2011, an examination of the minimization procedures of the Federal Bureau of Investigation used in relation to pen registers and trap and trace devices under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons;

(iv) whether, and how often, the Federal Bureau of Investigation used information acquired under a pen register or trap and trace device under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to produce an analytical intelligence product for distribution within the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the intelligence community, or to another department, agency, or instrumentality of Federal, State, local, or tribal governments; and

(v) whether, and how often, the Federal Bureau of Investigation provided information acquired under a pen register or trap and trace device under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to law enforcement authorities for use in criminal proceedings.

(3) SUBMISSION DATES.—

(A) CALENDAR YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2009.—Not later than September 30, 2011, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives

a report containing the results of the audits conducted under paragraph (1) for calendar years 2007 through 2009.

(B) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 AND 2011.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the audits conducted under paragraph (1) for calendar years 2010 and 2011.

(4) INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning January 1, 2007 and ending on December 31, 2011, the Inspector General of any element of the intelligence community outside of the Department of Justice that used information acquired under a pen register or trap and trace device under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 in the intelligence activities of the element of the intelligence community shall—

(i) assess the importance of the information to the intelligence activities of the element of the intelligence community;

(ii) examine the manner in which the information was collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated;

(iii) describe any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to orders under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 as the orders relate to the element of the intelligence community; and

(iv) examine any minimization procedures used by the element of the intelligence community in relation to pen registers and trap and trace devices under title IV of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 and whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

(B) SUBMISSION DATES FOR ASSESSMENT.—

(1) CALENDAR YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2009.—Not later than September 30, 2011, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence community that conducts an assessment under this paragraph shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representative a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2007 through 2009.

(2) CALENDAR YEARS 2010 AND 2011.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Inspector General of each element of the intelligence community that conducts an assessment under this paragraph shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representative a report containing the results of the assessment for calendar years 2010 and 2011.

(5) PRIOR NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL AND DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE; COMMENTS.—

(A) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days before the submission of any report paragraph (3) or (4), the Inspector General of the Department of Justice and any Inspector General of an element of the intelligence community that submits a report under this subsection shall provide the report to the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence.

(B) COMMENTS.—The Attorney General or the Director of National Intelligence may provide such comments to be included in any report submitted under paragraph (3) or (4) as the Attorney General or the Director of National Intelligence may consider necessary.

(6) UNCLASSIFIED FORM.—Each report submitted under paragraph (3) and any comments included in that report under paragraph (5)(B) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “foreign intelligence information” and “United States person” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801); and

(2) the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a).

SEC. 11. DELAYED NOTICE SEARCH WARRANTS.

Section 3103a(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “30 days” and inserting “7 days”.

SEC. 12. PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall periodically review, and revise as necessary, the procedures adopted by the Attorney General on October 1, 2010 for the collection, use, and storage of information obtained in response to a national security letter issued under section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, section 1114(a)(5) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3414(5)), section 626 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681u), or section 627 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681v).

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In reviewing and revising the procedures described in subsection (a), the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the privacy interests of individuals and the need to protect national security.

(c) REVISIONS TO PROCEDURES AND OVERSIGHT.—If the Attorney General makes any significant changes to the procedures described in subsection (a), the Attorney General shall notify and submit a copy of the changes to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 13. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act, or the application of the provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 14. OFFSET.

Of the unobligated balances available in the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund established under section 524(c)(1) of title 28, United States Code, \$5,000,000 are permanently rescinded and shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 15. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11 shall take effect on the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself,
Mr. COBURN, and Mr. JOHANNIS):

S. 194. A bill to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 194

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

SECTION 1. TERMINATION OF TAXPAYER FINANCING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGNS.

(a) **TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF INCOME TAX PAYMENTS.**—Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TERMINATION.**—This section shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009.”

(b) **TERMINATION OF FUND AND ACCOUNT.**—
(1) **TERMINATION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9014. TERMINATION.

“The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to any presidential election (or any presidential nominating convention) after the date of the enactment of this section, or to any candidate in such an election.”

(B) **TRANSFER OF EXCESS FUNDS TO GENERAL FUND.**—Section 9006 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS REMAINING AFTER TERMINATION.**—The Secretary shall transfer all amounts in the fund after the date of the enactment of this section to the general fund of the Treasury.”

(2) **TERMINATION OF ACCOUNT.**—Chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9043. TERMINATION.

“The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to any candidate with respect to any presidential election after the date of the enactment of this section.”

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) The table of sections for chapter 95 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9014. Termination.”

(2) The table of sections for chapter 96 of subtitle H of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9043. Termination.”

By Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KOHL, and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 195. A bill to reinstate Federal matching of State spending of child support incentive payments; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today, I rise to introduce the Child Support Protection Act of 2011 with my colleagues, Senators CORNYN, KOHL, and SNOWE. This bill continues the long-standing, bipartisan support of Congress for the Child Support Enforcement program, which began with the passage of the authorizing legislation in 1974.

Child support enforcement is a strong partnership between the Federal Government and State governments to help parents provide long-term support for their children. It includes a network of 60,000 dedicated staff serving 17 million children across this country. It provided \$24.4 billion to children in 2009. The Congressional Research Service reports that receipt of child support reduces child poverty by nearly 25 per-

cent. The Urban Institute estimates that \$4 in child support expenditures reduces spending in other public programs by \$5.

So, the Child Support Enforcement program's results are impressive and it is widely recognized as one of the most effective programs operated by the Federal Government. In fact, the program is notable for collecting \$4.78 for each dollar of expenditure. It is a true bargain that works well.

Child support programs do much more than just collect money. It works with noncustodial parents who need employment so that they can make regular payments. Child support staff also plays a critical role in times of high unemployment, by processing adjustments to support orders so that noncustodial parents do not fall hopelessly behind.

When Congress passed the Child Support Performance and Incentive Act of 1998, CSPIA, it created an innovative incentive program that rewards efficient, results-oriented child support enforcement efforts. These earned performance incentives must be used for child support activities. One of every four dollars from State expenditures to fund the child support program comes from CSPIA incentives and matched Federal funds. The Deficit Reduction Act, DRA, of 2005 repealed the authority to use the earned performance incentives as a match for Federal funds. The bill we have introduced today reverses the funding reduction imposed by the DRA.

States are using the incentives in a variety of ways. In my State of West Virginia, the incentive dollars are being used to invest in technology to upgrade services and enhance customer service. Thirty States or territories are investing in staff and program operations. Sixteen States are investing in technology, and three others are investing in customer service programs.

The Child Support Protection Act would give States the authority to use earned performance incentives to fund this important work and continue the impressive results that are being achieved. This permanent reversal is critical so that those in State and local government can budget for the future. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to cosponsor this much needed legislation that is not only important to child support enforcement, but our children, their families, and the States.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. KYL):

S. 201. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague, Senator KYL, in introducing a bill that would clarify the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation over program activities associated with the C.C.

Cragin Project in northern Arizona. A companion measure is being introduced today in the House by Congressman PAUL GOSAR from Arizona.

Pursuant to the Arizona Water Settlements Act of 2004, AWSA, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept from the Salt River Project, SRP, title of the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir for the express use of the Salt River Federal Reclamation Project. While it is clear that Congress intended to transfer jurisdiction of the Cragin Project to the Department of the Interior, and in particular, the Bureau of Reclamation, the lands underlying the Project are technically located within the Coconino National Forest and the Tonto National Forest. This has resulted in a disagreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Forest Service concerning jurisdiction over the operation and management activities of the Cragin Project.

For more than 5 years, SRP and Reclamation have attempted to reach an agreement with the Forest Service that recognizes Reclamation's paramount jurisdiction over the Cragin Project. Unfortunately, the Forest Service maintains that this technical ambiguity under the AWSA implies they have a regulatory role in approving Cragin Project operations and maintenance. This bill represents a negotiated compromise between the agencies and our offices that appropriately clarifies each agency's role with respect to the Dam and the Federal lands surrounding it. A similar bill was introduced during the 111th Congress and was reported with an amendment by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The version we are introducing today is identical to the Committee reported bill.

Speedy resolution of this jurisdictional issue is urgently needed in order to address repairs and other operational needs of the Cragin Project, including planning for the future water needs of the City of Payson and other northern Arizona communities. This clarification would simply provide Reclamation with the oversight responsibility that Congress originally intended. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DEMINT, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 202. A bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States before the end of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. PAUL. 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. 202

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 “Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2011”.

SEC. 2. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 shall be completed before the end of 2012.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A report on the audit required under subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which such audit is completed and made available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests it.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking all after “in writing.”

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ENSIGN):

S. 206. A bill to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act—SOAR—which seeks to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program or OSP. And I am proud to be joined by a bipartisan group of Senators in introducing this bill—Senator COLLINS, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator ENSIGN.

The DC Opportunity Scholarship Program offers scholarships to low-income students, especially those from failing schools, to attend private schools where they can get a better education. This program offers District of Columbia students and their families a choice that improves the quality of their education and significantly increases their likelihood of graduating from high school and attending college.

Here in Washington, there are many families who can exercise school choice. They can afford to live in neighborhoods with good schools, they can provide engaging supplemental and afterschool opportunities for their children, or they can choose to send their children to private schools. However, there are many low-income families

whose children are trapped in failing schools and do not have those options.

School reformers in Washington, through their hard work and, at times, controversial policies, have begun to make a difference for students in the District of Columbia. I applaud the work of Michelle Rhee and her team in their tireless efforts to make the District’s schools better. I am pleased that Mayor Gray has indicated he will continue school reform because there is much more work to do on behalf of Washington’s schoolchildren. District of Columbia test scores are on the rise but even so, according to recent National Assessment of Educational Progress data, the District of Columbia, while having one of the highest per pupil expenditures in the country, settles at the bottom of all states in reading and math for both 4th and 8th grade students. District of Columbia schools also have among the lowest graduation rates in the country.

We all know that meaningful and effective change is slow and we still have a long way to go before we can be confident that each student in the District is getting the public education they deserve. Ronald Holassie, a high school student in the OSP, expressed the implications of this well when he said “public schools in the District did not go bad over night and they won’t get better over night.” Students cannot wait for reforms to take effect in the worst of the District’s public schools—they need a good education right now if they are going to be able to fulfill their potential. The Opportunity Scholarships respond to that immediate need.

One of the goals of the OSP is holistic support of the reforms that are helping to improve education in all sectors of education here in the District. Since 2003, Congress has supported a tri-sector approach by appropriating new funds for District public schools, District public charter schools and the Opportunity Scholarship Program. Critics of the OSP argue that it takes away funds from public schools. That is simply not true. The scholarship program was intentionally designed to ensure that any funding for Opportunity Scholarships would not reduce funding for public schools. This legislation will provide additional new money for the District of Columbia’s Public Schools, for District of Columbia Public Charter Schools, and for the continuation of the Opportunity Scholarship Program. We have not changed the three part funding design of the initiative.

The SOAR Act also strengthens the existing requirements for all schools participating in the OSP by requiring a valid certificate of occupancy and ensuring that teachers in core subjects have an appropriate college degree. The bill continues to target students from lower income families who are attending those schools most in need of improvement and it increases the tuition amounts slightly to levels consistent with the tuition charged at typ-

ical participating schools. The new amounts are still well below the per pupil cost of educating a child in the District of Columbia public schools. While we have kept the income ceiling for entry into the program unchanged, we have increased slightly the income ceiling for those already participating in the program to ensure that parents are not forced to choose between a modest raise in their income and the scholarship.

The most recent study conducted by the Department of Education’s Institute of Education Science shows that the offer of an OSP scholarship raised a student’s probability of completing high school by twelve percentage points overall. The offer of a scholarship improved the graduation prospects by thirteen percentage points for the high-priority group of students from schools designated “Schools in Need of Improvement” and for those students actually using an OSP scholarship the improved graduation rate went up to twenty percentage points. In the District of Columbia, where the graduation rates are among the lowest in the country, this is important data that cannot be overlooked. Overall, parents of OSP students were more satisfied and felt school was safer if their child was offered or used an OSP scholarship.

In a landmark education speech at the outset of his presidency, President Obama promised that Education Secretary Arne Duncan “will use only one test when deciding what ideas to support . . . : It’s not whether an idea is liberal or conservative, but whether it works.” By that standard, this program should be continued. It is not a Democratic, Republican, or Independent program—it is not a liberal or conservative program—it is a program that puts children first. The Opportunity Scholarship Program works as evidenced by increased graduation rates, higher reading proficiency, and the overwhelming support of District families. I urge Republicans and Democrats to rally behind the OSP program. Last year we had a vote on the bill that received the support of 42 Senators. In this Congress, I will be fighting for another vote and am confident there will be more than 50 votes to reauthorize the program. With these votes and the strong support of Speaker BOEHNER I am hopeful we can give students here in the District the opportunities they deserve.

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. 206

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 “Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act of 2011” or the “SOAR Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Parents are best equipped to make decisions for their children, including the educational setting that will best serve the interests and educational needs of their child.

(2) For many parents in the District of Columbia, public school choice provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, as well as under other public school choice programs, is inadequate. More educational options are needed to ensure all families in the District of Columbia have access to a quality education. In particular, funds are needed to provide low-income parents with enhanced public opportunities and private educational environments, regardless of whether such environments are secular or nonsecular.

(3) While the per-student cost for students in the public schools of the District of Columbia is one of the highest in the United States, test scores for such students continue to be among the lowest in the Nation. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), an annual report released by the National Center for Education Statistics, reported in its 2009 study that students in the District of Columbia were being outperformed by every State in the Nation. On the 2009 NAEP, 56 percent of fourth grade students scored “below basic” in reading, and 44 percent scored “below basic” in mathematics. Among eighth grade students, 49 percent scored “below basic” in reading and 60 percent scored “below basic” in mathematics. On the 2009 NAEP reading assessment, only 17 percent of the District of Columbia fourth grade students could read proficiently, while only 13 percent of the eighth grade students scored at the proficient or advanced level.

(4) In 2003, Congress passed the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-199, 118 Stat. 126), to provide opportunity scholarships to parents of students in the District of Columbia to enable them to pursue a high quality education at a public or private elementary or secondary school of their choice. The DC opportunity scholarship program (DC OSP) under such Act was part of a comprehensive 3-part funding arrangement that also included additional funds for the District of Columbia public schools, and additional funds for public charter schools of the District of Columbia. The intent of the approach was to ensure that progress would continue to be made to improve public schools and public charter schools, and that funding for the opportunity scholarship program would not lead to a reduction in funding for the District of Columbia public and charter schools. Resources would be available for a variety of educational options that would give families in the District of Columbia a range of choices with regard to the education of their children.

(5) The DC OSP was established in accordance with the U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*, 536 U.S. 639 (2002), which found that a program enacted for the valid secular purpose of providing educational assistance to low-income children in a demonstrably failing public school system is constitutional if it is neutral with respect to religion and provides assistance to a broad class of citizens who direct government aid to religious and secular schools solely as a result of their genuine and independent private choices.

(6) Since the inception of the DC OSP, it has consistently been oversubscribed. Parents express strong support for the opportunity scholarship program. Rigorous studies of the program by the Institute of Education Sciences have shown significant improvements in parental satisfaction and in reading scores that are more dramatic when only those students consistently using the

scholarships are considered. The program also was found to result in significantly higher graduation rates for DC OSP students.

(7) The DC OSP is a program that offers families in need, in the District of Columbia, important alternatives while public schools are improved. This program should be reauthorized as 1 part of a 3-part comprehensive funding strategy for the District of Columbia school system that provides new and equal funding for public schools, public charter schools, and opportunity scholarships for students to attend private schools.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to provide low-income parents residing in the District of Columbia, particularly parents of students who attend elementary schools or secondary schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316), with expanded opportunities for enrolling their children in other schools in the District of Columbia, at least until the public schools in the District of Columbia have adequately addressed shortfalls in health, safety, and security, and the students in the District of Columbia public schools are testing in mathematics and reading at or above the national average.

SEC. 4. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—From amounts made available to carry out this section in accordance with section 14(b)(1), the Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities with approved applications under section 5 to carry out a program to provide eligible students with expanded school choice opportunities. The Secretary may award a single grant or multiple grants, depending on the quality of applications submitted and the priorities of this Act.

(b) **DURATION OF GRANTS.**—The Secretary shall make grants under this section for a period of not more than 5 years.

(c) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary and the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding the implementation of the program authorized under subsection (a) and the funding described in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 14(b).

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The memorandum of understanding shall address how the Mayor of the District of Columbia will ensure that the public schools and the public charter schools of the District of Columbia comply with all reasonable requests for information as necessary to fulfill the requirements for evaluations conducted under section 9.

(d) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(1) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the DC opportunity scholarship program under the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-8, 123 Stat. 654), the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-117, 123 Stat. 3181), or any other Act, shall be available until expended and may be used to provide opportunity scholarships under section 7 to new applicants.

(2) **REPEAL OF SITE INSPECTION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The fourth and fifth provisos under the heading “Federal Payment for School Improvement” of title IV of Division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-117, 123 Stat. 3182) are repealed. Any unobligated amounts reserved to carry out such provisos shall be made available to an eligible entity for administrative purposes or for opportunity scholarships under a grant under subsection (a), including for opportunity scholarships for new applicants for the 2011–2012 school year.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to receive a grant under section 4(a), an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The Secretary may not approve the request of an eligible entity for a grant under section 4(a) unless the entity’s application includes—

(1) a detailed description of—

(A) how the entity will address the priorities described in section 6;

(B) how the entity will ensure that if more eligible students seek admission in the program than the program can accommodate, eligible students are selected for admission through a random selection process which gives weight to the priorities described in section 6;

(C) how the entity will ensure that if more participating eligible students seek admission to a participating school than the school can accommodate, participating eligible students are selected for admission through a random selection process;

(D) how the entity will notify parents of eligible students of the expanded choice opportunities in order to allow the parents to make informed decisions;

(E) the activities that the entity will carry out to provide parents of eligible students with expanded choice opportunities through the awarding of scholarships under section 7(a);

(F) how the entity will determine the amount that will be provided to parents for the tuition, fees, and transportation expenses, if any;

(G) how the entity will—

(i) seek out private elementary schools and secondary schools in the District of Columbia to participate in the program; and

(ii) ensure that participating schools will meet the reporting and other requirements of this Act, and accommodate site visits in accordance with section 7(a)(4)(D);

(H) how the entity will ensure that participating schools are financially responsible and will use the funds received under a grant under section 4(a) effectively;

(I) how the entity will address the renewal of scholarships to participating eligible students, including continued eligibility; and

(J) how the entity will ensure that a majority of its voting board members or governing organization are residents of the District of Columbia; and

(2) an assurance that the entity will comply with all requests regarding any evaluation carried out under section 9.

SEC. 6. PRIORITIES.

In awarding grants under section 4(a), the Secretary shall give priority to applications from eligible entities that will most effectively—

(1) give priority to eligible students who, in the school year preceding the school year for which the eligible student is seeking a scholarship, attended an elementary school or secondary school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316);

(2) give priority to students whose household includes a sibling or other child who is already participating in the program of the eligible entity under section 4(a), regardless of whether such students have, in the past, been assigned as members of a control study group for the purposes of an evaluation under section 9;

(3) target resources to students and families that lack the financial resources to take advantage of available educational options; and

(4) provide students and families with the widest range of educational options.

SEC. 7. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), an eligible entity receiving a grant under section 4(a) shall use the grant funds to provide eligible students with opportunity scholarships to pay the tuition, fees, and transportation expenses, if any, to enable the eligible students to attend the District of Columbia private elementary school or secondary school of their choice beginning in school year 2011–2012. Each such eligible entity shall ensure that the amount of any tuition or fees charged by a school participating in such eligible entity's program under section 4(a) to an eligible student participating in the program does not exceed the amount of tuition or fees that the school charges to students who do not participate in the program.

(2) PAYMENTS TO PARENTS.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under section 4(a) shall make scholarship payments under the program under section 4(a) to the parent of the eligible student participating in the program, in a manner which ensures that such payments will be used for the payment of tuition, fees, and transportation expenses (if any), in accordance with this Act.

(3) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—

(A) VARYING AMOUNTS PERMITTED.—Subject to the other requirements of this section, an eligible entity receiving a grant under section 4(a) may award scholarships in larger amounts to those eligible students with the greatest need.

(B) ANNUAL LIMIT ON AMOUNT.—

(i) LIMIT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2011–2012.—The amount of assistance provided to any eligible student by an eligible entity under a program under section 4(a) for school year 2011–2012 may not exceed—

(I) \$8,000 for attendance in kindergarten through grade 8; and

(II) \$12,000 for attendance in grades 9 through 12.

(ii) CUMULATIVE INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—The limits described in clause (i) shall apply for each school year following school year 2011–2012, except that the Secretary shall adjust the maximum amounts of assistance (as described in clause (i) and adjusted under this clause for the preceding year) for inflation, as measured by the percentage increase, if any, from the preceding fiscal year in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(4) PARTICIPATING SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS.—None of the funds provided under subsection (a) for opportunity scholarships may be used by an eligible student to enroll in a participating private school unless the participating school—

(A) has and maintains a valid certificate of occupancy issued by the District of Columbia;

(B) makes readily available to all prospective students information on its school accreditation;

(C) in the case of a school that has been operating for 5 years or less, submits to the eligible entity administering the program proof of adequate financial resources reflecting the financial sustainability of the school and the school's ability to be in operation through the school year;

(D) agrees to submit to site visits as determined to be necessary by the eligible entity, except that a participating school shall not be required to submit to more than one site visit per year;

(E) has financial systems, controls, policies, and procedures to ensure that funds are used in accordance with the requirements of this Act; and

(F) ensures that each teacher of core subject matter in the school has a baccalaureate degree or equivalent degree.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under section 4(a) may use not more than 3 percent of the amount provided under the grant each year for the administrative expenses of carrying out its program under such section during the year, including—

(1) determining the eligibility of students to participate;

(2) selecting eligible students to receive scholarships;

(3) determining the amount of scholarships and issuing the scholarships to eligible students; and

(4) compiling and maintaining financial and programmatic records.

(c) PARENTAL ASSISTANCE.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under section 4(a) may use not more than 2 percent of the amount provided under the grant each year for the expenses of educating parents about the program under this Act and assisting parents through the application process under this Act during the year, including—

(1) providing information about the program and the participating schools to parents of eligible students;

(2) providing funds to assist parents of students in meeting expenses that might otherwise preclude the participation of eligible students in the program; and

(3) streamlining the application process for parents.

(d) STUDENT ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under section 4(a) may use not more than 1 percent of the amount provided under the grant each year for expenses to provide tutoring services to participating eligible students that need additional academic assistance in the students' new schools. If there are insufficient funds to pay for these costs for all such students, the eligible entity shall give priority to students who previously attended an elementary school or secondary school that was identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6316) as of the time the student attended the school.

SEC. 8. NONDISCRIMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity or a school participating in any program under this Act shall not discriminate against program participants or applicants on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.

(b) APPLICABILITY AND SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS, CLASSES, OR ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the prohibition of sex discrimination in subsection (a) shall not apply to a participating school that is operated by, supervised by, controlled by, or connected to a religious organization to the extent that the application of subsection (a) is inconsistent with the religious tenets or beliefs of the school.

(2) SINGLE SEX SCHOOLS, CLASSES, OR ACTIVITIES.—Notwithstanding subsection (a) or any other provision of law, a parent may choose and a school may offer a single sex school, class, or activity.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—For purposes of this Act, the provisions of section 909 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1688) shall apply to this Act as if section 909 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1688) were part of this Act.

(c) CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to alter or modify the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

(d) RELIGIOUSLY AFFILIATED SCHOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a school participating in any program under this Act that is operated by, supervised by, controlled by, or connected to, a religious organization may exercise its right in matters of employment consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–1 et seq.), including the exemptions in such title.

(2) MAINTENANCE OF PURPOSE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available under section 7(a) to eligible students, which are used at a participating school as a result of their parents' choice, shall not, consistent with the first amendment of the United States Constitution, necessitate any change in the participating school's teaching mission, require any participating school to remove religious art, icons, scriptures, or other symbols, or preclude any participating school from retaining religious terms in its name, selecting its board members on a religious basis, or including religious references in its mission statements and other chartering or governing documents.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A scholarship (or any other form of support provided to parents of eligible students) provided under section 7(a) shall be considered assistance to the student and shall not be considered assistance to the school that enrolls the eligible student. The amount of any such scholarship (or other form of support provided to parents of an eligible student) shall not be treated as income of the parents for purposes of Federal tax laws or for determining eligibility for any other Federal program.

SEC. 9. EVALUATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY AND THE MAYOR.—The Secretary and the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall—

(A) jointly enter into an agreement with the Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education to evaluate annually the performance of students who received scholarships under the 5-year program under section 4(a), and the Mayor shall ensure that, for the purposes of this evaluation, all public and public charter schools of the District of Columbia comply with all reasonable requests for information;

(B) jointly enter into an agreement to monitor and evaluate the use of funds authorized and appropriated under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 14(b) for the public schools and public charter schools of the District of Columbia; and

(C) make the evaluations public in accordance with subsection (c).

(2) DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary, through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, shall—

(A) ensure that the evaluation under paragraph (1)(A) is conducted using the strongest possible research design for determining the effectiveness of the program funded under section 4(a) that addresses the issues described in paragraph (4); and

(B) disseminate information on the impact of the program in increasing the academic growth and achievement of participating students, and on the impact of the program on students and schools in the District of Columbia.

(3) DUTIES OF THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES.—The Institute of Education Sciences shall—

(A) use a grade appropriate measurement each school year to assess participating eligible students;

(B) measure the academic achievement of all participating eligible students; and

(C) work with the eligible entities to ensure that the parents of each student who applies for an opportunity scholarship under a

program under section 4(a) (regardless of whether the student receives the scholarship) and the parents of each student participating in the scholarship program under section 4(a), agree that the student will participate in the measurements given annually by the Institute of Education Sciences for the period for which the student applied for or received the scholarship, respectively, except that nothing in this subparagraph shall affect a student's priority for an opportunity scholarship as provided under section 6(2).

(4) ISSUES TO BE EVALUATED.—The issues to be evaluated include—

(A) a comparison of the academic growth and achievement of participating eligible students in the measurements described in this section with the academic growth and achievement of eligible students in the same grades in the public schools and public charter schools of the District of Columbia, who sought to participate in the scholarship program but were not selected;

(B) the success of the program in expanding choice options for parents, improving parental and student satisfaction, and increasing parental involvement in the education of their children;

(C) the reasons parents choose for their children to participate in the program;

(D) a comparison of the retention rates, dropout rates, and (if appropriate) graduation and college admission rates of students who participate in the program funded under section 4(a), as compared to the retention rates, dropout rates, and (if appropriate) graduation and college admission rates of students of similar backgrounds who do not participate in such program;

(E) the impact of the program on students, and public elementary schools and secondary schools, in the District of Columbia;

(F) a comparison of the safety of the schools attended by students who participate in the program funded under section 4(a) and the schools attended by students who do not participate in the program, based on the perceptions of the students and parents and on objective measures of safety;

(G) such other issues as the Secretary considers appropriate for inclusion in the evaluation; and

(H) an analysis of the issues described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) with respect to the subgroup of eligible students participating in the program funded under section 4(a) who consistently use the opportunity scholarships to attend a participating school.

(5) PROHIBITION.—Personally identifiable information regarding the results of the measurements used for the evaluations may not be disclosed, except to the parents of the student to whom the information relates.

(b) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, Education and the Workforce, and Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Appropriations, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate—

(1) annual interim reports, not later than December 1 of each year for which a grant is made under section 4(a), on the progress and preliminary results of the evaluation of the program funded under such section; and

(2) a final report, not later than 1 year after the final year for which a grant is made under section 4(a), on the results of the evaluation of the program funded under such section.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—All reports and underlying data gathered pursuant to this section shall be made available to the public upon request, in a timely manner following submission of the applicable report under subsection (b), except that personally identifiable

information shall not be disclosed or made available to the public.

(d) LIMIT ON AMOUNT EXPENDED.—The amount expended by the Secretary to carry out this section for any fiscal year may not exceed 5 percent of the total amount appropriated to carry out section 4(a) for the fiscal year.

SEC. 10. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ACTIVITIES REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving funds under section 4(a) during a year shall submit a report to the Secretary not later than July 30 of the following year regarding the activities carried out with the funds during the preceding year.

(b) ACHIEVEMENT REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the reports required under subsection (a), each grantee receiving funds under section 4(a) shall, not later than September 1 of the year during which the second academic year of the grantee's program is completed and each of the next 2 years thereafter, submit to the Secretary a report, including any pertinent data collected in the preceding 2 academic years, concerning—

(A) the academic growth and achievement of students participating in the program;

(B) the graduation and college admission rates of students who participate in the program, where appropriate; and

(C) parental satisfaction with the program.

(2) PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—No report under this subsection may contain any personally identifiable information.

(c) REPORTS TO PARENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each grantee receiving funds under section 4(a) shall ensure that each school participating in the grantee's program under this Act during a year reports at least once during the year to the parents of each of the school's students who are participating in the program on—

(A) the student's academic achievement, as measured by a comparison with the aggregate academic achievement of other participating students at the student's school in the same grade or level, as appropriate, and the aggregate academic achievement of the student's peers at the student's school in the same grade or level, as appropriate;

(B) the safety of the school, including the incidence of school violence, student suspensions, and student expulsions; and

(C) the accreditation status of the school.

(2) PROHIBITING DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—No report under this subsection may contain any personally identifiable information, except as to the student who is the subject of the report to that student's parent.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) REPORTS BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, Education and the Workforce, and Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Appropriations, Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, an annual report on the findings of the reports submitted under subsections (a) and (b).

(2) REPORTS BY MAYOR.—In order for funds under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 14(b) to be made available to the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, information on—

(A) how the funds authorized and appropriated under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 14(b) for the public schools and public charter schools of the District of Columbia were utilized; and

(B) how such funds are contributing to student achievement.

SEC. 11. OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS.

(a) REQUESTS FOR DATA AND INFORMATION.—Each school participating in a program funded under section 4(a) shall comply with all requests for data and information regarding evaluations conducted under section 9(a).

(b) RULES OF CONDUCT AND OTHER SCHOOL POLICIES.—Each school participating in a program funded under section 4(a), including each participating school described in section 8(d), may require eligible students to abide by any rules of conduct and other requirements applicable to all other students at the school.

(c) NATIONALLY NORM-REFERENCED STANDARDIZED TESTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each school participating in a program funded under section 4(a) shall administer a nationally norm-referenced standardized test in reading and mathematics to each student enrolled in the school who is receiving an opportunity scholarship. The results of such test shall be reported to the student's parents or legal guardians and to the Secretary, through the Institute of Education Sciences of the Department of Education, for the purposes of conducting the evaluation under section 9.

(2) MAKE-UP SESSION.—If a school participating in a program funded under section 4(a) does not administer a nationally norm-referenced standardized test or the Institute of Education Sciences does not receive data regarding the results of such test for a student who is receiving an opportunity scholarship, then the Secretary, acting through the Institute of Education Sciences, shall administer such test not less than once during each school year to each student receiving an opportunity scholarship.

SEC. 12. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.—The term "elementary school" means an institutional day or residential school, including a public elementary charter school, that provides elementary education, as determined under District of Columbia law.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term "eligible entity" means any of the following:

(A) A nonprofit organization.

(B) A consortium of nonprofit organizations.

(3) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term "eligible student" means a student who is a resident of the District of Columbia and comes from a household—

(A) receiving assistance under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.); or

(B) whose income does not exceed—

(i) 185 percent of the poverty line; or

(ii) in the case of a student participating in the program under this Act in the preceding year, 300 percent of the poverty line.

(4) PARENT.—The term "parent" has the meaning given that term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(5) POVERTY LINE.—The term "poverty line" has the meaning given that term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(6) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term "secondary school" means an institutional day

or residential school, including a public secondary charter school, that provides secondary education, as determined under District of Columbia law, except that the term does not include any education beyond grade 12.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

SEC. 13. TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

(a) REPEAL.—The DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (title III of division C of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199; 118 Stat. 126)) is repealed.

(b) REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—This Act shall be deemed to be the reauthorization of the District of Columbia opportunity scholarship program under the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003.

(c) ORDERLY TRANSITION.—Subject to subsections(d) and (e), the Secretary shall take such steps as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to provide for the orderly transition to the authority of this Act from any authority under the provisions of the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-199; 118 Stat. 126), as the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or a repeal made by this Act shall be construed to alter or affect the memorandum of understanding entered into with the District of Columbia, or any grant or contract awarded, under the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-199; 118 Stat. 126), as the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) MULTI-YEAR AWARDS.—The recipient of a multi-year grant or contract award under the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-199; 118 Stat. 126), as the DC School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to receive funds in accordance with the terms and conditions of such award.

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, for the uses described in subsection (b), \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2012 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

(b) USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS ACT.—For each fiscal year, any amount appropriated to carry out this Act shall be equally divided among—

(1) the Secretary, in order to carry out the District of Columbia opportunity scholarship program established under section 4(a);

(2) the District of Columbia Public Schools, in order to improve public school education in the District of Columbia; and

(3) the State Education Office of the District of Columbia, in order to expand quality public charter schools in the District of Columbia.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joining Senator LIEBERMAN in introducing the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act of 2011, also known as the SOAR Act. This important piece of legislation will reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, which has successfully provided additional educational options for some of our nation’s most at-risk children.

Sadly, DC’s public schools continue to underperform despite a per-pupil expenditure rate that is one of the highest in the nation. Experts have carefully studied the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program and concluded

that the educational success of the program’s participants in reading has outpaced those in DC public schools.

Approximately 6 years ago, leaders in the District of Columbia became frustrated with institutionalized failure within the public school system, and designed a unique “three-sector” strategy that provided new funding for public schools, public charter schools and new educational options for needy children. Working with the District, Congress and the Bush administration then implemented the DC School Choice Incentive Act in 2004, giving birth to the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program.

The program is the first to provide federally funded scholarships to students, and has enabled low-income students from the District of Columbia public school system to attend the independent-private or parochial school of their choice. For many of these students, this was their first opportunity to access a high-quality education.

In March 2009, the Department of Education released its evaluation of the program’s impact after three years, which showed that overall, students offered scholarships had higher reading achievement than those not offered scholarships—the equivalent of an additional three months of learning.

Studies have also shown that parents were overwhelmingly satisfied with their children’s experience in the program. Common reasons for this higher level of satisfaction included, appreciation for the ability to choose their child’s school, the success their children are having in new school environments, and the support provided by the DC Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation, which runs the program.

In May 2009, Chairman LIEBERMAN and I held a compelling hearing in the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee where we heard the personal success stories of current and former participants in the program. Their testimony helped to highlight the real-world implications of discontinuing the program.

Ronald Holassie, then a junior at Archbishop Carroll, gave compelling testimony about the impact this program has had on his life. His mother was so concerned about the education he had been receiving that she was considering sending him to school in her home country of Trinidad, until she found out about the Opportunity Scholarship Program. Ronald said something very near the end of our hearing in response to a question from a member of the Committee that I also found enlightening. He said, “DC schools didn’t get bad over night, and they aren’t going to get better over-night either.” The program is critical to that improvement.

Based on what we have learned over the past few years, Chairman LIEBERMAN and I drafted a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program. This effort is

also being replicated in the House with a bill introduced by Speaker BOEHNER.

One of the reasons that I so strongly believe in the three-sector approach to funding for education in the District is that it reaffirms Congress’ commitment to improving educational outcomes and opportunities, not just for the students attending private schools, but also for all students in the District—including those attending DC public and charter schools.

I know that each of us shares the common goal of ensuring that all students in the District are receiving the highest quality education, which is why it is incumbent upon us to act and to act now to fully reauthorize the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REID, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 207. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today with Senators LEAHY, REID, WHITEHOUSE and others to introduce the COPS Improvement Act of 2011. This legislation would reauthorize and make improvements to one of the Department of Justice’s most successful efforts to fight crime, the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, program.

The success story of the COPS program has been told many times, but it is worth repeating. The goal in 1994 was to put an additional 100,000 cops on the beat. Over the next 5 years, from 1995 to 1999, the COPS Universal Hiring Program distributed nearly \$1 billion per year in grants to state and local law enforcement agencies in all 50 states to hire additional law enforcement officers, allowing us to achieve our goal of 100,000 new officers.

Common sense told the American people that having more police walking the beat would lead to less crime, and our experience with the COPS program proved that to be true. This unprecedented effort to put more police officers in our communities coincided with significant reductions in crime during the 1990s. As the number of police rose, we saw 8 consecutive years of reductions in crime. Few programs can claim such a clear record of success.

Unfortunately, the success of the COPS program led some to declare victory. Beginning in 2001, funding for the COPS program came under attack. President Bush proposed cuts to state and local law enforcement programs that totaled well over \$1 billion during his tenure. Despite bipartisan efforts in Congress to prevent those cuts, state and local law enforcement funding consistently declined. Ultimately, the administration succeeded in eliminating the COPS Hiring Program in 2005.

These cuts have been felt by the people who work tirelessly every day to keep our communities safe, and the consequences have been real. Cities across the country have seen the size of their police forces reduced. Many cities have hundreds of vacancies on their forces that they cannot afford to fill. They have been forced to choose between keeping officers employed and buying vital equipment. The men and women who have sworn to protect us from ever-evolving threats cannot go without either.

Over the past several years, there has been a bipartisan effort in Congress to renew our commitment to local law enforcement by restoring COPS funding. In 2009, we dedicated \$1 billion to the COPS program through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. These funds helped state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies create and preserve thousands of law enforcement positions. This boost has gone a long way to help many departments weather the economic downturn, but need is great—the COPS Office received nearly 7,300 applications requesting 39,000 officers and \$8.3 billion in funds in response to this grant funding.

We can all agree that local law enforcement needs our unwavering support. One way we can do this is to reauthorize the COPS program through the COPS Improvement Act of 2011. This legislation will re-authorize hiring programs for three specific purposes—general community policing, local counter-terrorism officers, and school resource officers. The bill steps up our commitment to community policing and community cooperation by reauthorizing community prosecutor grants. Technology grants that cut down on investigation time and paperwork are included so that officers can spend more time on the beat and less time behind a desk. The bill also creates an independent COPS Office within the Department of Justice, a step that is important to the program's continued success and oversight. Finally, the legislation revitalizes a Troops-to-Cops program to encourage local police agencies to hire former military personnel who are honorably discharged from military service or who are displaced by base closings.

The bill makes additional improvements to the COPS program by including safeguards to ensure that our money is being spent wisely. For example, it will allow the COPS Office to do more than simply revoke or suspend a grant if a recipient fails to comply with its terms. The COPS Office, at the direction of the Attorney General, would be able to take any enforcement action available to the Department of Justice, such as civil penalties or recoupment of funds.

In addition to strengthening law enforcement's ability to prevent and fight crime, the COPS Improvement Act directly creates jobs and helps local governments cope with the economic downturn without jeopardizing

community safety. Furthermore, by hiring more officers we will be better able to combat the crime that harms our economy by driving business opportunities out of distressed neighborhoods, taking with them economic opportunity.

The COPS Improvement Act of 2011 would authorize \$900 million per year over six years for the COPS program. It would allocate \$500 million per year for the hiring officers, \$150 million for community prosecutors, and \$250 million per year for technology grants.

To be sure, some will argue that \$900 million is too large a price tag. But it is hard to put a price tag on the security of our communities. Investing money in such a successful program with such an important goal is certainly worth the cost. We must also remember that preventing crime from occurring saves taxpayers from the costs associated with victim assistance and incarceration. For that reason, a recent report by the Brookings Institution found "COPS . . . to be one of the most cost-effective options available for fighting crime."

It is difficult to overstate the importance of passing the COPS Improvement Act. Because of the success of the program and the need for a renewed commitment to it, the bill has long had the support of every major law enforcement group in the Nation, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Sheriffs Association, the International Brotherhood of Police Organizations, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Officials, the International Union of Police Associations, and the Fraternal Order of Police. These law enforcement officers put their lives on the line every day to make our communities a safe place to live, and they deserve our full support.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 207

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 "COPS Improvements Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. COPS GRANT IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd) is amended—

- (1) by striking subsection (c);
- (2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c);
- (3) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

"(a) THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES.—

"(1) OFFICE.—There is within the Department of Justice, under the general authority of the Attorney General, a separate and distinct office to be known as the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (re-

ferred to in this subsection as the 'COPS Office').

"(2) DIRECTOR.—The COPS Office shall be headed by a Director who shall—

"(A) appointed by the Attorney General; and

"(B) have final authority over all grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts awarded by the COPS Office.

"(b) GRANT AUTHORIZATION.—The Attorney General shall carry out grant programs under which the Attorney General makes grants to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, other public and private entities, and multi-jurisdictional or regional consortia for the purposes described in subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f).";

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) in the heading, by striking "uses of grant amounts.—" and inserting "COMMUNITY POLICING AND CRIME PREVENTION GRANTS";

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking "to increase the number of officers deployed in community-oriented policing";

(C) in paragraph (4), by inserting "or train" after "pay for";

(D) by striking paragraph (9);

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (6) through (9), respectively;

(F) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) award grants to hire school resource officers and to establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems to combat crime, gangs, drug activities, and other problems in and around elementary and secondary schools";

(G) by striking paragraph (13);

(H) by redesignating paragraphs (14), (15), and (16) as paragraphs (13), (14), and (15), respectively;

(I) in paragraph (15), as so redesignated, by striking "and" at the end;

(J) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18);

(K) by inserting after paragraph (15), as so redesignated, the following:

"(16) establish and implement innovative programs to reduce and prevent illegal drug manufacturing, distribution, and use, including the manufacturing, distribution, and use of methamphetamine; and

"(17) award enhancing community policing and crime prevention grants that meet emerging law enforcement needs, as warranted."; and

(L) in paragraph (18), as so redesignated, by striking "through (16)" and inserting "through (17)";

(5) by striking subsections (h) and (i);

(6) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively;

(7) by redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as subsections (g) through (j), respectively;

(8) by inserting after subsection (c), as so redesignated, the following:

"(d) TROOPS-TO-COPS PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants made under subsection (b) may be used to hire former members of the Armed Forces to serve as career law enforcement officers for deployment in community-oriented policing, particularly in communities that are adversely affected by a recent military base closing.

"(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, 'former member of the Armed Forces' means a member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is involuntarily separated from the Armed Forces within the meaning of section 1141 of title 10, United States Code.

"(e) COMMUNITY PROSECUTORS PROGRAM.—The Attorney General may make grants under subsection (b) to pay for additional

community prosecuting programs, including programs that assign prosecutors to—

“(1) handle cases from specific geographic areas; and

“(2) address counter-terrorism problems, specific violent crime problems (including intensive illegal gang, gun, and drug enforcement and quality of life initiatives), and localized violent and other crime problems based on needs identified by local law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and others.

“(f) TECHNOLOGY GRANTS.—The Attorney General may make grants under subsection (b) to develop and use new technologies (including interoperable communications technologies, modernized criminal record technology, and forensic technology) to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in reorienting the emphasis of their activities from reacting to crime to preventing crime and to train law enforcement officers to use such technologies.”;

(9) in subsection (g), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments, and to other public and private entities.”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “define for State and local governments, and other public and private entities,” and inserting “establish”;

(C) in the first sentence of paragraph (3), by inserting “(including regional community policing institutes)” after “training centers or facilities”;

(10) in subsection (i), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “subsection (a)” the first place that term appears and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c)”;

(B) by striking “in each fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a)” and inserting “in each fiscal year for purposes described in paragraph (1) and (2) of subsection (c)”;

(11) in subsection (j), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “subsection (a)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(B) by striking the second sentence;

(12) in subsection (k)(1), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking “subsection (i) and”;

(B) by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(13) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) RETENTION OF ADDITIONAL OFFICER POSITIONS.—For any grant under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c) for hiring or rehiring career law enforcement officers, a grant recipient shall retain each additional law enforcement officer position created under that grant for not less than 12 months after the end of the period of that grant, unless the Attorney General waives, wholly or in part, the retention requirement of a program, project, or activity.

“(n) PROPORTIONALITY OF AWARDS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the same percentage of the total number of eligible applicants in each State receive a grant under this section.”.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—Section 1702 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “, unless waived by the Attorney General” after “under this part shall”;

(B) by striking paragraph (8); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (11) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively; and

(2) by striking subsection (d).

(c) RENEWAL OF GRANTS.—Section 1703 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-2) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1703. RENEWAL OF GRANTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A grant made under this part may be renewed, without limitations on

the duration of such renewal, to provide additional funds, if the Attorney General determines that the funds made available to the recipient were used in a manner required under an approved application and if the recipient can demonstrate significant progress in achieving the objectives of the initial application.

“(b) NO COST EXTENSIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Attorney General may extend a grant period, without limitations as to the duration of such extension, to provide additional time to complete the objectives of the initial grant award.”.

(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Section 1704 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “that would, in the absence of Federal funds received under this part, be made available from State or local sources” and inserting “that the Attorney General determines would, in the absence of Federal funds received under this part, be made available for the purpose of the grant under this part from State or local sources”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(e) ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—Section 1706 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-5) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “REVOCAION OR SUSPENSION OF FUNDING” and inserting “ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS”;

(2) by striking “revoke or suspend” and all that follows and inserting “take any enforcement action available to the Department of Justice.”.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1709(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd-8(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “who is authorized” and inserting “who is a sworn law enforcement officer and is authorized”;

(2) by inserting “, including officers for the Amtrak Police Department” before the period at the end.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 1001(a)(11) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)(11)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$1,047,119,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009” and inserting “\$900,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2017”;

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “3 percent” and inserting “5 percent”;

(ii) by striking “section 1701(d)” and inserting “section 1701(g)”;

(B) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “Of the funds available for grants under part Q, not less than \$500,000,000 shall be used for grants for the purposes specified in section 1701(c), not more than \$150,000,000 shall be used for grants under section 1701(e), and not more than \$250,000,000 shall be used for grants under section 1701(f).”.

(h) PURPOSES.—Section 10002 of the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “development” and inserting “use”;

(2) in the matter following paragraph (4), by striking “for a period of 6 years”.

(i) COPS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 109(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3712h(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by inserting “, except for the program under part Q of this title” before the period.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT COMPUTER SYSTEMS.—Section 107 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3712f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to any grant made under part Q of this title.”.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the 100 percent exclusion for gain on certain small business stock; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, for years I have worked to encourage investment in small businesses. We all realize that small businesses are the backbone of our economy. As the economy continues to recover, we must help small businesses have access to capital.

Many of our most successful corporations started as small businesses, including AOL, Apple Computer, Compaq Computer, Datastream, Intel Corporation, and Sun Microsystems. As you can see from this partial list, many of these companies played an integral role in making the Internet a reality.

Investing in small businesses is essential to strengthening our economy. Not only will investment in small businesses spur job creation, it will lead to new technological breakthroughs. We are at an integral juncture in developing clean energy technology. I believe that small businesses will repeat the role it played at, the vanguard of the computer revolution—by leading the Nation in developing the technologies which result in clean energy. Small businesses already are at the forefront of these industries, and we need to do everything we can to encourage investment in these small businesses.

Today, Senator SNOWE and I are introducing legislation to extend the zero capital gains rate on certain small business stock and the exception from minimum tax preference treatment through 2012. During the past two Congresses, Senator SNOWE and I introduced legislation which would make permanent changes to the 50 percent exclusion for gain on small business stock.

Back in 1993, I worked with Senator Bumpers to enact legislation to provide a 50 percent exclusion for gain for individuals from the sale of certain small business stock that is held for 5 years. Since the enactment of this provision, the capital gains rate has been lowered without any changes to the exclusion. Due to the lower capital rates, the 50 percent exclusion no longer provided a strong incentive for investment in small businesses.

Our efforts to improve this provision have been successful. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act temporarily increased the exclusion to 75 percent. The Small Business Jobs Act

of 2010 temporarily increased the exclusion to 100 percent and the alternative minimum tax, AMT, preference item for gain excluded under this provision would be temporarily eliminated. These provisions were further extended through 2011 by the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010. The legislation that I am introducing would extend these provisions through 2012.

Extending the zero capital gains rate on small business stock through 2012 would put this provision on equal footing with the extension of the lower capital gains rate included in the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance, Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010.

I believe that the additional improvements should still be made to the exclusion for small business stock and I will continue to work on this issue. As Congress begins its work on tax reform, encouraging investment in small businesses should be a goal of tax reform.

I urge my colleagues to support an extension of the zero capital gains rate and I look forward to working on tax reform which encourages job creation and investment in small businesses.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 26—RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRAGIC EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI ON JANUARY 12, 2010, HONORING THOSE WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THAT EARTHQUAKE, AND EXPRESSING CONTINUED SOLIDARITY WITH THE HAITIAN PEOPLE

Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CORKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. LANDRIEU) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 26

Whereas on January 12, 2010, an earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter scale struck the country of Haiti;

Whereas, according to the United States Geological Survey, the epicenter of the earthquake was located approximately 15 miles southwest of Port-au-Prince, the capital of Haiti;

Whereas, according to the United States Geological Survey, the earthquake was followed by 59 aftershocks of magnitude 4.5 on the Richter scale or greater, with the most severe measuring a magnitude of 6.0 on the Richter scale;

Whereas, according to the Government of Haiti, more than 230,000 people died as a result of the earthquake, including 103 citizens of the United States;

Whereas an untold number of international aid personnel also died as a result of the earthquake, including more than 100 United Nations personnel;

Whereas, according to the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration—

(1) an estimated 3,000,000 people, or nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ of the population of Haiti, have been directly affected by the disaster; and

(2) an estimated 1,300,000 people were displaced from their homes to settlements;

Whereas casualty numbers and infrastructure damage, including damage to roads, ports, hospitals, and residential dwellings, place the earthquake as the worst cataclysm to hit Haiti in more than 200 years and, proportionally, as one of the worst natural disasters in the world in modern times;

Whereas the Post Disaster Needs Assessment, which was conducted by the Government of Haiti, the United Nations, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other experts, estimates that damage and economic losses totaled \$7,800,000,000, which is equal to approximately 120 percent of the gross domestic product of Haiti in 2009;

Whereas the Post Disaster Needs Assessment estimates that \$11,500,000,000 is needed during the next 3 years for the reconstruction of Haiti and to lay the groundwork for long-term development;

Whereas Haiti was the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere before the January 2010 earthquake, when—

(1) more than 70 percent of Haitians lived on less than \$2 per day; and

(2) Haiti was ranked of 149th out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index;

Whereas, before the earthquake, Haiti was in the process of recovering from a catastrophic series of hurricanes and tropical storms, food shortages, rising commodity prices, and political instability, but was showing encouraging signs of improvement;

Whereas President Barack Obama vowed the “unwavering support” of the United States and pledged a “swift, coordinated and aggressive effort to save lives and support the recovery in Haiti”;

Whereas Senate Resolution 392, which was agreed to on January 21, 2010, by unanimous consent—

(1) expressed the profound sympathy and unwavering support of the Senate for the people of Haiti; and

(2) urged all nations to commit to assisting the people of Haiti with their long-term needs;

Whereas the response to the tragedy from the global community, and especially from the countries of the Western Hemisphere, has been overwhelmingly positive;

Whereas the initial emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development and United States Southern Command, was swift and resolute;

Whereas individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations throughout the United States and the international community responded to the crisis by supporting Haiti and its people through innovative ways, such as fundraising through text messaging;

Whereas more than \$2,700,000,000 is estimated to have been raised from private donations in response to the tragedy in Haiti;

Whereas the Haitian diaspora community in the United States, which was integral to emergency relief efforts—

(1) has annually contributed significant monetary support to Haiti through remittances; and

(2) continues to seek opportunities to partner with the United States Agency for International Development and other Federal agencies to rebuild Haiti;

Whereas Haiti continues to suffer from extreme poverty, gross inequality, a deficit of political leadership at all levels, and weak or corrupt state institutions;

Whereas significant long-term challenges remain as Haiti works to recover and rebuild;

Whereas the International Organization for Migration estimates that approximately 800,000 people remain in spontaneous and organized camps in Haiti;

Whereas, according to numerous non-governmental organizations and United States contractors, the pace of reconstruction in Haiti has lagged significantly behind the original emergency relief phase;

Whereas there is an acute need—

(1) to increase local capacity in health care and education; and

(2) to focus international attention on employment opportunities, rubble removal, permanent and sustainable shelter, reconstruction of roads, safety and security, and fundamental human rights in Haiti, especially in temporary camps and shelters;

Whereas the alleged irregularities and fraud that occurred in the election held in Haiti on November 28, 2010, have imperiled the credibility of the electoral process, undermined the recovery effort, and further destabilized security throughout Haiti;

Whereas political leadership is required to ensure that a democratically elected government, which is respected by the people of Haiti and recognized by the international community, is prepared to assume office on February 7, 2011, or shortly thereafter;

Whereas, on October 19, 2010, an outbreak of cholera was detected in the lower Artibonite region of Haiti;

Whereas initial efforts to contain the epidemic were disrupted by Hurricane Tomas and resulting widespread flooding, which led to the spreading and entrenchment of the disease throughout Haiti;

Whereas, according to the Haitian Ministry of Public Health and Population, between the outbreak in October 2010 and January 21, 2011—

(1) more than 3,850 people have died from cholera in Haiti; and

(2) more than 194,000 people in Haiti have been affected by the disease;

Whereas, according to the Pan American Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cholera could spread to as many as 400,000 people within the first year of the epidemic, potentially causing 8,000 deaths at the current case fatality rate;

Whereas the United States has provided \$40,000,000 worth of assistance to combat the cholera epidemic, primarily through the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, to assist with stockpiling health commodities, equipping cholera treatments centers, providing public information, and developing a safe and sustainable water and sanitation system;

Whereas the efforts to combat the cholera epidemic have helped to drive the mortality rate from cholera down from 7 percent to 1 percent of all contracted cases during the 3-month period ending on January 21, 2011;

Whereas, during the first year following the January 12, 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the people of Haiti have demonstrated unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage;

Whereas at the conference of international donors entitled “Towards a New Future for Haiti”, which was held on March 31, 2010, 59 donors pledged approximately \$5,570,000,000 (including nearly \$1,200,000,000 pledged by donors from the United States) to support the Action Plan for National Recovery and Development of the Government of Haiti;

Whereas the United Nations Office of the Special Envoy for Haiti estimates that approximately 63 percent of the recovery and development funds pledged for 2010 have been disbursed; and

Whereas Haiti requires sustained assistance from the United States and the international community in order to confront the ongoing cholera epidemic and promote reconstruction and development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors those who lost their lives as a result of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010;

(2) honors the sacrifices of the men and women of the Government of Haiti, the Government of the United States, the United Nations, and the international community in their responses to those affected by the earthquake;

(3) expresses continued solidarity with the people of Haiti as they work to rebuild their neighborhoods, livelihoods, and country;

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to support the long-term reconstruction of Haiti, in partnership with the Government of Haiti and in coordination with other donors;

(5) supports the efforts of the Executive Branch to prevent the spread of cholera, treat persons who contract the disease, provide technical assistance to the Haitian Ministry of Public Health, and improve long-term water, sanitation, and health systems;

(6) expresses support for the United States Embassy team in Port-au-Prince, members of the United States Coast Guard, United States Armed Forces, other United States Government personnel, and all members of international organizations who have persevered through adverse local conditions and continue to serve Haiti and the Haitian people;

(7) supports the continued effort of the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission, under the leadership of former President Bill Clinton and Prime Minister Bellerive, in its efforts to improve coordination, build state capacity, and bring donors and the Government of Haiti together to effectively lead the reconstruction process;

(8) urges the international community—

(A) to call on the leaders of Haiti to immediately reach a democratic resolution to the current electoral crisis to enable the newly elected leaders of the Government of Haiti to take office by February 7, 2011, or shortly thereafter;

(B) to continue to focus assistance on the priorities of the Government of Haiti;

(C) to develop, improve, and scale-up communications and participatory mechanisms to more substantially involve Haitian civil society at all stages of the cholera and post-earthquake responses; and

(D) to give priority to programs that protect and involve vulnerable populations, including internally displaced persons, children, and persons with disabilities;

(9) urges aid agencies—

(A) to train and use Haitian local and national authorities in the delivery of assistance; and

(B) to enhance their coordination and consultation with the Haitian people and key Haitian Government ministries to ensure the effectiveness of aid; and

(10) expresses support for—

(A) the continuation of the work of United States agencies, nongovernmental organizations, private volunteer organizations, regional institutions, and United Nations agencies to confront the consequences of the crises affecting Haiti;

(B) comprehensive assessments of the long-term needs for confronting the cholera epidemic in Haiti, including the construction of adequate water and sanitation infrastructure; and

(C) the continuation of humanitarian and development efforts between the Government of the United States and the Govern-

ment of Haiti, the Haitian Diaspora, and international actors who support the goal of a better future for Haiti.

SENATE RESOLUTION 27—DESIGNATING JANUARY 26, 2011, AS “NATIONAL KAWASAKI DISEASE AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. WEBB submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 27

Whereas Kawasaki disease is a serious illness characterized by the inflammation of blood vessels throughout the body;

Whereas symptoms of Kawasaki disease include fever, rash, swelling, irritation, redness of the whites of the eyes, and inflammation of the mouth, lips, and throat;

Whereas Kawasaki disease primarily affects young children and is a leading cause of acquired heart disease in the United States;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control estimates that in 2006 approximately 5,500 individuals with Kawasaki disease were hospitalized in the United States;

Whereas Kawasaki disease affects children of all races, but occurs most often in children of Asian and Pacific Island descent;

Whereas the cause of Kawasaki disease is unknown;

Whereas Kawasaki disease can usually be treated if diagnosed promptly, but can cause major health problems or even death if left untreated;

Whereas there is no test to definitively diagnose cases of Kawasaki disease;

Whereas a lack of awareness among health professionals and the public may contribute to the underdiagnosis of Kawasaki disease; and

Whereas on January 26, 1961, Dr. Tomisaku Kawasaki saw his first patient who suffered from what would later be termed Kawasaki disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates January 26, 2011, as “National Kawasaki Disease Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes the importance of awareness in diagnosing and properly treating cases of Kawasaki disease;

(3) urges all people of the United States to educate themselves about Kawasaki disease and the signs and symptoms of Kawasaki disease; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4—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

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas 13 Jewish chaplains have died while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Alexander Goode died on February 3, 1943, when the

USS *Dorchester* was sunk by German torpedoes off the coast of Greenland;

Whereas Chaplain Goode received the Four Chaplains' Medal for Heroism and the Distinguished Service Cross for his heroic efforts to save the lives of those onboard the *Dorchester*;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Irving Tepper was killed in action in France on August 13, 1944;

Whereas Chaplain Tepper also saw combat in Morocco, Tunisia, and Sicily while attached to an infantry combat team in the Ninth Division;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Louis Werfel died on December 24, 1944, at the young age of 27, in a plane crash while en route to conduct Chanukah services;

Whereas Chaplain Werfel was known as “The Flying Rabbi” because his duties required traveling great distances by plane to serve Army personnel of Jewish faith at outlying posts;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Meir Engel died at the Naval Hospital in Saigon on December 16, 1964, after faithfully serving his country during World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Morton Singer died on December 17, 1968, in a plane crash while on a mission in Vietnam to conduct Chanukah services;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Herman Rosen died in service of his faith and his country on June 18, 1943;

Whereas Chaplain Rabbi Herman Rosen's son, Air Force Chaplain Solomon Rosen, also died in service of his faith and his country, on November 2, 1948;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Nachman Arnoff died in service of his faith and his country on May 9, 1946;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Frank Goldberg died in service of his faith and his country on May 22, 1946;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Henry Goody died in service of his faith and his country on October 19, 1943;

Whereas Army Chaplain Rabbi Samuel Hurwitz died in service of his faith and his country December 9, 1943;

Whereas Air Force Chaplain Rabbi Samuel Rosen died in service of his faith and his country on May 13, 1955;

Whereas Air Force Chaplain Rabbi David Sobel died in service of his faith and his country on March 7, 1974;

Whereas Chaplains Hill in Arlington National Cemetery memorializes the names of 242 chaplains who perished while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas none of the 13 Jewish chaplains who have died while on active duty are memorialized on Chaplains Hill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that an appropriate site on Chaplains Hill in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker, to be paid for with private funds, to honor the memory of the Jewish chaplains who died while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, so long as the Secretary of the Army has exclusive authority to approve the design and site of the memorial marker.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public

that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 1, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the American Medical Isotopes Production Act of 2011.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Amanda_kelly@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Jonathan Epstein at (202) 224-5521 or Abby Campbell at (202) 224-1219.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, February 3, 2011, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the Energy and Oil Market Outlook for the 112th Congress.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Amanda_kelly@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Tara Billingsley at (202) 224-4756 or Amanda Kelly at (202) 224-6836.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Wednesday, February 16, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the U.S. Department of Energy's budget for fiscal year 2012.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Jonathan Epstein at (202) 224-3357, or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on January 26, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-325 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate at 10 a.m. on January 26, 2011, in Dirksen 406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 26, 2011, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Protecting American Taxpayers: Significant Accomplishments and Ongoing Challenges in the Fight Against Fraud."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SE-
CRETACY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO.
112-1

Mr. REID. Madam President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on January 26 of this year by President Obama:

Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Swiss Confederation (Treaty Doc. No. 112-1).

I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to their ratification, the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on October 2, 1996, signed on September 23, 2009, at Washington, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 (the "proposed Protocol") and a related agreement effected by an ex-

change of notes on September 23, 2009 (the "related Agreement"). I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Department of State, which includes an Overview of the proposed Protocol and related Agreement.

The proposed Protocol and related Agreement provide for more robust exchange of information between tax authorities in the two countries to facilitate the administration of each country's tax laws. They generally follow the current U.S. Model Income Tax Convention and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development standards for exchange of tax information. The proposed Protocol and related Agreement also provide for mandatory arbitration of certain cases that the competent authorities of each country have been unable to resolve after a reasonable period of time.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the proposed Protocol and related Agreement and give its advice and consent to their ratification.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 26, 2011.

ORDERS FOR JANUARY 27, 2011

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, January 27; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the rules changes resolutions, as provided for under the previous order.

Finally, I ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the caucus meetings that I have indicated we are going to have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, if all time is used, Senators should expect a series of rollcall votes tomorrow night about 7 o'clock. We hope that a lot of this time can be yielded back, but we have to wait and see. Those votes will be in relation to a series of resolutions to change the Senate rules. We have talked about that earlier this evening.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order and under the provisions of S. Res. 14, as a further mark of respect for the victims and heroes of the tragedy in Tucson, AZ.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:29 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 27, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

HENRY F. FLOYD, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT, VICE KAREN J. WILLIAMS, RETIRED.

MICHAEL CHARLES GREEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE DAVID G. LARIMER, RETIRED.

RAMONA VILLAGOMEZ MANGLONA, OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS, TO BE JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS, VICE ALEX R. MUNSON, RETIRED.

J. PAUL OETKEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE DENNY CHIN, ELEVATED.

NELVA GONZALES RAMOS, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE HAYDEN WILSON HEAD, JR., RETIRED.

V. NATASHA PERDEW SILAS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE CLARENCE COOPER, RETIRED.

LINDA T. WALKER, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE BEVERLY B. MARTIN, ELEVATED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, VICE ELENA KAGAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ERIC L. HIRSCHHORN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR EXPORT ADMINISTRATION, VICE MARIO MANCUSO, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

MARIO CORDERO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014, VICE HAROLD J. CREEL, JR., RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

PHILIP E. COYLE, III, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE ROSINA M. BIERBAUM.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SCOTT C. DONEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE CHIEF SCIENTIST OF THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION, VICE KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

REBECCA F. DYE, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DONALD M. BERWICK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES, VICE MARK B. MCCLELLAN.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

ALAN D. BERSIN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE W. RALPH BASHAM.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

MICHAEL F. MUNDACA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE ERIC SLOMON, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL W. PUNKE, OF MONTANA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE PETER F. ALLGEIER, RESIGNED.

ISLAM A. SIDDIQUI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF AGRICULTURAL NEGOTIATOR, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE RICHARD T. CROWDER.

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

JUAN F. VASQUEZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RICHARD SORIAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE CHRISTINA H. PEARSON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

TIMOTHY CHARLES SCHEVE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, VICE NANCY KILLEFER, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MATTHEW J. BRYZA, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUN-

SELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM DECEMBER 22, 2010, TO JANUARY 5, 2011.

ROBERT STEPHEN FORD, OF VERMONT, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM DECEMBER 22, 2010, TO JANUARY 5, 2011.

NORMAN L. EISEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CZECH REPUBLIC, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM DECEMBER 22, 2010, TO JANUARY 5, 2011.

GEORGE ALBERT KROL, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN.

FRANCIS JOSEPH RICCIARDONE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM DECEMBER 22, 2010, TO JANUARY 5, 2011.

DAVID LEE GARDEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

KATHERINE M. GEHL, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2013, VICE COLLISTER JOHNSON, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

ROBERTO R. HERENCIA, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2012, VICE PATRICK J. DURKIN, TERM EXPIRED.

MATTHEW MAXWELL TAYLOR KENNEDY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2012, VICE SAMUEL E. EBBESEN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

PAUL M. TIAO, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE GORDON S. HEDDELL, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

AGNES GUND, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2016. (NEW POSITION)

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

JOHN A. LANCASTER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 19, 2011, VICE KATHLEEN MARTINEZ.

JOHN A. LANCASTER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

JUDITH A. ANSLEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 19, 2011, VICE RON SILVER.

JUDITH A. ANSLEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

CRAIG BECKER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2014, VICE DENNIS P. WALSH.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

JONATHAN ANDREW HATFIELD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE, VICE GERALD WALPIN.

PHYLLIS MICHAMOFF SEGAL, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2013, VICE JACOB JOSEPH LEW, TERM EXPIRED.

LISA M. QUIROZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 8, 2014, VICE VINCE J. JUARISTI, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHN D. PODESTA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2014, VICE ALAN D. SOLOMONT, RESIGNED.

MATTHEW FRANCIS MCCABE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2013, VICE LEONA WHITE HAT, TERM EXPIRED.

MARGUERITE W. KONDRACK, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 10, 2014, VICE RICHARD ALLAN HILL, TERM EXPIRED.

JANE D. HARTLEY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2014, VICE DONNA N. WILLIAMS, RESIGNED.

RICHARD CHRISTMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2012, VICE TOM OSBORNE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RAFAEL BORRAS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE ELAINE C. DUKE, RESIGNED.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WILLIAM J. BOARMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE PUBLIC PRINTER, VICE ROBERT CHARLES TAPELLA, RESIGNED, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM DECEMBER 22, 2010, TO JANUARY 5, 2011.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE THOMAS M. SULLIVAN.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ERIC E. FIEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. HOWARD D. STENDAH

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD S. WENKE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DENNIS L. VIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MARK P. HERTLING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SUSAN S. LAWRENCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN M. BEDNAREK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. FRANCIS J. WIERCINSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID C. COBURN

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. RENALDO RIVERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM M. BUCKLER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK J. MACCARLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

MARC T. ARELLANO
ROBERT C. BRAMLISH
MICHAEL A. ERWIN
GERALD E. HADLEY
JOHN K. MCHUGH

DAVID J. MONK
DONALD F. STRUBE
HOWARD E. WHEELER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

GREGREY C. BACON
STEVEN A. FERNANDEZ
MARCUS R. HATLEY
TREVOR L. JACKSON
BRIAN R. NESVIK
DONNIE J. QUINTANA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JAMES P. MCGRATH III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

JOHN G. BROWN

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM A. MIX

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

HEATHER A. HIGGINBOTTOM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, VICE ROBERT L. NABORS, RESIGNED.

KATHARINE G. ABRAHAM, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, VICE CHRISTINA DUCKWORTH ROMER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DAVID S. COHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES, VICE STUART LEVY, RESIGNING.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on January 25, 2011.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interests of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE 112TH CONGRESS

RULE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) **APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES.**—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(2) of House Rule XI, each subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee rules III, IV, V, VI, VII and X, *infra*.)

(b) **AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS.**—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO PRINT.**—The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee and its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be paid from applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of House Rule X in accordance with clause 1(c) of House Rule XI. (See also paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of Committee rule VIII.)

(d) **VICE CHAIRMAN.**—The Member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be the vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule XI.

(e) **PRESIDING MEMBER.**—If the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee is not

present at any Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing, the vice chairman shall preside. If the Chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at a Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing the ranking Member of the majority party who is present shall preside in accordance with clause 2(d), House Rule XI.

(f) **PUBLICATION OF RULES.**—The Committee's rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair is elected in each odd-numbered year as provided in clause 2(a) of House Rule XI.

(g) **JOINT COMMITTEE REPORTS OF INVESTIGATION OR STUDY.**—A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

RULE II.—COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS— REGULAR, ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL

(a) **REGULAR MEETINGS.**—(1) Regular meetings of the Committee, in accordance with clause 2(b) of House Rule XI, shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business unless such day is a holiday, or Congress is in recess or is adjourned, in which case the Chairman shall determine the regular meeting day of the Committee, if any, for that month. The Chairman shall provide each member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as practicable, a written agenda of such meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chairman or a majority of the Committee. If the Chairman believes that there will not be any bill, resolution or other matter considered before the full Committee and there is no other business to be transacted at a regular meeting, the meeting may be cancelled or it may be deferred until such time as, in the judgment of the Chairman, there may be matters which require the Committee's consideration. This paragraph shall not apply to meetings of any subcommittee. (See paragraph (f) of Committee rule X for provisions that apply to meetings of subcommittees.)

(b) **ADDITIONAL MEETINGS.**—(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or after concurrence with the Ranking Minority Member, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such additional meetings pursuant to the notice from the Chairman.

(2) A hearing or meeting may begin sooner than specified in clause (1) (in which case the chair shall make the announcement specified at the earliest possible time) if the committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the transaction of business.

(3) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter the Chair shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) **SPECIAL MEETINGS.**—If at least three members of the Committee desire that a spe-

cial meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for such special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matters to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk of the Committee for such purpose) shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measures or matter to be considered at that special meeting in accordance with clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk) of the Committee shall notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered, and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

RULE III.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS; BROADCASTING

(a) **OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS.**—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House Rule XI. (See Appendix A.)

(b) **BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHY.**—Whenever a Committee or subcommittee meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall:

(1) To the maximum extent practicable the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(2) Be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of House Rule XI (See Appendix A). When such radio coverage is conducted in the Committee or subcommittee, written notice to that effect shall be placed on the desk of each Member. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, shall not limit the number of television or still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(c) **CLOSED MEETINGS.—ATTENDEES.**—No person other than Members of the Committee or subcommittee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or subcommittee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session that has been closed to the public as provided in clause 2(g)(1) of House Rule XI.

(d) **ADDRESSING THE COMMITTEE.**—A Committee member may address the Committee

• 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.

or a subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration (See Committee rule VII (e) relating to questioning a witness at a hearing). The time a member may address the Committee or subcommittee for any such purpose shall be limited to five minutes, except that this time limit may be waived by unanimous consent. A member shall also be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend his or her remarks beyond such subject.

(e) MEETINGS TO BEGIN PROMPTLY.—Subject to the presence of a quorum, each meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(f) PROHIBITION ON PROXY VOTING.—No vote by any Member of the Committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(g) LOCATION OF PERSONS AT MEETINGS.—No person other than the Committee or subcommittee Members and Committee or subcommittee staff may be seated in the rostrum area during a meeting of the Committee or subcommittee unless by unanimous consent of Committee or subcommittee.

(h) CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS AND MOTIONS.—A Member, upon request, shall be recognized by the Chairman to address the Committee or subcommittee at a meeting for a period limited to five minutes on behalf of an amendment or motion offered by the Member or another Member, or upon any other matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend the time limit. Every amendment or motion made in Committee or subcommittee shall, upon the demand of any Member present, be reduced to writing, and a copy thereof shall be made available to all Members present. Such amendment or motion shall not be pending before the Committee or subcommittee or voted on until the requirements of this paragraph have been met.

(i) DEMANDING RECORD VOTE.—

(1) A record vote of the Committee or subcommittee on a question or action shall be ordered on a demand by one-fifth of the Members present.

(2) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. If the Chairman postpones further proceedings:

(A) the Chairman may resume such postponed proceedings, after giving Members adequate notice, at a time chosen in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member; and

(B) notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition on which proceedings were postponed shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(j) SUBMISSION OF MOTIONS OR AMENDMENTS IN ADVANCE OF BUSINESS MEETINGS.—The Committee and subcommittee-Chairman may request and Committee and subcommittee Members should, insofar as practicable, cooperate in providing copies of proposed amendments or motions to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or the subcommittee twenty-four hours before a Committee or subcommittee business meeting.

(k) POINTS OF ORDER.—No point of order against the hearing or meeting procedures of the Committee or subcommittee shall be entertained unless it is made in a timely fashion.

(l) LIMITATION ON COMMITTEE SITTINGS.—The Committee or subcommittees may not

sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

(m) PROHIBITION OF WIRELESS TELEPHONES.—Use of wireless phones during a committee or subcommittee hearing or meeting is prohibited.

RULE IV.—QUORUMS

(a) WORKING QUORUM.—One-third of the members of the Committee or a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, other than as noted in paragraphs (b) and (c).

(b) MAJORITY QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for:

(1) the reporting of a bill, resolution or other measure (See clause 2(h)(1) of House Rules XI, and Committee rule VIII);

(2) the closing of a meeting or hearing to the public pursuant to clauses 2(g), 2(k)(5) and 2(k)(7) of the Rule XI of the Rules of the House;

(3) the authorizing of a subpoena as provided in clause 2(m)(3), of House Rule XI (See also Committee rule VI.); and

(4) as where required by a rule of the House.

(c) QUORUM FOR TAKING TESTIMONY.—Two members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE V.—RECORDS

(a) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee and subcommittee action which shall include—

(1) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcripts, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved, and

(2) written minutes shall include a record of all Committee and subcommittee action and a record of all votes on any question and a tally on all record votes. The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and by telephone request and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Not later than 24 hours after adoption of an amendment to a measure or matter, the chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(b) ACCESS TO AND CORRECTION OF RECORDS.—Any public witness, or person authorized by such witness, during Committee office hours in the Committee offices and within two weeks of the close of hearings, may obtain a transcript copy of that public witness's testimony and make such technical, grammatical and typographical corrections as authorized by the person making the remarks involved as will not alter the nature of testimony given. There shall be prompt return of such corrected copy of the transcript to the Committee. Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall receive copies of transcripts for their prompt review and correction and prompt return to the Committee. The Committee or subcommittee may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any Member or witness if it determines that such

Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time in which to make such corrections and further delay would seriously impede the consideration of the legislative action that is subject of the hearing. The record of a hearing shall be closed ten calendar days after the last oral testimony, unless the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise. Any person requesting to file a statement for the record of a hearing must so request before the hearing concludes and must file the statement before the record is closed unless the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise. The Committee or subcommittee may reject any statement in light of its length or its tendency to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) PROPERTY OF THE HOUSE.—All Committee and subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Members serving as Chairman and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto. The Majority Staff Director shall promptly notify the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of any request for access to such records.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF ARCHIVED RECORDS.—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House Rule VII. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of the need for a Committee order pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such House Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available.

(e) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN RECORDS AND PROCEEDINGS.—A stenographic record of a business meeting of the Committee or subcommittee may be kept and thereafter may be published if the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is need for such a record. The proceedings of the Committee or subcommittee in a closed meeting, evidence or testimony in such meeting, shall not be divulged unless otherwise determined by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee.

(f) ELECTRONIC AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS.—To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE VI.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) AUTHORITY TO SIT AND ACT.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its function and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee and each of its subcommittees is authorized (subject to paragraph (b)(1) of this rule)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings, and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents, as it deems necessary. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS.—(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present, as provided in clause 2(m)(3)(A) of House Rule XI. Such authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or

by any member designated by the Committee. As soon as practicable after a subpoena is issued under this rule, the Chairman shall notify all members of the Committee of such action.

(2) Notice of a meeting to consider a motion to authorize and issue a subpoena should be given to all Members of the Committee by 5 p.m. of the day preceding such meeting.

(3) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or subcommittee under paragraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(4) A subpoena duces tecum may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or hearing of the committee or subcommittee authorizing the subpoena.

(C) EXPENSES OF SUBPOENAED WITNESSES.—Each witness who has been subpoenaed, upon the completion of his or her testimony before the Committee or any subcommittee, may report to the offices of the Committee, and there sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees to which he or she is entitled. If hearings are held in cities other than Washington D.C., the subpoenaed witness may contact the Majority Staff Director of the Committee, or his or her representative, before leaving the hearing room.

RULE VII.—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) POWER TO HEAR.—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rule X and XI, the Committee and its subcommittees are authorized to sit and hold hearings at any time or place within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned. (See paragraph (a) of Committee rule VI and paragraph (f) of Committee rule X for provisions relating to subcommittee hearings and meetings.)

(b) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The Chairman of the Committee shall after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, make a public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. The Chairman of a subcommittee shall schedule a hearing only after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee, and the Chairmen of the other subcommittees after such consultation with the Committee Chairman, and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of such hearing at least one week before the hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or the subcommittee, with concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall request the Majority Staff Director to make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record, and shall promptly enter the appropriate information into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(c) SCHEDULING OF WITNESSES.—Except as otherwise provided in this rule, the scheduling of witnesses and determination of the time allowed for the presentation of testimony at hearings shall be at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, unless a majority of the Com-

mittee or subcommittee determines otherwise.

(d) WRITTEN STATEMENT; ORAL TESTIMONY.—(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee, shall insofar as practicable file with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee, at least two working days before day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony. Witnesses shall provide sufficient copies of their statement for distribution to Committee or subcommittee Members, staff, and the news media. Insofar as practicable, the Committee or subcommittee staff shall distribute such written statements to all Members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as they are received as well as any official reports from departments and agencies on such subject matter. All witnesses may be limited in their oral presentations to brief summaries of their statements within the time allotted to them, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, in light of the nature of the testimony and the length of time available.

(2) As noted in paragraph (a) of Committee rule VI, the Chairman of the Committee or one of its subcommittees, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(3) To the greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years. Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(e) QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES.—Committee or subcommittee Members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee for that purpose. Each Member so recognized shall be limited to questioning a witness for five minutes until such time as each Member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness for five minutes; and thereafter the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee may limit the time of a further round of questioning after giving due consideration to the importance of the subject matter and the length of time available. All questions put to witnesses shall be germane to the measure or matter under consideration. Unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee determines otherwise, no committee or subcommittee staff shall interrogate witnesses.

(f) EXTENDED QUESTIONING FOR DESIGNATED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (e), the Chairman and Ranking Minority member may designate an equal number of Members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 60 minutes.

(g) WITNESSES FOR THE MINORITY.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee or subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon as provided in clause 2(j)(1) of House Rule XI.

(h) SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER.—Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable, the Committee shall make available immediately to all members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject

matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall, to the extent practicable, make available to the members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter. (See Committee rule X(f).)

(i) OPEN HEARINGS.—Each hearing conducted by the Committee or subcommittee shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage, except as provided in clause 4 of House Rule XI (see also Committee rule III (b)). In any event, no Member of the House may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing unless the House by majority vote shall authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular bill or resolution or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by means of the above procedure.

(j) HEARINGS AND REPORTS.—(1)(i) The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation. A copy of the Committee rules (and the applicable provisions of clause 2 of House Rule XI, regarding hearing procedures, an excerpt of which appears in Appendix A thereto) shall be made available to each witness upon request. Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; but only the full Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(ii) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (i) of this rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall afford a person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and the Committee or subcommittee shall receive and shall dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(iii) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee or subcommittee. In the discretion of the Committee or subcommittee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee or subcommittee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings. A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee or subcommittee. (See paragraph (c) of Committee rule V.)

(2) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when

the House is in session on such day) in advance of their consideration.

RULE VIII.—THE REPORTING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) FILING OF REPORTS.—The Chairman shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee and shall take or cause to be taken all necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or other measure to a vote. No bill, resolution, or measure shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of Committee is actually present. A Committee report on any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (not counting days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the Committee, for the reporting of that bill or resolution. The Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall notify the Chairman immediately when such a request is filed.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORTS.—Each Committee report on any bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall include as separately identified sections:

(1) a statement of the intent or purpose of the bill or resolution;

(2) a statement describing the need for such bill or resolution;

(3) a statement of Committee and subcommittee consideration of the measure including a summary of amendments and motions offered and the actions taken thereon;

(4) the results of the each record vote on any amendment in the Committee and subcommittee and on the motion to report the measure or matter, including the names of those Members and the total voting for and the names of those Members and the total voting against such amendment or motion (See clause 3(b) of House rule XIII);

(5) the oversight findings and recommendations of the Committee with respect to the subject matter of the bill or resolution as required pursuant to clause 3(c)(1) of House Rule XIII and clause 2(b)(1) of House Rule X;

(6) the detailed statement described in section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, except that the estimates with respect to new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law;

(7) the estimate of costs and comparison of such estimates, if any, prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with such bill or resolution pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if submitted in timely fashion to the Committee;

(8) a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding;

(9) a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution;

(10) an estimate by the committee of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and for its authorized duration or for each of the five fiscal years following the fiscal year of reporting, whichever period is less (see Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2), (3) and (h)(2), (3)), together with—

(i) a comparison of these estimates with those made and submitted to the Committee

by any Government agency when practicable, and (ii) a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) with appropriate levels under current law (the provisions of this clause do not apply if a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report);

(11) a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

(12) the changes in existing law (if any) shown in accordance with clause 3 of House Rule XIII;

(13) the determination required pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92-463, if the legislation reported establishes or authorizes the establishment of an advisory committee; and

(14) the information on Federal and intergovernmental mandates required by section 423(c) and (d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as added by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-4).

(15) a statement regarding the applicability of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act, Public Law 104-1.

(c) SUPPLEMENTAL, MINORITY, OR ADDITIONAL VIEWS.—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than two subsequent calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such date) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that Member, with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee. When time guaranteed by this paragraph has expired (or if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the Committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk of the House not later than one hour after the expiration of such time. All such views (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(1) and House Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1)), as filed by one or more Members of the Committee, shall be included within and made a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that bill or resolution.

(d) PRINTING OF REPORTS.—The report of the Committee on the measure or matter noted in paragraph (a) above shall be printed in a single volume, which shall:

(1) include all supplemental, minority or additional views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

(2) bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under House Rule XII, clause 3(a)(1)) are included as part of the report.

(e) IMMEDIATE PRINTING; SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS.—Nothing in this rule shall preclude (1) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by paragraph (c), or (2) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report on any bill or resolution that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

(f) AVAILABILITY OF PRINTED HEARING RECORDS.—If hearings have been held on any

reported bill or resolution, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have the record of such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such bill or resolution by the House. Each printed hearing of the Committee or any of its subcommittees shall include a record of the attendance of the Members.

(g) COMMITTEE PRINTS.—All Committee or subcommittee prints or other Committee or subcommittee documents, other than reports or prints of bills, that are prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Chairman of the Committee or the Committee prior to public distribution.

(h) POST ADJOURNMENT FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS.—(1) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(2) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chairman of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each member of the Committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the Committee.

(i) The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE IX.—OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

(a) OVERSIGHT PLAN.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Chairman shall convene the Committee in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress. Such plans shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing such plans the Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(1) consult with other committees of the House that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction, with the objective of ensuring that such laws, programs, or agencies are reviewed in the same Congress and that there is a maximum of coordination between such committees in the conduct of such reviews; and such plans shall include an explanation of what steps have been and will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(2) review specific problems with federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals;

(3) give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority;

(4) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review at least once every ten years; and

(5) include proposals to cut or eliminate programs, including mandatory spending programs, that are inefficient, duplicative, outdated, or more appropriately administered by State or local governments.

The Committee and its appropriate subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as provided in clause 2(d) of House Rule X. The Committee shall include in the report filed pursuant to clause 1(d) of House Rule XI a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee under clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(b) ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE: VIEWS AND ESTIMATES. (See Appendix B)—Not later than six weeks after the President submits his budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request, the Committee shall, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year (under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—see Appendix B) that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE: RECOMMENDED CHANGES.—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (See Appendix B).

(e) CONFERENCE COMMITTEES.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determine the number of conferees the Chairman deems most suitable and then recommend to the Speaker as conferees, in keeping with the number to be appointed by the Speaker as provided in House Rule I, clause 11, the names of those Members of the Committee of not less than a majority who generally supported the House position and who were primarily responsible for the legislation. The Chairman shall, to the fullest extent feasible, include those Members of the Committee who were the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House and such other Committee Members of the majority party as the Chairman may designate in consultation with the Members of the majority party. Such recommendations shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members no less favorable to the ma-

majority party than the ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members on the Committee. In making recommendations of Minority Party Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(f)(1) The Committee, or a subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following the establishment of the committee on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs which the committee may authorize.

(2) A hearing described in subparagraph (1) shall include a focus on the most egregious instances of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement as documented by any report the committee has received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States.

(g) The Committee or a subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing in any session in which the committee has received disclaimers of agency financial statements from auditors of any Federal agency that the committee may authorize to hear testimony on such disclaimers from representatives of any such agency.

(h) The Committee or a subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing on issues raised by reports issued by the Comptroller General of the United States indicating that Federal programs or operations that the committee may authorize are at 'high risk for waste, fraud, and mismanagement, known as the 'high-risk-list' or the 'high-risk series'.

(i)(1) Not later than the 30th day after June 1 and December 1, the Committee shall submit to the House a semiannual report on the activities of the committee. After adjournment sine die of a regular session of Congress, or after December 15, whichever occurs first, the Chair may file the second or fourth semiannual report, a copy of which shall be made available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days, with the Clerk at any time.

(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee during that Congress.

(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee pursuant to clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken with respect thereto.

RULE X.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) NUMBER AND COMPOSITION.—There shall be such subcommittees as specified in paragraph (c) of this rule. Each of such subcommittees shall be composed of the number of members set forth in paragraph (c) of this rule, including *ex officio* members.¹ The Chairman may create additional subcommittees of an *ad hoc* nature as the Chairman determines to be appropriate subject to any limitations provided for in the House Rules.

(b) RATIOS.—On each subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party members to minority party members, there shall be included the *ex officio* members of the subcommittees and ratios below reflect that fact.

(c) JURISDICTION.—Each subcommittee shall have the following general jurisdiction and number of members:

Conservation, Energy, and Forestry (22 members, 12 majority and 10 minority).—

Soil, water, and resource conservation, small watershed program, energy and biobased energy production, rural electrification, forestry in general and forest reserves other than those created from the public domain.

Department Operations, Oversight, and Credit (10 members, 6 majority and 4 minority).—Agency oversight, review and analysis, special investigations, and agricultural credit.

General Farm Commodities and Risk Management, (26 members, 15 majority and 11 minority).—Program and markets related to cotton, cottonseed, wheat, feed grains, soybeans, oilseeds, rice, dry beans, peas, lentils, the Commodity Credit Corporation, risk management, including crop insurance, commodity exchanges, and specialty crops.

Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, Ratios (20 members, 11 majority and 9 minority).—Livestock, dairy, poultry, meat, seafood and seafood products, inspection, marketing, and promotion of such commodities, aquaculture, animal welfare, and grazing.

Nutrition and Horticulture, Ratios (10 members, 6 majority and 4 minority).—Food stamps, nutrition and consumer programs, fruits and vegetables, honey and bees, marketing and promotion orders, plant pesticides, quarantine, adulteration of seeds and insect pests, and organic agriculture.

Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture, Ratios (14 members, 8 majority and 6 minority).—Rural Development, farm security and family farming matters, research, education and extension, biotechnology, foreign agriculture assistance, and trade promotion programs, generally.

(d) REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION.—

(1)(a) IN GENERAL.—All bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks after being referred to the Committee. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may determine that the Committee will consider certain bills, resolutions, or other matters.

(b) TRADE MATTERS.—Unless action is otherwise taken under subparagraph (3), bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee relating to foreign agriculture, foreign food or commodity assistance, and foreign trade and marketing issues will be considered by the Committee.

(2) The Chairman, by a majority vote of the Committee, may discharge a subcommittee from further consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter referred to the subcommittee and have such bill, resolution or other matter considered by the Committee. The Committee having referred a bill, resolution, or other matter to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may discharge such subcommittee from further consideration thereof at any time by a vote of the majority members of the Committee for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(3) Unless the Committee, a quorum being present, decides otherwise by a majority vote, the Chairman may refer bills, resolutions, legislation or other matters not specifically within the jurisdiction of a subcommittee, or that is within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, jointly or exclusively as the Chairman deems appropriate, including concurrently to the subcommittees with jurisdiction, sequentially to the subcommittees with jurisdiction (subject to any time limits deemed appropriate), divided by subject matter among the subcommittees with jurisdiction, or to an *ad hoc* subcommittee appointed by the Chairman for the purpose of considering the matter and reporting to the Committee thereon, or make such other provisions deemed appropriate.

(e) PARTICIPATION AND SERVICE OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON SUBCOMMITTEES.—(1) The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall serve as *ex officio* members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittees. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member may not be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

(2) Any member of the Committee who is not a member of the subcommittee may have the privilege of sitting and nonparticipatory attendance at subcommittee hearings or meetings in accordance with clause 2(g)(2) of House Rule XI. Such member may not:

- (i) vote on any matter;
- (ii) be counted for the purpose of a establishing a quorum;
- (iii) participate in questioning a witness under the five minute rule, unless permitted to do so by the subcommittee Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member or a majority of the subcommittee, a quorum being present;
- (iv) raise points of order; or
- (v) offer amendments or motions.

(f) SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS.—(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and make recommendations to the Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction after consultation by the subcommittee Chairmen with the Committee Chairman. (See Committee rule VII.)

(2) After consultation with the Committee Chairman, subcommittee Chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their subcommittees and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make any announcement relating thereto. (See Committee rule VII(b).) In setting the dates, the Committee Chairman and subcommittee Chairman shall consult with other subcommittee Chairmen and relevant Committee and Subcommittee Ranking Minority Members in an effort to avoid simultaneously scheduling Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings to the extent practicable.

(3) Notice of all subcommittee meetings shall be provided to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee by the Majority Staff Director.

(4) Subcommittees may hold meetings or hearings outside of the House if the Chairman of the Committee and other subcommittee Chairmen and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee is consulted in advance to ensure that there is no scheduling problem. However, the majority of the Committee may authorize such meeting or hearing.

(5) The provisions regarding notice and the agenda of Committee meetings under Committee rule II(a) and special or additional meetings under Committee rule II(b) shall apply to subcommittee meetings.

(6) If a vacancy occurs in a subcommittee chairmanship, the Chairman may set the dates for hearings and meetings of the subcommittee during the period of vacancy. The Chairman may also appoint an acting subcommittee Chairman until the vacancy is filled.

(g) SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION.—(1) Any bill, resolution, recommendation, or other matter forwarded to the Committee by a subcommittee shall be promptly forwarded by the subcommittee Chairman or any subcommittee member authorized to do so by the subcommittee. (2) Upon receipt of such recommendation, the Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall promptly advise all members of the Committee of the subcommittee action.

(3) The Committee shall not consider any matters recommended by subcommittees until two calendar days have elapsed from the date of action, unless the Chairman or a

majority of the Committee determines otherwise.

(h) SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS.—No investigation shall be initiated by a subcommittee without the prior consultation with the Chairman of the Committee or a majority of the Committee.

END NOTE

¹The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee serve as *ex officio* Members of the Subcommittees. (See paragraph (e) of this Rule).

RULE XI.—COMMITTEE BUDGET, STAFF, AND TRAVEL

(a) COMMITTEE BUDGET.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, and the minority members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget for each session of the Congress. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and subcommittees. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted to minority members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall take whatever action is necessary to have such budget duly authorized by the House.

(b) COMMITTEE STAFF.—(1) The Chairman shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate. (See House Rule X, clause 9).

(2) The Ranking Minority member of the Committee shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who may delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(3) From the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to any primary or additional expense resolution, the Chairman shall ensure that each subcommittee is adequately funded and staffed to discharge its responsibilities and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff (See House Rule X, clause 6(d)).

(c) COMMITTEE TRAVEL.—(1) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee members and Committee staff regarding domestic and foreign travel (See House rule XI, clause 2(n) and House Rule X, clause 8 (reprinted in Appendix A)). Official travel for any member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Committee Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and its subcommittees and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (i) The purpose of the official travel;
- (ii) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;
- (iii) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and
- (iv) The names of members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

(2) In the case of official travel of members and staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to the Committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated in clause (1).

(3) Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

(4) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of Members of the Committee or is employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

- (i) No Member or employee of the Committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law; and (ii) Each Member or employee of the Committee shall make an itemized report to the Chairman within 60 days following the completion of travel showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose, and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed by the Chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

RULE XII.—AMENDMENT OF RULES

These rules may be amended by a majority vote of the Committee. A proposed change in these rules shall not be considered by the Committee as provided in clause 2 of House Rule XI, unless written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each Committee member two legislative days in advance of the date on which the matter is to be considered. Any such change in the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after its approval.

REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING HEALTH CARE LAW ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CORY GARDNER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 2011

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, which would repeal the health care law.

Some ask why we simply can't just change the law that is on the books—amend it to make it a bit better. Mr. Speaker, we cannot build upon something that is fundamentally flawed. So before we move forward with a replacement, we must get rid of the law in front of us. Repeal will free businesses and individuals from costly, onerous, and unconstitutional mandates. Once we do that, we can move toward replacing it with real solutions that help Americans get affordable healthcare and help businesses avoid excessive costs and penalties associated with this law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can achieve these goals by doing the following things. First, we need to create a mechanism whereby small businesses and associations can pool together to get health insurance through their respective organizations. I believe that these associations and individuals should be allowed to purchase insurance plans across state lines, creating choice and competition which will ultimately drive down the cost of health insurance for everyone. Furthermore, tort reform must be addressed in a way that reduces medical malpractice lawsuits, which has had a profound effect on the ability of doctors to practice and has made the profession less appealing to individuals who truly want to serve those in need.

This healthcare bill is a recipe for further fiscal insanity. It expands already bloated entitlement programs and will add 32 million more people to these programs by 2019 at a cost of \$938 billion. States in particular will be severely burdened by the new law. They will now be required to increase Medicaid eligibility to cover individuals below 138 percent of the poverty level, which will eventually lead many already cash-strapped states down the road to bankruptcy. These expansions are simply unsustainable, especially during our current economic crisis. What we need is reform, not massive expansion of entitlement programs.

This is just one of the problems with this bill, Mr. Speaker. Not only will it expand entitlements, it will raise premiums for millions of families and it includes an unconstitutional mandate requiring individuals to purchase healthcare. At a time when families are already struggling to make ends meet, this is not the right choice for our country.

Finally, this bill was drafted behind closed doors, and without any transparency. The American people, let alone the Republicans in Congress, had little input into the final product that became law. We deserve better. The American people deserve better from their leaders, elected to represent their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that we must work toward a system whereby Americans can get access to the doctors that best suit their needs at an affordable price. Repealing this healthcare law is the first step.

IN RECOGNITION OF DAVID N.
WALSH

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sergeant David N. Walsh, who is retiring after 31 years of law enforcement service—21 years of service to the city of Fair-

field, nearly eight years with the Contra Costa Sheriff's Department, and more than two years with Fresno County Sheriff's Department. As his colleagues, friends and family gather together to celebrate the next chapter of his life, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding public servant and defender of peace and safety.

David began his law enforcement career as a Deputy Sheriff with Fresno County and then Contra Costa County. He was then hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department on November 27, 1989. As an officer, he worked in various capacities including Patrol, Investigations, Firearms Instruction, and Field Training. He joined the Special Activity Felony Enforcement, SAFE, Team in 1992 and was promoted to Police Corporal on April 19, 2002.

On July 9, 2004, David was promoted to Police Sergeant and ultimately supervised a number of different teams including Patrol, Violent Crime Suppression, Traffic and Investigations. He was an extremely capable and team orientated leader. Over the course of his career, David has received numerous commendations from the community and his co-workers.

David was a valued employee and leader of the Fairfield Police Department. His commitment to the community was unwavering. He was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired amongst his peers for his hard work, dedication and positive work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing David N. Walsh continued success and happiness in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO DOCK MONTERIA
BROWN

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, It is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a community giant, Dock Monteria Brown, a very special friend who passed away on Tuesday, January 25, 2011.

Dock Monteria Brown was born on January 30, 1929 in Halifax County to Nelson and Vilvie Brown. His father was a Veteran of World War I.

Dock graduated from J.A. Chaloner Senior High School in 1948 and entered Shaw University that fall. In 1951, just one year before graduation, Dock was drafted into the U.S. Army and was deployed to fight in the Korean War.

He served for 12 months in Korea before returning to Fort Bragg and his native North Carolina to serve out the remainder of his tour. Immediately after his Honorable Discharge, Dock resumed his education at Shaw University and earned his undergraduate degree.

In order to fulfill his dream of becoming a teacher, Dock then attended my alma mater, North Carolina Central University and earned a Master's Degree in Sociology and School Administration. Dock taught high school History at Weldon High School and Eastman High School for 24 years, and served as principal of Pittman High School for 10 years.

As an educator, Dock Brown made a tremendous and undeniable impact on the lives of students in Halifax County. He was truly the catalyst for many young people growing into strong, well-educated and productive adult citizens.

Over his many years of service, he served as a Halifax County Commissioner; state representative in the North Carolina House of Representatives, Weldon Town Commissioner; Trustee at Elizabeth City State University, and as an appointee to the Governor's Commission to select Superior Court Judges. For his untiring service to the State of North Carolina, Dock was awarded the state's highest civilian honor—the Order of the Long Leaf Pine—by then-Governor James Hunt.

Dock Brown also served on the county's health board and he was honored with the Lifetime Achievement Award from the State Mental Health Association for his tireless dedication to the issue of Mental Health.

He was also an active member of First Baptist Church in Roanoke Rapids starting at age 11, and he served in many capacities including Deacon for over fifty years.

Dock Brown was a true public servant with a legacy that will live on through the many people he inspired over the years, including myself. I had the pleasure of offering legislation to this body that was signed into law naming the Weldon, N.C. Post Office in honor to Dock Brown. It was a fitting honor, and I know his community will truly miss him.

Dock Brown leaves behind his wonderful wife, Helen, after nearly 60 years of marriage. They raised two wonderful children: Dock Brown, Jr. and Ivy Brown Singleton, who is married to U.S. Army Lt. Col. Terance Singleton, II.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the remarkable life of Dock Monteria Brown, and to join me in praying for his wife and family during these difficult times. I know they will draw comfort in knowing that he lived a great life and that he left a great and indelible mark on his community.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL SPILL AND OFFSHORE DRILLING

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling for their thorough and comprehensive review of the disastrous Gulf oil spill. I appreciate the hard work and diligence of the Commissioners and their staff in compiling this report and know it will prove beneficial as we consider legislative responses to the spill during the 112th Congress. In addition, I would like to commend the Commission for completing the report on time and under budget.

By now, we are all too familiar with the account of the spill. On April 20th, a BP oil rig located 52 miles off of the Louisiana coast exploded with 126 workers on the rig, resulting in 11 families losing their loved ones. With no plan in place for failure of the blowout preventer and no clear leader in the federal response, efforts to stop the flow of oil from the

damaged well took far too long. The BP oil spill is now the largest spill in United States history and the environmental and economic impacts of this disaster will be felt for years to come. The report by the Oil Spill Commission provides further details of the causes of the spill, including the fact that the disaster could have been prevented to begin with.

The report also emphasizes that we can not just focus on reforming the deficiencies in current drilling regulations, we must also continue to monitor the environmental impact of the spill on the Gulf of Mexico. Recovery may take years and the long-term effects of the oil spill, as well as those of the response and clean-up efforts, are still unclear. This monitoring will ensure we are prepared to quickly respond to the unforeseen consequences of this spill.

Thankfully, institutions of higher learning around the country are already conducting vital research as we begin ecosystem recovery efforts, including at the University of South Florida whose College of Marine Science has become an international center for the study of our nation's and our world's waters and of our coastal lands. Together with the Florida Institute of Oceanography, also in St. Petersburg, which is drawing together all the state of Florida's marine research expertise, and a variety of other local, state and federal organizations, our community has provided key information to our nation's decision makers about the impact it is having on our environment and the development of long-term strategies to clean it up.

Last Congress in response to the Deepwater Horizon spill, I also introduced the SAFEGUARDS Act and was pleased to see many of the issues I had addressed in the measure included in the Commissions report, including updating the National Contingency Plan and ensuring that National Environmental Policy Act requirements are not ignored going forward. Their recommendations will prove useful as I work on revising this legislation for reintroduction later in the 112th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me today in thanking the Oil Spill Commission for their independent and impartial report. Their suggestions will prove useful as we continue our response to last years horrific oil spill and I urge my colleagues to work together to ensure the complete recovery of the Gulf of Mexico.

TRIBUTE TO CLIVE SIMPSON

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Clive Simpson of Boone County, Iowa. For the last 28 years, Clive has worked for the Boone News-Republican, delivering the "Boone County Shopping News" to rural Iowans.

Clive was born May 12, 1915 in Sac County, and he retired after working for 30 years for the Federal Highway Administration in Ames, Iowa. However, that retirement did not last long. At his wife's urging in 1982, Clive began delivering the "Boone County Shopping News" once a month every month. In the 28 years since, Clive has delivered over 187,000 issues and covered over 60,000 miles, all in his own

car. Now at the age of 95, Clive decided that it's finally time for him to officially retire.

I thank Clive for his strong and diligent work ethic. It is an admirable character trait, and one that I hope to see many Americans embody. Clive is a good role model for many younger Americans in that respect.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in commending Clive Simpson for his decades of service at the Boone News-Republican. It is an honor to serve as his representative, and I wish Clive and his wife Gertrude a happy and healthy retirement.

MEMORIALIZING MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP POLICE DETECTIVE CHRIS JONES

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to memorialize one of Bucks County's finest, Middletown Township Police Detective Chris Jones.

Chris Jones was working overtime on January 29, 2009 when he was struck and killed while in the performance of his duties.

As he was returning to his patrol car, two cars collided and careened into his vehicle, which then struck and pinned him under his own police cruiser. He was transported to a local hospital where he succumbed to his injuries a short time later.

Mr. Speaker, our nation's police officers risk their lives every day in order to preserve communities throughout our country that are safe and free. Those who give their lives in that mission deserve our eternal gratitude.

Detective Jones served with the Middletown Township Police Department for 10 years and had previously served in the United States Navy for 7 years, a veteran of Operation Desert Storm. Just 37 at the time, Chris left a wife and three children at home the day he went to serve the people of his community.

Detective Jones is the only officer of the Middletown Township Police Department to have lost his life in the line of duty and he will be remembered this week during a solemn ceremony at the police station where he served.

HONORING DR. THOMAS M. GELLHAUS' LIFELONG DEDICATION TO WOMEN'S HEALTH AT HOME AND AROUND THE GLOBE

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the House's attention to the work and dedication of one of my constituents, Dr. Thomas M. Gellhaus.

Dr. Gellhaus is a longtime obstetrician-gynecologist in Davenport, Iowa, and earned his medical degree at the University of Iowa. He has delivered a generation of Iowans, cared for our daughters, wives, mothers, and grandmothers, and done everything he can to make sure their health is well-cared for.

For many years, Dr. Gellhaus has held a leadership position among ob-gyn members of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. He leaves this position this year, but leaves physicians with a long legacy of advocacy and caring for their patients.

Dr. Gellhaus has been a key advocate for patient safety in ob-gyn care and care for underserved women throughout the world. He's been a member of ACOG's Executive Board, helping guide health care policy; in 1999, he was chosen for ACOG's prestigious McCain Fellow Advocacy Program, in which a practicing ob-gyn works with Congress and the Administration; and was a member of the 2002 Class of the Primary Health Care Fellowship sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Dr. Gellhaus recently endowed a new program, the ACOG Gellhaus Resident Fellow Advocacy Award, which encourages 3rd and 4th year ob-gyn residents to work with Congress on behalf of women's health.

In addition to a very busy private practice, since 1996, Dr. Gellhaus has dedicated nearly a year of his life to the preparation for and participation in international health mission projects. These projects have taken him to Central America, South America, Africa and the Dominican Republic. He has been the project medical director for most of these missions; organizing, fundraising, securing medical supplies and recruiting medical personnel. During the missions, Dr. Gellhaus has worked with over 559 other mission participants. His medical teams have, over the years, had more than 18,520 patient encounters, dispensed 48,052 prescriptions and have performed more than 1,472 surgical procedures.

He has personally financed the cost of many participants' missionary project costs, without which they would not have been able to participate. Dr. Gellhaus' deep faith and compassion are lived through these medical missions. In 1999, Dr. Gellhaus was honored with the ACOG Award for International Service in recognition of his mission work in third world countries.

Dr. Gellhaus has a beautiful family, with his wife, Melanie, and their 3 daughters. He reminds us of what is right in America. It is my pleasure to honor Dr. Gellhaus' work and dedication.

TRIBUTE TO VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding care provided by the emergency room staff at the Veterans Memorial Hospital (VMH) in Waukon, Iowa. For their dedication to providing quality care and compassionate service, the VMH was recently awarded the 2010 Summit Award by the Press Ganey Association, recognizing it as one of the best emergency rooms in the nation.

The Summit Award is given every year to one hospital in the country that has consistently demonstrated a high level of patient satisfaction. Since 2007, Press Ganey has sent

out thousands of surveys to patients who have received care in an emergency room. These surveys are then collected, and the information in each is used to rank the hospitals according to the level of satisfaction its patients reported. In each consecutive quarter for the last three years, VMH has scored in the top five percent of hospitals nationwide and patient visits have increased by 15 percent.

I commend the staff of Veterans Memorial Hospital for their hard work in promoting superb care and a positive patient experience. It is this dedication to serving patients that we hope to see in hospitals around the country. I urge my colleagues in the United States Congress to join me in congratulating Veterans Memorial Hospital for their achievement. I wish them the best of luck in the future.

HONORING CITY OF HOPE

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to City of Hope for reaching a milestone achievement, as its doctors performed their 10,000th bone marrow transplant, on January 13, 2011. City of Hope is one of the first biomedical research institutions in the world to reach this milestone. They give people battling diseases like leukemia, lymphoma and myeloma with a second chance at life.

City of Hope is a biomedical research, treatment and education center located in my district, the 32nd California Congressional district. Since its founding in 1913, City of Hope has achieved numerous scientific breakthroughs and pioneered many lifesaving procedures that benefit patients worldwide. It is one of only 40 comprehensive cancer centers, the highest designation bestowed by the National Cancer Institute.

This institution is a pioneer in the field of bone marrow transplantation. In the nearly 35 years since City of Hope physicians performed one of the nation's first successful bone marrow transplants, the institution has helped transplantation evolve into a gold standard treatment for several diseases.

Bone marrow or stem cell transplants typically include intensive high-dose chemotherapy and radiation, followed by weeks or even months of recovery in the hospital. The return on these hundreds of hours of treatment is the possibility of a renewed life cured of the disease.

City of Hope scientists continue to make transplants safer and more effective, and help extend the length and quality of patients' lives. New transplant procedures are improving cure rates, extending the procedure to older patients and expanding the use of transplants to diseases beyond leukemia, lymphoma and multiple myeloma. As an example, researchers at City of Hope are developing a transplant based gene therapy for AIDS-related cancers that may be able to treat both the cancer and the HIV infection.

Today, City of Hope has one of the largest and most successful bone marrow transplant programs in the country. It is because of their dedicated physicians, nurses, and researchers who have helped transplantation evolve from an investigational procedure into a lifesaving

treatment for people here and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing City of Hope for reaching their 10,000th bone marrow transplant and providing hope to so many cancer patients—and their loved ones—worldwide.

IN RECOGNITION OF TROY D.
FREEMAN

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Police Corporal Troy D. Freeman, who is retiring after 28 years of law enforcement service—26 years of service to the City of Fairfield and three years with the San Francisco State University Department of Public Safety. As his colleagues, friends and family gather together to celebrate the next chapter of his life, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding public servant and defender of peace and safety.

Troy began his law enforcement career as a Police Officer with the San Francisco State University Department of Public Safety. He was then hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department on March 5, 1984. As an officer, he worked in various capacities including Patrol, K-9, Firearms Instruction, and Field Training. He joined the Special Activity Felon Enforcement (SAFE) Team in 1991, earned the Police Officer of the Year award in 2005, and was promoted to Police Corporal on August 19, 2005.

One of Troy's most significant contributions to the Police Department was his involvement with the K-9 Unit. He was a K-9 handler from 1989-2001 with two very special dogs, Cito and Brend, and continued to train and lead the K-9 program even after his dogs retired. He was responsible for developing, coordinating, conducting, and documenting all of the training for the K-9 Unit. He also managed the asset seizure records and researched updates in law and training methods. Troy was instrumental to the success of the Police Department's K-9 program.

Troy was a valued employee and leader of the Fairfield Police Department. His commitment to the community was unwavering. He was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired amongst his peers for his hard work, dedication and positive work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Troy D. Freeman continued success and happiness in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON BATES

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievement of Brandon Bates, a Boy Scout from Winterset, Iowa, who recently received the Eagle Scout Award. I commend

Brandon on his perseverance and dedication to improving his community.

Brandon, who is the son of Jerry and Roxanne Bates, first joined the Boy Scout organization as a Tiger Scout at age 7. He went on to become a Cub Scout and then a Boy Scout. Throughout his years in scouting, Brandon has worked hard to earn many merit badges and awards, all of which involve personal betterment and community service. As a Cub Scout, he earned the "Arrow of Light," which is the highest award that a Cub Scout can earn. As a Boy Scout, Brandon has earned the World Conservation Award, the Leave No Trace patch, and now the Eagle Scout Award.

The Eagle Scout Award is the highest award that a Boy Scout can receive. In order to be eligible for this award, a Boy Scout must earn a minimum of 21 merit badges. Brandon has currently earned 40. Only 2% of Boy Scouts nationwide receive this honorable reward, and it is looked upon with distinction in the military, in many colleges and in the business world.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in commending Brandon Bates for his achievement. It is an honor to serve as his representative, and I wish him luck in the future.

HONORING MCKAY HATCH'S NO
CUSSING EFFORTS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker it is with great pleasure that I rise today to honor McKay Hatch, founder of The No Cussing Club.

During middle school, McKay grew tired of the constant stream of obscene and cruel language from his peers that lowered their self-esteem. He courageously asked his classmates to not cuss around him. His peers accepted the challenge and stopped cussing and thanked him for his leadership efforts.

Encouraged by his peers' support for his efforts, McKay founded the No Cussing Club at South Pasadena Middle School. Club members take the No Cussing Challenge, which is a commitment to use better language. The commitment not only improves their lives but also the world around them by using empowering, instead of deflating, language. Through the club motto of "Leave People Better Than You Found Them," members seek out opportunities to lift people up through their words and actions.

In high school, McKay formed a No Cussing Club during his freshman year and it soon had over 100 active members. The club dedicated itself to spreading its message and adding members in all 50 states. Today the No Cussing Club has over 50,000 members, in all 50 states and 30 different countries.

McKay and the No Cussing Club have also worked with local and state leaders to designate local and state cuss free weeks. In 2008, the city of South Pasadena declared the first week of March and all subsequent first weeks of March as No Cussing Week. In 2009, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted a similar proclamation and in 2010 the California legislature adopted a

resolution declaring the first week of March to be No Cussing Week. The local and statewide No Cussing Weeks serve as a reminder to both public officials and private citizens to be more civil toward one another and to elevate the level of discourse in both public and private life.

McKay now travels regularly to spread his message of using clean and respectful language that is uplifting, encouraging, and motivating to students all over the country. He has recently expanded his efforts to encourage an end to bullying, which includes reducing the use of negative and discouraging language.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring the inspiring work of McKay Hatch.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

HON. JOHN F. TIERNEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM LEADER: I agree to take a leave of absence from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) with the understanding that I can be reappointed in the 113th Congress.

Serving on the HPSCI has been a privilege, and I have appreciated the opportunity it has afforded me to ensure that appropriate oversight is conducted over our intelligence and national security programs. Like you, I believe rigorous congressional oversight is critical to the successful implementation of such programs and helps reassure our constituents that their hard-earned tax dollars are being well-spent.

As you know, I am currently serving as a member of the House Committees on Education and the Workforce and Oversight and Government Reform. As such, and in light of the new Republican Majority's decision to reduce the number of members on standing committees in the House, I agree that it is appropriate at this time to take a leave of absence from the HPSCI with the understanding that I can be reappointed in the next Congress.

I thank you for the courtesy you have extended to me, and I look forward to continuing our work together on addressing the important challenges confronting the American people.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. TIERNEY,
Member of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO JORDANNE BLAIR

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievement of Jordanne Blair of Lake City, Iowa. Jordanne, who was crowned Miss Rodeo Iowa 2010, recently represented Iowa in the Miss Rodeo America pageant in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Jordanne is the daughter of Lee and Joanne Blair and is a 2009 graduate of South Dakota State University. She has been passionate

about competing in rodeos for many years, and has inspired that same passion in others as Miss Rodeo Iowa 2010. In that role, she was successful in establishing the annual Exceptional Rodeo in Lake City for handicapped individuals.

On December 4, 2010, Jordanne attended the Miss Rodeo America pageant in Las Vegas as the candidate from Iowa. Competing in the pageant were 28 women from around the country, and Jordanne was selected to be one of the ten semi-finalists. Although it was her close friend Haley McKenzie of South Dakota who took the title of Miss Rodeo America 2011, Jordanne had an exciting experience at the competition.

On January 1, 2011, Jordanne was succeeded by Heidi Gansen of Zwingle, Iowa, who is currently Miss Rodeo Iowa 2011. However, Jordanne has no plans to retire from the rodeo scene. She will advise Heidi in her new role, continue to promote the Exceptional Rodeo and the Lake City Rodeo, serve on the Miss Rodeo Iowa Board, and resume competitive barrel racing. Jordanne also plans to pursue a career in marketing or broadcast journalism.

I commend Jordanne for her devotion to her passion, her community and her state. I know my colleagues in the United States Congress will join me in congratulating and thanking her for the work she has done as Miss Rodeo Iowa 2010. It is an honor to represent her in Congress, and I wish her the best of luck in the future.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN VALUES TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Center for American Values (CAV) based in Pueblo, Colorado. They recently opened their doors with a mission to preserve fundamental American ideals including honor, integrity and patriotism. The organization is committed to ensuring that the values this nation was founded on are passed down to future generations.

The Center for American Values launch late last year was inspired by a few devoted individuals who seek to recognize citizens who have taken great risks in the name of protecting America's freedom. CAV's mission statement is concise: "A nonpartisan organization committed to recognizing the need to honor the extreme sacrifices made to help sustain America's values. We strive to ensure these extraordinary actions are preserved . . . forever." CAV emphasizes Medal of Honor recipients and other military heroes, and fittingly so—Pueblo is the home of four Medal of Honor recipients. Cofounders Drew Dix, a Vietnam veteran and Medal of Honor winner, and Dr. Adolph Padula, who produced a documentary on Medal of Honor recipients, saw CAV as an opportunity to ensure that American citizens do not forget what makes our nation unique and exceptional. Both men also note that CAV honors heroes from all segments of society. For instance, the organization stresses remembrance of those who have taken economic risks when starting a new

business. Regardless of their background, risk-takers continue to propel our country forward.

Currently, The Center for American Values is directed by Tom Allee, with support from its corporate officers Brad Padula and Drew Dix, and board members Sue Smith and Bob Root. CAV is lined with over 140 pictures of Medal of Honor recipients and the building that the organization occupies has been fully renovated from its previous crumbling state. Through community outreach, educational opportunities, and frequent conferences and partnerships with charitable organizations, the CAV will continue to carry out its mission statement for years to come. Ultimately, CAV hopes to influence societal values on a national stage.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I stand here today to recognize The Center for American Values. Their commitment to the public good and preservation of fundamental American ideals is a great service to the citizens of Pueblo and the nation at large.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast votes on the following legislative measure. If I were present for roll call votes, I would have voted "aye" for the following vote: rollcall No. 12, January 18, 2011: On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended: H.R. 292, Stop the Over Printing (STOP) Act.

MARY WATT TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mary Watt of Montrose, Colorado. She has an exemplary record of public service to her community and has given countless hours of service to her hometown.

Mary began her remarkable career in public service in 1973, starting as an executive assistant to the city manager of Montrose. In 1979, she was promoted to city clerk and treasurer, where she handled a variety of issues, including budget preparation, administration of municipal elections, and interpretation of municipal and city ordinances. In 1993, Mary was given the post of administrative services director and city clerk. In this capacity she was recognized as a top public administrator, receiving the Manager's Award for Excellence in 1996, which cited her ability to balance her professional duties while remaining intensely involved in community service. Mary has quickly climbed the professional ladder in the past decade, rising from administrative services director in 2004, to interim city manager in 2005. In August 2005, the Montrose City Council appointed her as full-time City Manager, where she currently serves as CEO of Montrose, Colorado.

Mary is capable of lending her managerial and organizational skills in to a variety of

roles—she is truly multitalented. For instance, she served on the Montrose Chamber of Commerce, where she eventually led the organization as president. Her outreach and influence extends far beyond her professional life, too. Since 1980, she has been an active member of the Altrusa Club, a community service organization in Montrose. She has selflessly helped guide the club in multiple roles, most notably as president in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mary's track record as a reliable public leader. She has given decades of her life in pursuit of improving local government and her community.

A TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL
VANG PAO

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. KISSEL to honor the memory of Major General Vang Pao of Fresno, California, who passed away Thursday January 6th after a battle with pneumonia.

Major General Vang Pao led the Royal Lao Army during the Secret War in Laos, fighting against the People's Army of Vietnam in cooperation with the Central Intelligence Agency and United States military forces. Bravely leading thousands of soldiers in a guerilla war against communism, Vang Pao became a hero, due to his leadership and dedication.

Growing up in the Xiengkhuang province, Vang Pao became interested in military service early in life. He left his family farm as a teenager to join the French Military in defense of his fellow Hmong as the Japanese invaded, and began a historic military career. At the end of World War II, and the departure of the Japanese, Vang Pao was recruited as an officer in the First Indochina War to fight the Viet Minh.

As he rose within the Royal Lao Army, Vang Pao was heralded for his valor and dedication and was the only ethnic Hmong to attain the rank of General in the Royal Lao Army. In the early 1960's, when the CIA recruited Hmong men in Laos to join a guerrilla unit during the Vietnam War, Vang Pao was chosen to be the commander. As his Hmong soldiers rescued downed American pilots from enemy territories and defended American outposts in Laos, he gained a reputation for being a disciplined, honorable leader.

The Hmong soldiers also attacked many North Vietnamese convoys that were using the Ho Chi Minh trail from North Vietnam into South Vietnam. By attacking these supply routes, thousands of U.S. soldiers' lives were saved in South Vietnam. Vang Pao and the Royal Lao Army valiantly fought for their cause throughout the entire Secret War.

Immigrating to the United States in May of 1975, Major General Vang Pao was instrumental in negotiating the resettlement of thousands of his fellow Hmong. Vang Pao continued his leadership after his exit from military service. He was active in fostering U.S.-Laos relations, and combating human rights abuses abroad, as well as serving as an icon and mentor to the Hmong-American community. A

widely respected figure, General Vang Pao was a constant feature at Hmong-American events and celebrations nationwide.

Major General Vang Pao is survived by his widow, Mrs. May Song Vang, 25 children, 68 grandchildren, 17 great grandchildren and numerous friends and community members.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KISSEL and myself in honoring the life of Major General Vang Pao as we offer our condolences to his family and celebrate his memory and service to our country.

DR. S.K. RAO MUSUNURU

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. S.K. Rao Musunuru who will be recognized at the Community Aging and Retirement Services (CARES) Annual Benefit on February 5, 2011, for his continued philanthropic commitment to our community.

He began his formal study of medicine in 1968, but what is most noteworthy is his ability to couple his medical expertise with community involvement—enhancing the knowledge base, furthering the medical profession, and ensuring that local needs are met. While Dr. Musunuru boasts numerous memberships in nationally and internationally acclaimed organizations, including the American Medical Association, the International Society of Heart Transplantation, and the Society of Critical Medicine, he is still mindful of the medical needs in his own backyard.

He was instrumental in transforming a 50-bed rural hospital into a 290-bed Heart Institute, meriting recognition for its high standard of care. During his tenure as Chairman of the Board for Pasco Hernando Community College, the college had a 100 percent increase in nursing enrollment, and he has been vocal in his teachings of "proper prevention and prompt intervention, so that people can live longer and stronger."

Dr. Musunuru's involvement in the community certainly does not go unrecognized. He recently became the recipient of the 2010 Outstanding Physician Award and, for the second consecutive year, received Rotary International's highest honor, the Paul Harris Fellowship recognition. While his accomplishments and awards are extensive to list, words cannot adequately acclaim Dr. Musunuru achievements. The lives he has impacted are countless, and I applaud him for his resolve to use his talents to meet the growing needs of the community and the larger medical profession.

TED VALERIO TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Detective Ted Valerio of Montrose, Colorado. The Montrose Police Department recently awarded him the Employee of the Year for 2010, as well as a Merit Citation.

Detective Valerio was hired on April 30, 2001. Since then, his superiors and coworkers have recognized him as a respected individual of exceptional character and integrity. Detective Valerio has taken the lead and solved a number of important felony cases in the past decade and continues to prove himself an asset to the force. Aside from his responsibilities as a detective, he administers pre-hire polygraph exams for all police department employees—he is the second polygraph examiner to ever work in the Montrose Police Department. Detective Valerio also serves on the Montrose Special Weapons and Tactics team (SWAT), which carries a great risk of personal injury.

Mr. Speaker, Detective Valerio is consummate law enforcement professional and I am proud to congratulate him on his recent awards. I would also like to thank him and the countless other officers who continue to serve their communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF MELVIN E.
FERRO

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Corporal Melvin E. Ferro, who is retiring after more than 28 years of law enforcement service to the City of Fairfield. As his colleagues, friends and family gather together to celebrate the next chapter of his life, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding public servant and defender of peace and safety.

Mel started his law enforcement career when he was hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department on March 19, 1982. As an officer, he worked in various capacities including Patrol, Investigations, and Field Training. He earned awards for his performance, including Police Officer of the Year for 1994, and twice he was named Police Officer of the Quarter—June through October 2000 and again for July through December 2007. Mel served as a Field Training Officer beginning in 1995 and was later promoted to Police Corporal on December 31, 1999.

One of Mel's most significant contributions to the Fairfield Police Department has been his expertise in investigating and solving major crimes. His knowledge and memory pertaining to the activity and association of criminals in the area was a resource for the entire Police Department. He took community-orientated policing to a new level because he made an effort to learn where criminals lived in Fairfield, and he tracked their travel and associates. Additionally, as a trainer of fellow police officers, he taught what most police officers rarely develop—the craft of being a police officer.

Mel was a valued employee and leader in the Fairfield Police Department. His commitment to the community was unwavering. He was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired amongst his peers for his hard work, dedication and positive work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Melvin E. Ferro continued success and happiness in all of his future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 18, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MARIANNA RAFTOPOULOS
TRIBUTE**HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege as the representative of Colorado's 3rd district to rise and pay tribute to the inspirational life of Mrs. Marianna Raftopoulos. Mrs. Raftopoulos was a woman with a deep sense of civic conviction, a loving wife and mother of three.

Marianna Raftopoulos was raised on a sheep ranch in Western Colorado, and the spirit of the west remained with her for the duration of her exemplary life. After graduating from the University of Colorado, Marianna pursued many passions. Most notably were her efforts to improve Moffat County, and the Colorado Republican Party. She was a champion of many causes including chairwoman of the Republican Central Committee, The Moffat Tunnel Commission, The Moffat County Economic Development Partnership, and served as a Moffat County commissioner and chairwoman of Colorado Wildlife Commission. With the passing of Marianna Raftopoulos, Western Colorado has lost an inspiring leader, and our nation has lost a great patriot.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a true honor to stand in tribute and pay respect to the life of Mrs. Marianna Raftopoulos. She was a great leader, who is still greatly missed.

RECOGNIZING BONNIE ARD AS
WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA'S
EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT PERSON
OF THE YEAR**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Bonnie Ard as the 2012 Walton County, Florida Educational Support Person of the Year. I am honored to recognize her achievements and her dedication to the students and teachers of northwest Florida.

Bonnie Ard is the secretary for Maude Sanders Elementary School in DeFuniak Springs, Florida. Mrs. Ard considers the faculty and staff at the school to be a team and part of her family. She sets the tone for the rest of the school's faculty and staff, using her space in the front office to establish a professional, caring, and family-friendly environment that epitomizes the work of the faculty and staff at Maude Sanders Elementary. Tracey Dickey, Principal of Maude Sanders Element-

tary, extols Mrs. Ard's excellent rapport with the parents and students of the school and her steadfast desire to seek to serve the parents and students of Maude Sanders Elementary as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Bonnie Ard as the Walton County Educational Support Person of the Year. Her passion for the students of Maude Sanders Elementary is laudable and her dedication to her profession is exemplary. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. Ard, and we wish her all the best.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS
OF SARAH BRACHMAN**HON. RALPH M. HALL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a fellow Texan; Sarah Brachman, who has been named the National Down Syndrome Society's 2011 Advocate of the Year.

This young lady is one of more than 400,000 Americans living with Down Syndrome, but that has never slowed her down. She is more engaged than many in our political system—having interned here in Washington and in both Federal and State legislative offices in Kentucky where she's in school. And she truly is an advocate for the disabled, happily talking to anyone who will listen about her life and what it means to live with a disability, and personally recruiting over thirty Members of Congress, myself included, for the Congressional Down Syndrome Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and all of our colleagues will join me in congratulating Sarah for this well deserved honor.

CELEBRATING THE CITY OF
BROOKLYN CENTER'S CENTENNIAL**HON. ERIK PAULSEN**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a wonderful community in my district, Brooklyn Center. 2011 is no ordinary year for Brooklyn Center, as next week they will celebrate their centennial.

A quaint suburb located west of Minneapolis, throughout its 100-year history, Brooklyn Center has embraced growth, the importance of family values, and the development of industry, all while maintaining its small-town charm.

Brooklyn Center's residents take great pride in its many diverse and successful residents, its great schools, many shops and recreation options—including the famous Dudley/Budweiser Minnesota Classic Softball Tournament.

As an avid biker, I appreciate Brooklyn Center's acres of picturesque parks and miles of trails. The city's many nature areas are a great representation of the community's pride and commitment to civic improvement.

Congratulations Brooklyn Center on 100 years of being "a great place to start and a great place to stay." I'm sorry I won't be there

to celebrate with you, but I hope your Centennial Celebration is truly the "Party of the Century."

RECOGNIZING VANESSA BUMP AS
WALTON COUNTY, FLORIDA'S
TEACHER OF THE YEAR**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Vanessa Bump as the 2012 Walton County, Florida Teacher of the Year. For twenty years, Mrs. Bump has been an inspiration to her students, colleagues, and community; I am honored to recognize her achievements.

During her career as an educator, Vanessa Bump has served as the Media Specialist at Bay Elementary School, the Library/Media Specialist at Walton High School, and as a Social Studies Teacher in the Escambia County School District. She currently teaches Social Studies and Journalism at South Walton High School. Her outstanding performance was recognized there when she received the 2004 Walton High School Teacher of the Year award.

In addition to her distinction in the classroom, Mrs. Bump serves in myriad other capacities, including Yearbook Sponsor, School Technology Coordinator, Junior Class Sponsor, Prom Sponsor, History Fair Coordinator, and Project-Based Learning Trainer. She has also been presented with the Herff-Jones Outstanding Journalism Educator of the Year award and holds a National Journalism Certification.

Teachers are amongst our most valuable public servants, as they are responsible for educating the future of our country. To be honored as Teacher of the Year, selected from a pool of exemplary educators, is an immense honor. This honor is a reflection of the impact Vanessa Bump has had on her students and the difference she has made in their lives. She has proven herself to be among the many great teachers in our nation, and I am proud to have her as a constituent of Florida's First District.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to honor Vanessa Bump for her accomplishments and her continuing commitment to excellence at South Walton High School and in the Walton County School District.

HONORING LIZ BURNS, RECIPIENT
OF THE 2010 WESTERN SPRINGS
CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD**HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Liz Burns, who will receive the 2010 Western Springs, IL Citizen of the Year Award on January 30, 2011. A resident of Western Springs for 47 years, Mrs. Burns has been an invaluable asset to her community in large part due to her contributions to the local library system.

Mrs. Burns was first appointed to the board of the Thomas Ford Memorial Library in 1991 and solidified her status as a permanent fixture on the board in 1993 with an election to a four-year term. She served as president of the board from 1995 to 1997 and oversaw the \$3.1 million library expansion project during her tenure. In 1997, she led efforts to produce and implement the Library's long-range plan, preserving a high-quality learning environment for generations to come.

Since the end of her term as president of the board, Mrs. Burns has served as a trustee at the Thomas Ford Library Foundation. She became chair of the Foundation's board of trustees in 2004, and has worked to build an endowment for the Friends of the Library's continuing educational programs and activities. Liz continues to serve her community as a volunteer reading tutor at the St. Gregory Episcopal School for Boys.

Born and raised in Charleston, IL and the youngest of six children, Mrs. Burns attended the University of Illinois, Urbana where she earned a degree in English. She taught English and Journalism at Riverside-Brookfield High School before starting her family. She later became licensed as a Certified Financial Planner and went to work at the Western Springs Federal Credit Union. Mrs. Burns moved on to Merrill Lynch in 1987 then to Charles Schwab in 1991 where she worked as a securities specialist until her retirement in 2002.

I ask you to join me in honoring Mrs. Liz Burns on her selection as a 2010 Western Springs Citizen of the Year, and may she continue to enjoy educating through her work as a tutor and a trustee of Thomas Ford Memorial Library.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATIVE AU-
TONOMY ACT OF 2011

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Legislative Autonomy Act of 2011, to end the unnecessary and redundant congressional review of District of Columbia legislation. This bill would eliminate the congressional review period for civil (30 legislative days) and criminal (60 legislative days) legislation passed by the District of Columbia. Under the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, if a congressional resolution disapproving a D.C. bill is signed into law during the congressional review period, that bill does not become law. The congressional review period, which is limited only to those days when Congress is in session, delays D.C. bills from becoming law, often for many months. The delays force the D.C. Council to pass most bills several times, using a cumbersome and complicated process in which bills are passed on an emergency, temporary, and permanent basis to ensure that the operations of this large and rapidly changing city continue uninterrupted. The D.C. Legislative Autonomy Act would allow bills passed by the D.C. Council and signed by the mayor to become law immediately.

My bill would do no more than align the Home Rule Act with congressional practice

over many decades. Since the 1973 Home Rule Act, of the more than 4,500 legislative acts transmitted to Congress, only three resolutions to disapprove a D.C. bill have been enacted—in 1979, 1981, and 1991—and two of those involved distinct federal interests. Placing a congressional hold on 4,500 D.C. bills has not only proven unnecessary, but also a waste of money and time for both the District and Congress. Instead of using the formal disapproval process to overturn D.C. legislation, Congress has preferred to use appropriations riders. It is particularly unfair to require the D.C. Council to engage in a phantom process that Congress has itself discarded.

The wastefulness of the layover process is all the more apparent considering that my bill does not prevent review of District laws by Congress. Under clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the U.S. Constitution, the House and the Senate may scrutinize every piece of legislation passed by the D.C. Council, and, using that authority, change or strike legislation at any time if it desired. My bill would only eliminate the automatic hold placed on local legislation and the need for the D.C. Council to use a process initially passed for the convenience of Congress, but one that Congress has since eliminated in all but law. The bill would promote efficiency and cost savings for both Congress and the District. The bill would benefit the city's bond rating, which is affected by the shadow of congressional review and the delay in the finality of District legislation.

The limited legislative autonomy granted in this bill would allow the District to realize the greater measure of meaningful self-government and home rule that it deserves, and has more than earned in the 37 years since the Home Rule Act became effective. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

IN MEMORY OF PAULINE
MURILLO, ELDER OF THE SAN
MANUEL BAND OF SERRANO
MISSION INDIANS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me in praising the life of Pauline Murillo, who was a wonderful lady, a strong leader for the San Manuel Band of Serrano Mission Indians, and one of the most important chroniclers and teachers of Indian history in Southern California. Mrs. Murillo passed away Jan. 21, 2011.

Pauline Chacon was born in 1934 on the San Manuel Reservation, which is in the foothills of the San Bernardino Mountains in Southern California. When Pauline was a young child, the reservation was tucked away from any nearby towns, and was little known to the residents of San Bernardino County.

But from an early age, Pauline became involved with an effort to reach beyond the boundaries of the reservation to help area schoolchildren learn the history and culture of the San Manuel tribe. Pauline and her mother, Tribal Spokeswoman Martha Manuel Chacon, visited schools to share factual accounts of tribal history, culture and language.

Pauline would carry this work forward as a tribal culture bearer, native speaker, author

and presenter dedicated to a principal, "To never forget who you are or where you came from." Today she is regarded as one of the most knowledgeable and influential resources on Southern California Indian history and culture.

She married George Murillo in 1952, and together they have three children, eight grandchildren and 19 great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Murillo wrote two books about her life and San Manuel culture and traditions, "Living in Two Worlds" and "We Are Still Here Alive and in Spirit." Both contained hundreds of rare photographs. She was instrumental in the creation of an interactive CD-ROM for the Serrano-language and made traditional Indian cradle dolls and other crafts.

Pauline and George are well known for their philanthropy, donating time and funds to hospitals, schools and non-profits to benefit the greater community. In 2009 the Murillos donated \$900,000 to Cal State San Bernardino to construct an observatory, which was named for the family. In 2008 the family's contribution to Loma Linda University Medical Center allowed the hospital to expand its lounge for oncology patients and their families and was rededicated to the family.

While Pauline Murillo was leading the San Manuel tribe in reaching out to the greater community, the cities of San Bernardino and Highland have grown to surround the reservation's borders. Although the reservation was once impoverished, tribal members have found success with the opening of casinos—and have become one of the top local employers in the process. As a highly-respected tribal elder, Pauline Murillo has ensured that the tribe remains a strong presence throughout the community. She was a member of the Highland Senior Center, the Highland Women's Club and the "Red Hat Ladies" service group.

Mr. Speaker, Pauline Murillo was beloved throughout our region—her nickname of Dimples tells much about her always-smiling presence. She was a treasured resource for Native American culture, identity and tradition. She spent hours with high school students and faculty telling of the language and history of the Serrano people. We will all miss her greatly. I ask you and my colleagues to join me in extending condolences to her loving family and friends, and to express our appreciation for the lifetime of service to her community.

IN RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL M.
JOHNSTONE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Captain Michael M. Johnstone, who is retiring after nearly 30 years of law enforcement service—26 years of service to the City of Fairfield and almost four years with the Oakland Police Department. As his colleagues, friends and family gather together to celebrate the next chapter of his life, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding public servant and defender of peace and safety.

Michael began his law enforcement career as a Police Officer with the Oakland Police

Department. He was then hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department on October 29, 1984. As an officer, he worked in various capacities including Patrol, Investigations, Special Operations, Narcotics, and Field Training. He earned the Police Officer of the Year award in 1996, joined the Crisis Negotiation Team in 1997, and was promoted to Police Corporal on December 31, 1999.

On December 28, 2001, Michael was promoted to Police Sergeant and ultimately served in a number of capacities including Patrol, Investigations, Professional Standards, and Public Information. He was a strong and decisive leader which led to him receiving the Manager of the Year award in 2003. On December 7, 2007, he was promoted to Police Lieutenant and served as Commander for Patrol, Quality of Life, and Administrative Divisions. As the Police Department experienced changes in leadership and command staff, Michael consistently stepped in and assisted City management in filling the gaps. Over the last two years, he assumed the Captain's position and managed Patrol Operations twice and he also acted as Deputy Police Chief when needed.

Michael was a valued employee and leader of the Fairfield Police Department. His commitment to the community was unwavering. He was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired amongst his peers for his hard work, dedication and positive work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Michael M. Johnstone continued success and happiness in all of his future endeavors.

HONORING ALDO SANTORUM

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Aldo Santorum, the father of my friend and colleague, former Pennsylvania Senator Rick Santorum.

Aldo Santorum passed away on January 15th in Crescent Beach Florida at the age of 88 in the home where he and his wife, Catherine Dughi, had spent the past 20 years together.

Aldo was an American patriot who served alongside fellow members of the Greatest Generation who honored the call to service in World War II.

After the war, Aldo Santorum took advantage of the GI Bill to earn a degree in psychology from St. Francis College in Loretto, Pennsylvania as well as a graduate degree from Catholic University in Washington and a doctorate in clinical psychology from the University of Ottawa.

Instead of going into private practice, Aldo devoted his professional career to serving fellow veterans as a clinical psychologist for the Veterans Administration.

Throughout his career, Aldo Santorum served in VA hospitals in Martinsburg, West Virginia, Butler, Virginia and in Chicago until 1990, when he and his wife Catherine retired to Crescent Beach, Florida.

In addition to his wife and children, Aldo Santorum is survived by an extended, but closely-knit family of 10 grandchildren.

I extend my condolences to Rick Santorum and the entire Santorum family for their loss.

INTRODUCING THE FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Federal Reserve Transparency Act. Throughout its nearly 100-year history, the Federal Reserve has presided over the near-complete destruction of the United States dollar. Since 1913 the dollar has lost over 98% of its purchasing power, aided and abetted by the Federal Reserve's loose monetary policy. How long will we as a Congress stand idly by while hard-working Americans see their savings eaten away by inflation? Only big-spending politicians and politically favored bankers benefit from inflation.

Serious discussion of proposals to oversee the Federal Reserve is long overdue. I have been a longtime proponent of more effective oversight and auditing of the Fed, but I was far from the first Congressman to advocate these types of proposals. Esteemed former members of the Banking Committee such as Chairmen Wright Patman and Henry B. Gonzales were outspoken critics of the Fed and its lack of transparency.

Since its inception, the Federal Reserve has always operated in the shadows, without sufficient scrutiny or oversight of its operations. While the conventional excuse is that this is intended to reduce the Fed's susceptibility to political pressures, the reality is that the Fed acts as a foil for the government. Whenever you question the Fed about the strength of the dollar, they will refer you to the Treasury, and vice versa. The Federal Reserve has, on the one hand, many of the privileges of government agencies, while retaining benefits of private organizations, such as being largely insulated from Freedom of Information Act requests.

The Federal Reserve can enter into agreements with foreign central banks and foreign governments, and the GAO is prohibited from auditing these agreements. Why should a government-established agency, whose police force has federal law enforcement powers, and whose notes have legal tender status in this country, be allowed to enter into agreements with foreign powers and foreign banking institutions with no oversight? Particularly because the Fed has operated swap lines with foreign central banks and provided hundreds of billions of dollars of bailouts to foreign commercial banks, the Fed's negotiations with the European Central Bank, the Bank of International Settlements, and other foreign institutions should face increased scrutiny, most especially because of their significant effect on foreign policy. Given the currency crisis in Europe and the prospect of the Fed propping up foreign governments or bailing out American banks invested in European debt, this issue is of especially pressing concern.

The Fed's funding facilities and its agreements with the Treasury should be reviewed. The Treasury's supplementary financing accounts that fund Fed facilities allow the Treasury to funnel money to Wall Street without

GAO or Congressional oversight. Additional funding facilities that have allowed the Fed to keep financial asset prices artificially inflated and subsidize poorly performing financial firms should be scrutinized, as well as the Mortgage-Backed Securities Purchase Program, which has subsidized banks by transferring trillions of dollars of worthless debt off their books.

The Federal Reserve Transparency Act would eliminate restrictions on GAO audits of the Federal Reserve and open Fed operations to enhanced scrutiny. We hear officials constantly lauding the benefits of transparency and especially bemoaning the opacity of the Fed, its monetary policy, and its funding facilities. By opening all Fed operations to a GAO audit and calling for such an audit to be completed by the end of 2012, the Federal Reserve Transparency Act would achieve much-needed transparency of the Federal Reserve. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING PETE CARIS, RECIPIENT OF THE 2010 WESTERN SPRINGS CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Pete Caris, who will receive the 2010 Western Springs, IL Citizen of the Year Award on January 30, 2011. Born and raised in Western Springs, Mr. Caris has been selected for this award in large part due to his accomplishments with the Western Springs Historical Society.

Mr. Caris was the president of the Western Springs Historical Society Board from 1999 to 2006. During his tenure, he has worked hard to raise funds for the Ekdahl House project to preserve and showcase one of the oldest houses in Western Springs. He has also volunteered at the Tower Museum where visitors can learn about the rich history of Western Springs. Mr. Caris stood out as a nominee for his award not only because of his position on the board, but also because of his hard work increasing the visibility of the Historical Society. He consistently leads public events including the Gathering on the Green and the Christmas Walk in his hometown.

In addition to being active with the Historical Society, Mr. Caris has been involved with the First Congregational Church of Western Springs for many years. He has also acted as a mentor to many young citizens while coaching church league basketball for 23 years. All of Mr. Caris' work in Western Springs, whether leading youth teams or ensuring the preservation of local historical treasures, makes him a deserving recipient of the 2010 Citizen of the Year award.

I ask you to join me in honoring Mr. Pete Caris on his selection as a 2010 Western Springs Citizen of the year, and may he continue to happily serve the citizens Western Springs, IL, young and old.

REPEALING THE JOB-KILLING
HEALTH CARE LAW ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 2011

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add one more story to this debate to help illustrate why the Affordable Care Act is so important. One of my constituents recently wrote to tell me that his 19 year old son has a rare liver disease and that his only hope is a transplant. Under the new healthcare reform law, he is now able to keep his son on his insurance plan to age 26. His household would be out of luck without healthcare reform as last year his son's health care costs exceeded \$120,000.

It is stories like these that are the essence of why passing health reform was so important. It provides protections to ensure that someone like my constituent can access health care and not face exorbitant personal costs when an illness strikes.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this repeal legislation and hope we can all work together to find ways to move our country forward.

THE HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETICS
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to introduce the High School Athletics Accountability Act. As opportunities for girls and women to participate in sports and athletics have been made increasingly available, women's participation has grown exponentially. Over three million high school girls now participate in organized sports, as opposed to 294,015 in 1971 before Title IX was enacted. Athletic participation has brought with it confidence and camaraderie among young women, giving them memories and friends that will last a lifetime.

Despite our progress, persistent attacks against equality for women's sports require that we continue to protect the rights our nation's young women deserve. Currently high schools are not required to disclose any data on equity in sports, making it difficult for high schools and parents to ensure fairness in their athletics programs. The High School Athletics Accountability Act requires that high schools report basic data on the number of female and male students in their athletic programs and the expenditures made for their sports teams. The data will help high schools improve opportunities for girls in sports, and thereby help high schools and parents of schoolchildren foster fairness in athletic opportunities for girls and boys. Ultimately better information will encourage greater participation of all students in athletics.

Without information about how athletic opportunities and benefits are being allocated at

the high school level, female students may be deprived of their chance to play sports. For many young women, sports are often their ticket to higher education. A survey conducted by the National Federation of State High School Associations indicates that female students receive 1.3 million fewer opportunities to play high school sports than do male students, which translate into many lost opportunities for athletic scholarships. Other studies show that student athletes tend to graduate at higher rates, perform better in school and are less likely to use drugs and alcohol. The New York Times recently highlighted research that found that the "increase in girls' athletic participation caused by Title IX was associated with a 7 percent lower risk of obesity 20 to 25 years later, when women were in their late 30s and early 40s." The study notes that while a 7 percent decline in obesity is modest, "no other public health program can claim similar success." Women athletes also tend to have more confidence, better body image, and higher self-esteem than female non-athletes—critical attributes that help them succeed throughout their lives.

We must give our schools the tools they need to identify inequities in their programs so that current and future generations of women can enjoy the benefits of sports.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to help girls move toward equality in athletics at every level and in every community across the Nation.

CONGRATULATING PAUL
KARAFIOL ON RECEIVING THE
PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR EX-
CELLENCE IN MATHEMATICS
AND SCIENCE TEACHING

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Paul Karafiol, an educator at Walter Payton College Prep in Chicago, on receiving the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. The Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching is administered by the National Science Foundation on behalf of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Awardees are selected by a panel of scientists for their prowess in teaching pre-college-level science and mathematics. I am elated that Mr. Karafiol received this distinguished honor for the caliber of his teaching of math. His ability to convey mathematics concepts to students in clear and interesting ways provides a great benefit to Chicago, and the Presidential award is a well-earned recognition of his skill.

Mr. Karafiol is a Chicago native and Chicago Public School graduate. He received his bachelor's degree in Philosophy from Harvard University and his master's degree in Philosophy from the University of Chicago. Mr. Karafiol has always had a love for math. As a youth, he was on the Math Team at the Kenwood Academy. His first summer jobs involved working as a junior staff member in math programs for talented students held at

the University of Chicago, Hampshire College, and ENSAE in Toulouse, France. After teaching at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts for many years, Mr. Karafiol moved back to Chicago in 1997 to teach math at Providence-St. Mel, another wonderful school in Chicago. In 2000, he assisted in opening the math department at Walter Payton College Prep, becoming the Chairman of the math department in 2009. When you talk with Mr. Karafiol, his passion for teaching math is evident. He speaks of his excitement at understanding the connections among concepts and discovering surprises using numbers; it is this love of the subject that he shares with his students by creating environments in which they too can appreciate these learning revelations.

Walter Payton College Prep—the school at which Mr. Karafiol teaches—has an environment of continuous collaboration, reflection, and dedication to excellence. Through the commitment of Mr. Karafiol and the math department staff, Walter Payton College Prep was given the Intel Star Innovator award for the finest math and science program in the country. Over 150 schools competed in the Intel Schools of Distinction competition. Three schools were named as finalists in each of six categories: High School Math and Science; Middle School Math and Science; and Elementary Math and Science. Payton's math program was cited as the High School Mathematics winner; it also received the competition's grand prize—the Star Innovator Award. Mr. Karafiol notes that collaboration between the math and science departments at Walter Payton improve both departments' understandings of what math skills students need to be successful, when students need which skills, and how best to teach, reinforce, or remediate particular math skills. This joint process also helps Payton's math teachers gain new ideas about applications and contexts that they could integrate into their classes to improve mathematics learning. Impressively, over a quarter of the students at Walter Payton take five or more math courses before graduation. In addition to this rigorous set of core classes, many of the students at Walter Payton fill their electives with advanced placement statistics and/or university-level math courses: Over 99 percent of the student population scores as "Meeting or Exceeding" state math standards on the Prairie State Achievement Examination.

We have an obligation to the future of our Nation to assure every segment of our population has the opportunity to pursue careers in science and math. When children have an effective educator in these fields, they experience an excitement and understanding of math and science that increases their self confidence and interest in pursuing careers in science and mathematics. I celebrate with Mr. Karafiol and Walter Payton College Prep on the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. Their dedication prepares students in Chicago to take an active role in making America a leader in math and science among the community of nations in the 21st century.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "TAX
CODE TERMINATION ACT"**HON. BOB GOODLATTE**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, last night we gathered in this Chamber to hear President Obama deliver his State of the Union Address. I was particularly encouraged to hear the President say, "the best thing we could do on taxes for all Americans is to simplify the individual tax code." The President stated he was prepared to join both parties in simplifying our tax code. I join the President in calling for a simplified tax code, and I rise today to introduce the Tax Code Termination Act. This legislation can be the impetus for overhauling our tax system.

The fact is our current tax system has spiraled out of control. At a time when Americans devote a total of 7 billion hours each year to comply with the tax code, we need tax simplification. Today's tax code is unfair, discourages savings and investment, and is impossibly complex. The Tax Code Termination Act will force Congress to finally debate and address fundamental tax reform. This bi-partisan legislation is simple. It will abolish the Internal Revenue Code by December 31, 2015, and call on Congress to approve a new Federal tax system by July of the same year.

While almost every Member would acknowledge that our tax code is no longer working in a fair manner for Americans, nothing has been done to create a more equitable tax code. Congress won't act on fundamental tax reform unless it is forced to do so. My bill will force Congress to finally debate and address fundamental tax reform.

Once this bill becomes law, today's oppressive tax code would survive for only four more years, at which time it would expire and be replaced with a new tax code that will be determined by Congress, the President, and the American people. This legislation will allow us, as a Nation, to collectively decide what the new tax system should look like. Having a date-certain to end the current tax code will force the issue to the top of the national agenda.

Although many questions remain about the best way to reform our tax system, I am certain that if Congress is forced to address the issue we can create a tax code that is simpler, fairer, and better for our economy than the one we are forced to comply with today.

Whichever tax system is adopted, the key ingredients should be: a low rate for all Americans; tax relief for working people; protection of the rights of taxpayers and reduction in tax collection abuses; promotion of savings and investment; and encouragement of economic growth and job creation. Taxes may be unavoidable but they don't have to be unfair and overcomplicated.

Just like other programs that require reauthorization, the tax code must be reviewed to examine whether it is fulfilling its intended purpose and then Congress must make any changes that are necessary.

America's future depends on overcoming the handicap of the current tax code. There is widespread consensus that the current system is broken, and keeping it is not in America's best interest. I urge my colleagues to support

this legislation and end the broken tax system that exists today.

IN HONOR OF SGT. ZAINAH C.
CREAMER**HON. MIKE ROSS**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen hero who was a respected and dedicated officer in the United States Army. On January 12, 2011, our state and nation lost a great patriot when Sergeant Zainah C. Creamer, aged 28, was killed in the line of duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Sgt. Creamer died in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when an improvised explosive device detonated near her unit.

Sgt. Creamer was born in Texarkana, Texas, and graduated from Arkansas High School in Texarkana, Ark., in 2000. Although I never had the honor of meeting Sgt. Creamer, it is clear by the outpouring of praise from her friends and family that she was a special person who deeply loved her country and never hesitated to help those in need. I extend my deepest condolences on behalf of all Arkansans to her family, friends, colleagues and acquaintances for this devastating loss.

Sgt. Creamer was assigned to the 212th Military Police Detachment, Headquarters Battalion, Fort Belvoir, Va. She was a soldier for more than six years and was an Army dog handler serving her second deployment with the 2nd Battalion of the 502nd Infantry Regiment.

With her bravery and dedication to duty, Sgt. Creamer exemplified what it meant to be a U.S. soldier; she made this nation and her family proud. My deepest thoughts and prayers go out to all of her family and friends during this very difficult time.

Today, I ask all Members of Congress to join me as we honor the life of Army Sergeant Zainah C. Creamer and her legacy, as well as each man and woman in our Armed Forces, and all of those in harm's way supporting their efforts, who give the ultimate sacrifice in service to this great country. We owe them our eternal gratitude.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT D.
BUNTING**HON. JOHN GARAMENDI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lieutenant Robert D. Bunting, who is retiring after 27 years of law enforcement service—21 and a half years of service to the City of Fairfield and five and a half years with the Calistoga Police Department. As his colleagues, friends and family gather together to celebrate the next chapter of his life, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding public servant and defender of peace and safety.

Robert started his law enforcement career as a Police Officer with the Calistoga Police

Department. He was then hired as a Police Officer with the Fairfield Police Department on June 12, 1989. As an officer, he worked in various capacities that included Patrol, Firearms Instruction, and Field Training. Robert joined the Special Activity Felony Enforcement, SAFE, Team in 1992 and was promoted to Police Corporal on September 20, 2002.

On February 4, 2005, Robert was promoted to Police Sergeant and ultimately supervised a number of different teams including Violent Crime Suppression, Special Enforcement, and Patrol. Since being promoted to Police Lieutenant on May 9, 2008, he has served as the Commander for the Major Crimes Division, Patrol, and Public Information. Not only was Robert a capable and decisive leader but he also demonstrated resourcefulness, teamwork, and a devotion to duty which led to him receiving a Distinguished Service Medal in 2007. Additionally, he has received numerous commendations from community members, local businesses, and supervisors during his career.

Robert was a valued employee and leader of the Fairfield Police Department. His commitment to the community was unwavering. He was a loyal representative of the law enforcement community and admired amongst his peers for his hard work, dedication and positive work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to pay tribute to this dedicated public servant. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing Robert D. Bunting continued success and happiness in all of his future endeavors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM THE
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSI-
NESS DURING TENURE ON BUDG-
ET COMMITTEE**HON. HEATH SHULER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following letters:

JANUARY 25, 2011.

Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER PELOSI, This letter is to advise you that, effective today, I am taking a leave of absence from the Committee on Small Business until my tenure on the Committee on the Budget is completed. It is my understanding from Clause C of Rule 19 of the Democratic Caucus rules (referenced below) that I will continue to accrue seniority during the leave of absence, at the same rate as if I had continued to serve on the Committee on Small Business.

Rule 19, Clause C: "Any Member of the Committee on the Budget shall be entitled to take a leave of absence from service on any committee or subcommittee during the period he or she serves on the Budget Committee and seniority rights of such Member on such committee and on each subcommittee to which such Member was assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if such Member had continued to so serve during the period of the leave of absence."

Accompanying this letter is a letter from the Democratic Leader verifying that my seniority on the Committee on Small Business will continue to accrue during my absence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HEATH SHULER,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 25, 2011.

Hon. HEATH SHULER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR HEATH: Thank you for your interest in serving on the House Budget Committee in the 112th Congress. According to the Democratic Caucus rules, members are entitled to take a leave of absence from their standing committee until their tenure on the Budget Committee is complete. Thus, your full seniority on the Small Business Committee shall be fully protected for the duration of your service on the Budget Committee.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic
Leader.
ROSA DELAURO,
Co-Chair House
Democratic Steering
& Policy Committee.

JANUARY 25, 2011.

Democratic Steering and Policy Committee,
Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN DELAURO: This letter is to advise you that, effective today, I am taking a leave of absence from the Committee on Small Business until my tenure on the Committee on the Budget is completed. It is my understanding from Clause C of Rule 19 of the Democratic Caucus rules (referenced below) that I will continue to accrue seniority during the leave of absence, at the same rate as if I had continued to serve on the Committee on Small Business.

Rule 19, Clause C: "Any Member of the Committee on the Budget shall be entitled to take a leave of absence from service on any committee or subcommittee during the period he or she serves on the Budget Committee and seniority rights of such Member on such committee and on each subcommittee to which such Member was assigned at the time shall be fully protected as if such Member had continued to so serve during the period of the leave of absence."

Accompanying this letter is a letter from the Democratic Leader verifying that my seniority on the Committee on Small Business will continue to accrue during my absence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

HEATH SHULER,
Member of Congress.

JANUARY 25, 2011.

Hon. HEATH SHULER,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR HEATH: Thank you for your interest in serving on the House Budget Committee in the 112th Congress. According to the Democratic Caucus rules, members are entitled to take a leave of absence from their standing committee until their tenure on the Budget Committee is complete. Thus, your full seniority on the Small Business Committee shall be fully protected for the duration of your service on the Budget Committee.

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
House Democratic
Leader.
ROSA DELAURO,
Co-Chair House Demo-
cratic Steering &
Policy Committee.

HONORING RESIDENTS OF THE
VILLAGE OF WESTERN SPRINGS,
ILLINOIS ON THEIR 125TH ANNI-
VERSARY AS A VILLAGE

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the residents of Western Springs, Illinois, a village in my district and my hometown, which will celebrate its quasicentennial anniversary on January 30, 2011.

Western Springs enjoys a long and colorful history beginning in the early 19th century. The area, originally consisting of swampland and flat plains, was settled by a small population of farmers in 1834. These rural families enjoyed a very quiet life until the CB&Q Railroad arrived in 1863. New construction filled the swamps and the Western Springs Land Association purchased the three tracts of land on which Western Springs now sits for \$105,000.

Many of the area's earliest inhabitants were Quaker, so the town adopted a personality that included a simple lifestyle and a prohibition of alcohol. Eventually, developer Thomas Clarkson Hill moved to the area and helped to organize the community to attract more residents. Area inhabitants built a school house in 1872 and a post office in 1873 and as more new immigrants arrived, Quaker influence dwindled. After several more community projects, the Village of Western Springs incorporated in 1886, named for the mineral springs to the southwest of the town.

In 1890, the Village hired Edgar and Benezette Williams to design and build a waterworks system after the local water springs were depleted. The famous Western Springs Water Tower was part of that project and still stands 112 feet tall as a National Register Historic Place.

Western Springs' other most historic site is the Ekdahl House, built by August Ekdahl as a general store. The general store was one of the town's first businesses and later served as a post office. The building is now a museum where local residents can learn about the history of their village. The preservation of the Water Tower and the Ekdahl house can be attributed to the efforts of the determined members of the Western Springs Historical Society.

Although Western Springs has come a long way since its days as a Quaker farm settlement, it is still a safe and quiet town as demonstrated by its being named by Business Week a "Great Place to Raise Kids" and one of CNN Money's "Best Places to Live." My wife Judy and I are proud to be counted among the Village's 12,493 residents. I will gather with my fellow Western Springs residents at McClure Junior High on January 30th to celebrate the Village's 125th year. We will enjoy festivities including a giant tower cake, ice skating, and a bonfire, along with honoring the 2010 Citizens of the Year.

I ask you to join me in honoring the residents of Western Springs, Illinois on their 125th anniversary as a village. May they enjoy this weekend's celebration and may the Village continue to thrive as a close community.

COMMENDING THE EFFORTS OF
NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, parents across this country have taken a stand, and they are demanding more academic choices for their children. In that spirit, I would like to highlight that this week, January 23–29, marks the inaugural "National School Choice Week," an event that promotes giving parents a choice on education.

The mission of National School Choice Week is simple: we need a K–12 education system that provides a wide array of options. We need an effective education system that has the flexibility to personalize and motivate students and allow parents to choose the school that is best for their child.

To provide a system of learning that meets the needs of tomorrow's students, we need to empower the parents, teachers and school systems today. I am honored to take this opportunity to champion this cause and the individual freedom to choose. I believe that promoting educational choice for parents and students is a vital part of the educational process. Our students deserve the best teachers, facilities, and studying environments. I am proud to say that I am "all in" for National School Choice Week.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF BLACK
JANUARY IN AZERBAIJAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the people of Azerbaijan in remembrance of the tragic events of Black January, when at midnight of January 19, 1990, 26,000 Soviet troops stormed the capital city of Baku with tanks and armored vehicles.

That night the Soviet military machine intended to restore public order by bulldozing innocent people and firing on peaceful demonstrators, including on women and children. According to Azerbaijani records, as a result of this merciless act authorized by then President Mikhail Gorbachev, 130 people died, 611 were injured, 841 were arrested, and 5 went missing.

Human Rights groups have condemned the Baku incursion for its attacks on medical personnel, ambulances and even hospitals. The punishment inflicted by Soviet soldiers was intended as a warning to nationalists, not only in Azerbaijan, but in other Republics of the Soviet Union. The Soviet use of force in Baku was a desperate attempt to rescue the totalitarian regime. However, Black January had the opposite effect on Azerbaijan. It consolidated the rising independence movements in the country and united the Azerbaijani nation in their quest for freedom.

Azerbaijan has developed into a thriving country and has become an essential partner of the United States in the region, collaborating on strengthening energy security and working together to counter terrorism and extremism. I would like to thank the Azerbaijani

people for their friendship and share my thoughts and prayers with the families of those who gave their lives fighting for a better Azerbaijan. The United States will continue to work with Azerbaijan and other countries in the region to promote human rights, maintain stability, strengthen institutions, enhance the rule of law, and settle conflicts.

HONORING THE LATE HMONG GENERAL VANG PAO FOR HIS VALIANT SERVICE AND STEADFAST ALLIANCE WITH THE UNITED STATES DURING THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to General Vang Pao, the revered leader of the Hmong community residing in my Northern California congressional district and throughout the United States. I join that community in mourning his loss.

It is fitting for all Americans to pause and reflect on General Vang Pao's steadfast alliance with the United States during the Vietnam War. General Vang Pao commanded the Secret Army, a highly effective CIA-trained and supported force that fought against the Pathet Lao and People's Army of Vietnam. His tremendous courage and leadership aided American soldiers against aggression from the North Vietnamese. By fighting valiantly at our nation's side, he helped preserve and protect our way of life.

Our nation should not forget General Vang Pao's contributions to the American cause. We must also remember the Hmong who lost their lives or who were forced out of their homeland as they fought against the evils of communism. They sacrificed tremendously and deserve our enduring gratitude.

HONORING MELVIN E. ZIEGLER

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Melvin E. Ziegler, who soon is to receive the World War II Bronze Star Medal. This prestigious award is given to those in the United States Army distinguished as heroic or meritorious during their service fighting against an enemy of the United States.

Mr. Ziegler fought in the 88th Infantry Division during World War II in Italy. He previously was honored with the Purple Heart and the Combat Infantryman Badge. Unbeknownst to Mr. Ziegler, he was awarded The Bronze Star Medal; however, it was never awarded or issued to him. Melvin recently received a letter from the Department of the Army informing him of this honor. I am pleased to say that after 65 years, Melvin E. Ziegler will receive the medal he so greatly deserves.

During World War II, Private Ziegler was part of the force driving the Nazis from North

Italy. Melvin was shot by a German machine gunner. The bullet was stopped from going through his chest by a New Testament Bible that he held in his chest pocket. Mr. Ziegler stated that he frequently did not read the Bible at the time, but since that fateful day, he reads it often.

Melvin currently lives in Owensville, Missouri, with his wife of over 60 years, Iola. He will be presented the medal on Sunday, January 30, 2011, at his church of 20 years, the Salem Full Gospel Church in Salem, Missouri. Surrounded by his family, friends, and congregation members, Melvin E. Ziegler will finally receive the Bronze Star Medal for his service and heroism.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Melvin E. Ziegler for this celebrated award and thank him for his service to this great country.

REDUCING NON-SECURITY SPENDING TO FISCAL YEAR 2008 LEVELS OR LESS

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 38, an irresponsible piece of legislation that asks the members of the House to abdicate their responsibility to vote on a budget for the federal government. This resolution opens the door to massive funding cuts to programs that are critical to our fragile economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, with H. Res. 38 the Republicans have offered what they call a "Budget Resolution"—but what should be called a "Budgetless Resolution" because it contains no numbers, no specifics and, worst of all, no ideas for job creation or economic recovery.

Instead, it takes the unprecedented step of giving unilateral authority to the Budget Committee chairman to set spending limits for the federal government. With all due respect to Chairman Ryan, no members of Congress should ever contract out their vote to another member—especially not on something as fundamentally important as setting funding levels for the federal government.

H. Res. 38, the Budgetless Resolution, is a one-page document that makes the vague and simplistic goal of reducing federal spending to 2008 levels or less. Democrats are serious about deficit reduction. But we also must make sure that we continue on the path to economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, we have to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. If we are going to work on deficit reduction—as we should—we should go through the budget surgically, examining where federal investments are working and where they are not.

The Republican plan is the exact opposite approach—it is deficit reduction while blindfolded. The across the board Republican budget cuts would seriously hurt the people in my district by gashing funding for critical programs.

We are not talking about "duplicative" or "wasteful" spending. We are talking about Title I education funding that gives poor students after-school support that helps them

reach their full potential; GOP cuts would leave over 332,000 students in California without extra academic support.

We are talking about Title II education funds that keep class sizes small and classrooms more focused; GOP cuts would lay off over 1,000 teachers in California, resulting in dramatically larger class sizes for students in my district.

And this is just one example of the effect that Republican budget cuts would have in one state and in one area. Imagine how devastating the cumulative effect of Republicans' blind, across the board cuts. We are not talking about stripping funding for "bridges to nowhere"—we are talking about real people; real lives; real families.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to cut spending, let's not do so blindly. Let's have a bipartisan conversation about what our spending priorities are and where we can afford to trim the budget. I am certain that we can come to some agreement if we at least allow a conversation to be had. Deficit reduction is one of Democrats' top priorities. But we owe it to the American people to do so responsibly.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H. Res. 38.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today our national debt is \$14,062,239,904,820.69.

On January 6th, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was \$10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by \$3,423,814,158,526.89 since then.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

HONORING ROSEMARIE DUERTA HUGGINS FOR HER SERVICE TO THE CABRILLO CIVIC CLUBS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rosemarie Duerta Huggins for her outstanding leadership and service as the 2010 President of Cabrillo Civic Clubs of California, Inc.

Rosemarie is a long-standing civic leader in California's Portuguese community. Upon joining Cabrillo Civic Club #10 Fresno County in 1967, Rosemarie embraced the mission of the Clubs, which is to be dedicated to the progress of California in memory of Portuguese compatriot, Joao Rodrigues Cabrilho, discoverer of California; to observe September 28 of each year as "Cabrillo Day"; to erect and maintain appropriate memorials, shrines and landmarks of Portuguese navigators who discovered and explored California; to teach

and foster Americanization; to promote scholarships; and encourage better education and to perpetuate the achievements of their pioneer forefathers in the Golden State.

As president, Rosemarie served the Clubs' membership and communities of California with exemplary service. Her dedication led to expansion of the Clubs' charitable services and programs, including organizing blood drives, coordinating fundraising efforts for polio and cancer research, and assisting candidates for U.S. citizenship. During Rosemarie's tenure, the Clubs also awarded approximately 157 deserving students of Portuguese descent with \$500 scholarships for higher education.

Prior to her service as state president, Rosemarie served in several capacities to help advance the Clubs' mission, including assuming the role of president of the Club's Fresno County Chapter from 1992 to 1993. Through her chairmanship on program and fundraising committees, Rosemarie was also highly instrumental in fostering awareness of the Club's founding principles including supporting scholarship and education, Americanization, and participation in civic affairs in the local community and across California. In addition to her years of service with the California Cabrillo Civic Clubs of California, Inc., Rosemarie has successfully attended to the needs of her household, her career at Children's Hospital Central California, and her duties as an active member of the Portuguese Lodge SPRSI and Clovis Hills Community Church.

Rosemarie lives by the conviction that "It is up to us to keep our heritage alive so it will not perish." Her leadership and dedication is highly commendable and should serve as an example for all of us to follow. I ask my colleagues to rise with me to honor Rosemarie Duerta Huggins for her many contributions and countless efforts that have kept the Portuguese legacy vibrant in communities across California and our great nation.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE RICHARD
FIELDS

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a trailblazing legal professional and one of my mentors, Judge Richard Fields.

Judge Fields is being honored on February 10, 2011, by the Center for Heirs Property Preservation with the Commitment to Justice Award. Although I cannot be there in person due to Congressional obligations, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without adding my personal recognition of this remarkable man.

Judge Richard E. Fields has a story not unlike that of many African Americans born in the segregated South. He was born and raised in Charleston, South Carolina to parents who spent their youth working in the fields, unable to earn more than a fourth grade education. Yet that didn't stop them from wanting a better life for their son.

Judge Fields left home in 1940, and went to West Virginia State College, now University, where he earned a BS in Business Administration. In 1944 he entered the Howard University Law School and graduated with a law degree in 1947.

Two years later, Judge Fields returned to his hometown and became the first African American to open a law office in Charleston since the early 1900s and he had the distinction of becoming the first black litigator.

After distinguishing himself over two decades as an outstanding legal advocate, he was elected in 1969 as a Municipal Judge for the City of Charleston. He served in that position until 1975, when he was elected Judge of the Family Court of Charleston County. Five years later, he was elected Judge of the Circuit Courts of South Carolina where he remained until his retirement in 1992.

In retirement, Judge Fields has been very active in the legal community. He was a member of the Committee to Establish the School of Law and now serves on the Advisory Committee to the Charleston School of Law which was established in 2004.

In 1952, Judge Fields joined the Claflin College, now University, Board of Trustees, where he served for more than 50 years. In 1992, the Richard E. Fields and Myrtle E. Fields Scholarship was established at Claflin to provide financial assistance to students of merit.

Throughout his career, Judge Fields has served on numerous boards and committees in both the public and private sectors. In 1980, he along with several businessmen, established the Liberty National Bank, and he served on its Board of Directors for a number of years.

After returning to Charleston to practice law, Judge Fields resumed his membership in historic Centenary Methodist Church. He was elected Treasurer of that congregation in approximately 1950, and held that position for more than 50 years. He has been the Church's delegate to the South Carolina Annual Conference for more than 50 years. In 1970, Judge Fields was elected to the General Board of Finance and Administration, the corporate body of the Church.

He has been honored by the local chapter of "100 Black Men" and by the American Board of Trial Advocates which established "The Richard E. Fields Civility Award" to be given annually to a judge or attorney embodying his high standards of decency, civility, and equanimity. West Virginia State University also honored him in 2009 as the Alumnus of the Year.

In addition to all his public accolades, I must add my personal commendation to Judge Fields. I often recount the story of when I was a young man just out of college intent on changing the world from my place in Charleston, Judge Fields gave me advice that I will never forget. He reminded me of the story of the three little pigs and the wolf that huffed and puffed and couldn't blow their brick house down. Judge Fields equated the obstacles that had been built to keep African Americans out to the brick house. He told me, "You got to get inside. You can't change things from outside no matter how well-meaning you may be." Judge Fields words helped me to define my political philosophy, and that is how I have come to build a career as a public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in celebrating the transformative work of The Honorable Richard Fields. His life story is an example of overcoming obstacles with integrity and leadership. He continues, through his work with the Center for Heirs Property Preservation, higher education insti-

tutions, his church and his legal profession, to promote opportunity and justice for all. Judge Fields is a South Carolina and a national treasure, who is very deserving of this recognition.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SBIR ENHANCEMENT ACT, THE SBTT ENHANCEMENT ACT, AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION ACT

HON. MAZIE K. HIRONO

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce three bills that will strengthen the existing Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Program by increasing the percentage of federal funding that goes to these important programs and increasing the size of the grants, which have significantly declined in real value since they were last authorized. The bills are H.R. 448, the Small Business Innovation Enhancement Act; H.R. 447, the SBIR Enhancement Act; and H.R. 449, the SBTT Enhancement Act.

Small companies, like Cellular Bio-engineering, Oceanit, and Archinoetics in Hawaii are a source of great innovative talent. However, too many great ideas never come to fruition because small entrepreneurial firms lack the resources they need to test an idea and bring it to fruition. The Small Business Innovation Research, SBIR, Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer, SBTT, Program have proven track records.

The SBIR Program, for instance, has awarded some \$16 billion in awards since 1983. Some 1.45 million people are employed in SBIR firms and these firms have 450,000 employees with graduate degrees in engineering and science—more than all U.S. academic institutions combined.

However, the number of new firms entering into the SBIR program has declined drastically in recent years. Part of the reason is the difficulty in applying for grants and the fact that the grant maximum amount for Phase I of the program was limited to \$100,000. My bill doubles that amount to \$200,000. Phase I funding is used to explore the scientific, technical, and commercial feasibility of an idea or technology.

Phase II funding, previously limited to a maximum of \$750,000, is increased to \$1.5 million in my bill. Phase II awards are given to companies that successfully complete phase I and can be used for R&D work as the developer moves to commercializing their invention.

The Small Business Technology Transfer Program or SBTT is very similar to SBIR, but the grants are specifically designed to fund public/private collaborations between nonprofit research institutions and small businesses that want to develop commercial applications for technologies developed by those institutions. The SBTT program uses the same Phase I and Phase II funding formula as SBIR. Eligible nonprofit research institutions include U.S.-based nonprofit colleges or universities, domestic nonprofit research organizations, and federally funded R&D centers. The University of Hawaii would be an eligible institution for SBTT grants.

Last year, when the House prohibited Members of Congress from seeking earmarks for private companies, I worried about the effect this would have on small high technology companies in Hawaii and throughout the country. I've been so impressed by the innovative scientists and engineers I've met and have proudly sought earmarks in the past to further their work. In the absence of earmarks, I believe that strengthening the SBIR and SBTT programs is our best chance to provide the opportunities these creative entrepreneurs need to create new businesses and products that will provide good jobs, strengthen our economy, and improve our quality of life.

In his State of the Union address last night, President Obama highlighted the importance of encouraging private sector innovation to spur economic growth and exports. Passing my bills to strengthen SBIR and SBTT would be a good first step.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ASSESSMENT ACCURACY AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2011

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, as Congress considers the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act this year, we have an obligation to listen closely to the students, parents, and educators that we represent to ensure that our efforts result in responsible and pragmatic improvements. While we have made great strides in the areas of assessment and accountability over the last nine years, this reauthorization provides a critical opportunity to learn from our experiences and fine-tune the law.

One example of a lesson my constituents have learned, and have vigorously shared with me, is that we should be encouraging states to move towards better assessment models. As I have met with educators over the past several years, one of the primary concerns that I have heard is that the state assessment fails to provide information of value to educators and administrators. Even more disturbing, it often takes four to six months before scores are returned to schools, which leaves little or no time for teachers to use the information to address student performance before they advance to the next grade.

However, I believe there is a sensible solution that Congress can adopt to address these concerns and give states more options in assessment design. Today, Rep. DAVID WU and I are introducing the bipartisan Assessment Accuracy and Improvement Act of 2011 to give states the option to use adaptive testing as their statewide assessment measuring reading, math, and science to fulfill No Child Left Behind requirements. I believe that this legislation will give states the ability to truly track the academic growth of every child and provide more accurate information to teachers, parents and school administrators through the use of an adaptive test.

For those who may be unfamiliar with adaptive testing, it is a test that changes in response to previously-asked questions. For example, if a student answers a question correctly, the test presents a question of in-

creased difficulty. If a student answers incorrectly, the test presents a question of decreased difficulty. As you can see, an adaptive test customizes itself to a student's actual level of performance with a great degree of accuracy.

Giving states the flexibility to use an adaptive test and to ask questions outside of grade level will improve the accuracy of student assessment and enable educators to target appropriate instruction for each child based on performance at, above, or below grade level. In addition, using an adaptive test over time will allow accurate measurement of the performance growth of each individual student.

In Wisconsin, hundreds of school districts currently use their own funds to participate in adaptive testing in addition to the state assessment required by NCLB. Educators and administrators appreciate the diagnostic information it yields and the efficiency that it provides. I believe that school districts nationally are already "speaking with their wallets" by spending scarce resources to voluntarily participate in this testing because it provides valuable information that the state assessment does not.

Additionally, 30 states are currently participating in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, SBAC, one of the two state assessment consortia to receive funding under Race to the Top. SBAC is developing a researched-based computer adaptive test aligned to the common core standards. This legislation will ensure that these states will be able to fully utilize the capabilities of this next assessment.

Mr. Speaker, adaptive testing is one of the keys to putting the 'child' back into No Child Left Behind. I hope that our colleagues will join us in this pragmatic and responsible improvement to the law as we work towards a bipartisan reauthorization this year.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 242

HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, for the last few years, national forests throughout California have been in the process of implementing the Forest Service's 2005 Travel Management Rule, TMR. As a result, many national forests have proposed to reduce off-highway vehicle, OHV, access by 90 percent or more, in addition to restricting use on so-called maintenance-level 3, ML-3, roads by classifying them as "highways."

Throughout the travel management process, recreational users and local governments provided substantive documentation and comments to address safety issues and other concerns with this flawed policy. Despite the best efforts of these elected officials and pro-access groups, their comments were all but ignored as the Forest Service moved forward with the TMR. For these reasons, and given the significant economic damage this rule will cause to recreational communities throughout California, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 242, to restrict funding to the Forest Service to continue implementing the TMR in the State of California until the agency develops a more balanced and workable OHV policy.

Repeated requests for the Forest Service to change course within its own authority have gone unanswered. This legislation will help ensure that this agency is being held accountable to the public it is required to serve instead of using their tax dollars to restrict access to their Federal lands. I would encourage you to support H.R. 242.

JOB CREATION, ECONOMIC RECOVERY, AND DEBT REDUCTION

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as the 112th Congress goes to work on the policies and actions needed to move America forward, Democrats continue to make job creation, economic recovery and debt reduction the top priorities. Unfortunately, the first actions by the new Republican Majority are not consistent with these priorities.

These goals should be accomplished in a way that is aligned with the needs of working families—what will generate good jobs for working people; what will ease the burden for middle class families; what will create long-term economic growth for everyone. Democrats measure everything Congress does by these goals.

In the 37th district of California, things are improving, but unemployment and foreclosure rates are still well above the national average; this is the time to keep moving forward with policies tailored to help working families. Now is not the time to move backwards to policies that got us into this recession in the first place.

The Republicans have employed a lot of rhetoric about jobs and the economy; however, their first actions in control of the House show no follow through. The initial issues being pursued by the GOP are:

The repeal of Health Care Reform. Republicans knew the repeal would go nowhere in the Senate, but still insisted upon wasting valuable time that could have been spent on job creation.

The Republicans have offered what they call a "Budget Resolution"—but what should be called a "Budgetless Resolution" because it contains no numbers, no specifics and, worst of all, no ideas for job creation or economic recovery.

The Budgetless Resolution is a one-page document that makes the vague goal of reducing federal spending to 2008 levels. This budgetless resolution opens the door to reckless slashes in funding to programs that are critical to our fragile economic recovery.

In California alone, Republicans' blind budget slashing would cut 237 million from Title I funding for poor students. The cuts would leave over 332,000 poor students in California without additional academic support that helps them perform to their full potential in school and, ultimately, achieve their dreams and goals; this does not help us stay competitive in the global marketplace. And this is just one example of Republican cuts in one area in one state. Imagine the damage that Republicans' across the board, reckless cuts will do to our economic recovery.

This is not the smart way to manage the budget. It is worse than arbitrary; it is like

budgeting with blindfolds on. It gives no thought, no reasons and no real discussion on how the cuts would be made and what the ramifications would be.

Democrats believe that jobs and the economy should be the top priorities and everything we do is measured against those goals. Republicans are failing the test.

REDUCING NON-SECURITY SPENDING TO FISCAL YEAR 2008 LEVELS OR LESS

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 2011

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the irresponsible budget resolution under consideration by the House.

My priorities in the new Congress remain supporting middle class families and helping to foster job creation. These goals should be how we in Congress measure every action we take. Unfortunately the budget resolution before us today fails to meet these goals and is little more than a not-so-shrewd act of political theater staged hours before the President delivers the State of the Union in this chamber.

The resolution, which authorizes the Budget Committee chairman to cut non-security federal spending to 2008 levels, is an insincere attempt at fiscal responsibility. Getting our nation's fiscal house in order is a task I and many of my colleagues take seriously. However, rather than setting a concrete plan for how Congress should spend taxpayer dollars, this resolution contains no hard numbers. Moreover, this resolution would take the unprecedented and undemocratic step of empowering one Member of Congress with the ability to identify which programs to cut and by how much.

One example of how this resolution will hurt middle-class Americans is by cutting the Pell Grant program. Pell Grants help working-class Americans afford a college education. Since 2008, Congress increased wisely the Pell Grant to \$5,550. Should this ill-conceived resolution pass, Pell Grants could be cut by nearly 25 percent.

For America's economy to remain competitive in the coming years, Congress must make wise investments of taxpayer dollars. Pell Grants are just one of many of these wise investments. Allowing one Member of Congress to cut capriciously from federal programs while claiming to be fiscally responsible is anything but.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this budget resolution.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 27, 2011 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 1

- 10 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings to examine the U.S. economic outlook. SD-608
- Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the American Medical Isotopes Production Act of 2011. SD-366
- Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine Iraq, focusing on transitioning to a civilian mission. SD-419

- Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine foreclosure mediation programs, focusing on if bankruptcy courts can limit homeowner and investor losses. SD-226

- 2:30 p.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Contracting Oversight Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine improving Federal contract auditing. SD-342

FEBRUARY 2

- 10 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings to examine tax reform, focusing on fiscal responsibility. SD-608
- Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing to examine public health and drinking water issues. SD-406
- Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine catastrophic preparedness, focusing on FEMA. SD-342
- Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. SD-226
- 2 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations. SD-226

FEBRUARY 3

- 9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the energy and oil market outlook for the 112th Congress. SD-366

FEBRUARY 16

- 9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the U.S. Department of Energy's budget for fiscal year 2012. SD-366

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S249–S294

Measures Introduced: Twenty-three bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 188–210, S.J. Res. 3, S. Res. 26–27, and S. Con. Res. 4.

Pages S271–72

Measures Passed:

Tragedy in Tucson Resolution: By a unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. 1), Senate agreed to S. Res. 14, honoring the victims and heroes of the shooting on January 8, 2011 in Tucson, Arizona.

Pages S255–60

Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act: Senate passed H.R. 366, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Page S261

Recognizing the Anniversary of the Earthquake in Haiti: Senate agreed to S. Res. 26, recognizing the anniversary of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, honoring those who lost their lives in that earthquake, and expressing continued solidarity with the Haitian people.

Pages S261–63

Appointments:

Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, pursuant to Public Law 111–25, announced the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission for the life of the commission:

The Honorable Orrin Hatch of Utah vice Robert Bennett.

Page S263

Congressional Budget Office: For the information of the Senate, the Chair made the following announcement:

The President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Douglas W. Elmendorf as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2015.

Page S263

Rules Change Resolutions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader after consultation with the Republican Leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following resolutions, en bloc: A Wyden-Grassley-McCaskill resolution relative to “secret holds” which is at the desk; A Udall (CO) resolution regarding waiving the reading of an amendment, which is at the desk; S. Res. 8 (Harkin); S. Res. 10 (Udall (NM)) with a substitute amendment which is at the desk; and S. Res. 21 (Merkley) with a substitute amendment which is at the desk; that there be up to 8 hours of debate equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, for the purpose of debating these resolutions concurrently; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the substitute amendment to S. Res. 10 be agreed to and the substitute amendment to S. Res. 21 be agreed to; the Senate then vote on or in relation to the resolutions in the order listed above, with no intervening action or debate; that the following resolutions be subject to a 60 vote threshold for adoption: Wyden-Grassley-McCaskill resolution; and Udall (CO) resolution; that the following remaining resolutions be subject to a threshold of two-thirds of those voting for adoption: S. Res. 8; S. Res. 10, as amended; and S. Res. 21, as amended; that there be no amendments, motions, or points of order in order to any of these resolution prior to the vote on or in relation to the resolution, except for the substitute amendments to S. Res. 10 and S. Res. 21, listed above; provided further, that if a resolution fails to achieve the listed threshold for adoption, it be returned to its previous status.

Page S265

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d’Ivoire; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–3)

Pages S267–68

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaty:

Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Swiss Confederation (Treaty Doc. No. 112-1).

The treaty was transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

Page S292

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Henry F. Floyd, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Michael Charles Green, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York.

Ramona Villagomez Manglona, of the Northern Mariana Islands, to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands for a term of ten years.

J. Paul Oetken, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Nelva Gonzales Ramos, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

V. Natasha Perdew Silas, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Linda T. Walker, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

Eric L. Hirschhorn, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration.

Mario Cordero, of California, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2014.

Philip E. Coyle III, of California, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Scott C. Doney, of Massachusetts, to be Chief Scientist of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Rebecca F. Dye, of North Carolina, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 2015.

Donald M. Berwick, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Alan D. Bersin, of California, to be Commissioner of Customs, Department of Homeland Security.

Michael F. Mundaca, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Michael W. Punke, of Montana, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the Rank of Ambassador.

Islam A. Siddiqui, of Virginia, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

Juan F. Vasquez, of Texas, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Richard Sorian, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Timothy Charles Scheve, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board for a term expiring September 14, 2015.

Matthew J. Bryza, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Azerbaijan (Recess Appointment).

Robert Stephen Ford, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic (Recess Appointment).

Norman L. Eisen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic (Recess Appointment).

George Albert Krol, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Francis Joseph Ricciardone, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey (Recess Appointment).

David Lee Carden, of New York, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Katherine M. Gehl, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2013.

Roberto R. Herencia, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2012.

Matthew Maxwell Taylor Kennedy, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2012.

Paul M. Tiao, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor.

Agnes Gund, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2016.

John A. Lancaster, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for the remainder of the term expiring September 19, 2011.

John A. Lancaster, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

Judith A. Ansley, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States

Institute of Peace for the remainder of the term expiring September 19, 2011.

Judith A. Ansley, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

Craig Becker, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of five years expiring December 16, 2014.

Jonathan Andrew Hatfield, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service.

Phyllis Nichamoff Segal, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2013.

Lisa M. Quiroz, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring February 8, 2014.

John D. Podesta, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2014.

Matthew Francis McCabe, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2013.

Marguerite W. Kondracke, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring June 10, 2014.

Jane D. Hartley, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2014.

Richard Christman, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for the remainder of the term expiring October 6, 2012.

Rafael Borrás, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

William J. Boarman, of Maryland, to be Public Printer (Recess Appointment).

Winslow Lorenzo Sargeant, of Wisconsin, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

Heather A. Higginbottom, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Katharine G. Abraham, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

David S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

9 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Army and Navy.

Pages S293–94

Messages from the House: Page S268

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Page S268

Measures Read the First Time: Page S268

Executive Communications: Pages S268–71

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S272–73

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S273–91

Additional Statements: Pages S266–67

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Pages S291–92

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S292

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—1) Page S259

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned, in accordance with S. Res. 14, at 8:29 p.m., until 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 27, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S292.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE BP DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL SPILL AND OFFSHORE DRILLING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the report and recommendations, including any recommendations for legislative action, issued by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, after receiving testimony from former Senator Bob Graham, Miami Lakes, Florida, and William K. Reilly, San Francisco, California, both Co-Chairs, National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling.

TRANSPORTATION'S ROLE IN THE ECONOMY AND JOB CREATION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine transportation's role in supporting the economy and job creation, after receiving testimony from Susan Martinovich, Nevada Department of Transportation, Carson City, on behalf of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO); Raymond J. Poupore, National Construction Alliance II (NCA II), Washington, D.C.; Wayne Johnson, Owens Corning, Toledo, Ohio, on behalf of the National Industrial Transportation League (NITL); and William Dorey, Watsonville,

California, on behalf of Granite Construction Incorporated.

PROTECTING AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting American taxpayers,

focusing on accomplishments and ongoing challenges in the fight against fraud, after receiving testimony from Lanny A. Breuer, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, and Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, both of the Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 72 public bills, H.R. 447–518; and 15 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 13; and H. Res. 57–71, were introduced.

Pages H506–10

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H513

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Reducing Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions: The House passed H.R. 359, to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions, by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 160 nays, Roll No. 25.

Pages H482–83, H483–99

Rejected the Walz (MN) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 173 yeas to 228 nays, Roll No. 24.

Pages H496–99

Agreed to:

Peters amendment (No. 1 printed in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2011) that adds language to the bill stipulating that all amounts in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund after the date of the enactment of the legislation shall be transferred by the Secretary to the general fund of Treasury only if used to reduce the deficit (by a recorded vote of 396 yeas to 7 noes, Roll No. 23).

Pages H492–93, H496

Withdrawn:

Castor amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of January 25, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have transferred funds in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to the Office of Justice programs to provide for local law enforcement costs of providing security at Presidential nominating conventions;

Page H493

Tsongas amendment (No. 4 printed in the Congressional Record of January 25, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have

added at the end of the bill a new section entitled “Prohibition on the Use of Federal Funds for Presidential Campaign and Lobbying Activities”; and

Pages H493–94

Moore amendment (No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record of January 25, 2011) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have struck all after the enacting clause and inserted new text.

Page H494

Point of Order sustained against:

Polis amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of January 5, 2011) that sought to strike all after the enacting clause and insert new text.

Pages H494–96

H. Res. 54, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, was agreed to by voice vote after the previous question was ordered by a ye-a-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 22.

Pages H475–82

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Zoe Lofgren, wherein she resigned from the Committee on Ethics, effective today.

Pages H499–H500

Committee Leave of Absence: Read a letter from Representative Shuler wherein he notified the House that he is taking a leave of absence from the Committee on Small Business.

Page H500

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 62, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Page H500

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Representatives Ruppertsberger, Thompson (CA), Schakowsky, Langevin, Schiff, Boren, Gutierrez, and Chandler.

Page H500

Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker’s appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Representatives Sam Johnson (TX) and LaTourette.

Page H500

United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Representative Turner, Chairman; Representatives Shimkus, Shuster, Miller (FL), Emerson, Granger, and Bilirakis. **Page H500**

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House Democracy Partnership: Representative Dreier, Chairman; Representatives Fortenberry, Biggert, Conaway, Buchanan, Boustany, Wilson (SC), Roskam, Crenshaw, and Diaz-Balart. **Page H500**

Director of the Congressional Budget Office—Appointment: The Chair announced the joint appointment by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of Dr. Douglas W. Elmendorf as Director of the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2015. **Page H500**

Joint Economic Committee—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee: Representative Brady (TX), Chairman; Representatives Burgess, Campbell, Duffy, Amash, and Mulvaney. **Page H501**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H483.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 3 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. **Page H505**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H481–82, H496, H498, and H499. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and at 2:56 p.m., pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 1, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 8, 2011.

Committee Meetings

DOD BUDGET REDUCTIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on proposed Department of Defense budget reductions and efficiencies initiatives. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: William Lynn, Deputy Secretary; GEN Peter W. Chiarelli, USA, Vice Chief of Staff; ADM Jonathan W. Greenert, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations; GEN Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., USMC, Assistant Com-

mandant; GEN Phillip M. Breedlove, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff.

HEALTH CARE LAW—FISCAL CONSEQUENCE; COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on the Budget: Held a hearing on the Fiscal Consequences of the Health Care Law. Testimony was heard from Richard S. Foster, Chief Actuary, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; Dennis G. Smith, Secretary, Department of Health Services, State of Wisconsin; and public witnesses.

Prior to the hearing, the Committee met for organizational purposes. Committee approved an oversight plan for the 112th Congress.

AMERICAN WORKFORCE STATE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on the State of the American Workforce. Testimony was heard from Robert F. McDonnell, Governor, State of Virginia; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

REGULATORY REFORM—ADMINISTRATION VIEWS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "The Views of the Administration on Regulatory Reform." Testimony was heard from Cass Sunstein, Director, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND JOB PROMOTION

Committee on Financial Services: Held a hearing on Promoting Economic Recovery and Job Creation: The Road Forward. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Homeland Security: Met for organizational purposes. Committee adopted its rules of procedure and agreed to an oversight plan for the 112th Congress.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 394, Federal Courts Jurisdiction and Venue Clarification Act of 2011; H.R. 398, To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to toll, during active-duty service abroad in the Armed Forces, the periods of time to file a petition and appear for an interview to remove the conditional basis for permanent resident status; H.R. 386, Securing Aircraft Cockpits Against Lasers Act of 2011; H.R. 368, Removal Clarification Act of 2001, and H.R.

347, Federal Restricted Buildings and Grounds Improvement Act of 2011.

ICE WORKSITE ENFORCEMENT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement held a hearing on ICE Worksite Enforcement—Up to the Job? Testimony was heard from Kumar C. Kibble, Deputy Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION; BP DEEPWATER HORIZON OIL SPILL

Committee on Natural Resources: Met for organizational purposes. Committee adopted its rules of procedure and agreed to an oversight plan for the 112th Congress.

The committee also held an oversight hearing on the report by the President's National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling. Testimony was heard from Bob Graham, former Senator of Florida and William K. Reilly, former Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, both Co-Chairmen of the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling.

BAILOUTS AND THE FORECLOSURE CRISIS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Held a hearing on Bailouts and the Foreclosure Crisis: Report of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program ("SIGTARP"). Testimony was heard from Neil Barofsky, Special; Inspector General, Troubled Asset Relief Program; and Tim Massad, Acting Assistant Secretary, Financial Stability and Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Small Business: Met for organizational purposes. Committee adopted its rules of procedure and agreed to an oversight plan for the 112th Congress.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Met for organizational purposes. Committee adopted its rules of procedure and agreed to an oversight plan for the 112th Congress.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Met for organizational purposes. Committee adopted its rules of procedure and agreed to an oversight plan for the 112th Congress.

HEALTH CARE LAWS' IMPACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on the impact of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care Laws on JOBS, Employers, and the Economy. Testimony was heard from Austan Goolsbee, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors; Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former Director, CBO; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: To hold hearings to examine the results of the investigation by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force into the release of proprietary data in the KC-X competition, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on the Budget: To hold hearings to examine the budget and economic outlook for fiscal years 2011–2021, 10 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on European Affairs, to hold hearings to examine crackdown in Belarus, focusing on responding to the Lukashenko regime, 2:15 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: To hold hearings to examine the Affordable Care Act, focusing on the impact of health insurance reform on health care consumers, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Disaster Recovery, to hold hearings to examine claims and social services in the aftermath of Deepwater Horizon oil spill, 1:30 p.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: Business meeting to consider S. 23, to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform, and the nominations of James E. Graves, Jr., of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, Amy Totenberg, and Steve C. Jones, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, James Emanuel Boasberg, and Amy Berman Jackson, both to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, Paul Kinloch Holmes III, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, Anthony J. Battaglia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Edward J. Davila, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Diana Saldana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Max Oliver Cogburn, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, and Marco A. Hernandez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, 10 a.m., SD-226.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10:30 a.m., Thursday, January 27

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Tuesday, February 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of the rules change resolutions, and after a period of debate, Senators should expect a series of up to 5 roll call votes on or in relation to resolutions to change the Senate rules beginning around 7:15 p.m.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the Democratic caucus meeting.)

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barton, Joe, Tex., E132
 Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E125
 Braley, Bruce L., Iowa, E123
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E121
 Carney, John C., Jr., Del., E126
 Chu, Judy, Calif., E123
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E133
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E133
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E125, E133
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E125, E130
 Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E122
 Garamendi, John, Calif., E121, E123, E126, E128, E131

Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E130
 Gardner, Cory, Colo., E121
 Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E126
 Herger, Wally, Calif., E132, E135
 Hirono, Mazie K., Hawaii, E134
 Holt, Rush D., N.J., E135
 Larson, John B., Conn., E129
 Latham, Tom, Iowa, E122, E123, E124, E124
 Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E128
 Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E127, E129, E131
 Lucas, Frank D., Okla., E115
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E132
 Miller, Jeff, Fla., E126, E127
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E127

Paul, Ron, Tex., E128
 Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E127
 Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E134
 Richardson, Laura, Calif., E132, E135
 Ross, Mike, Ark., E130
 Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E124
 Shuler, Heath, N.C., E131
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E128
 Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E129
 Tierney, John F., Mass., E124
 Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E124, E125, E126, E126
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E132
 Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E122



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at www.gpo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office, Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.