

S. 398

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 398, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to improve energy efficiency of certain appliances and equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to ban the sale of certain synthetic drugs.

S. 424

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 424, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to ambulance services under the Medicare program.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to improve the safety of motorcoaches, and for other purposes.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 520, a bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to prohibit the Department of Justice from tracking and cataloguing the purchases of multiple rifles and shotguns.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 575, a bill to study the market and appropriate regulatory structure for electronic debit card transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 584

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 584, a bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues associated with recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes.

S. 593

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 593, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax rate for excise tax on investment income of private foundations.

S. 595

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 595, a bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to complete payments under such title to local educational agencies eligible for such payments within 3 fiscal years.

S. 633

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 183

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 183 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 197

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 197 proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 241

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 241 intended to be proposed to S. 493, a bill to reauthorize and improve the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 659. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect Medicare beneficiaries' access to home health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my colleague from

Washington in introducing legislation, the Home Health Care Access Protection Act of 2011, to prevent future unfair administrative cuts in Medicare home health payment rates.

Home health has become an increasingly important part of our health care system. The kinds of highly skilled and often technically complex services that our Nation's home health agencies provide have helped to keep families together and enabled millions of our most frail and vulnerable older and disabled persons to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and stay just where they want to be—in the comfort and security of their own homes. Moreover, by helping these individuals to avoid more costly institutional care, they are saving Medicare billions of dollars each year.

That is why I find it so ironic—and troubling—that the Medicare home health benefit continually comes under attack.

The health care reform bill signed into law by the President last year includes \$40 billion in cuts to home care over 10 years. Moreover, these cuts are a “double-whammy” because they come on top of \$25 billion in additional cuts to home health imposed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services through regulation in the last several years.

These cuts are particularly disproportionate for a program that costs Medicare less than \$20 billion a year. This simply is not right, and it certainly is not in the best interest of our nation's seniors who rely on home care to keep them out of hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions.

The payment rate cuts implemented and proposed by CMS are based on the assertion that home health agencies have intentionally “gamed the system” by claiming that their patients have conditions of higher clinical severity than they actually have in order to receive higher Medicare payments. This unfounded allegation of “case mix creep” is based on what CMS contends to be an increase in the average clinical assessment “score” of home health patients over the last few years.

In fact, there are very real clinical and policy explanations for why the average clinical severity of home care patients' health conditions may have increased over the years. For example, the incentives built into the hospital diagnosis-related group—or DRG—reimbursement system have led to the faster discharge of sicker patients. Advances in technology and changes in medical practice have also enabled home health agencies to treat more complicated medical conditions that previously could only be treated in hospitals, nursing homes, or inpatient rehabilitation facilities.

Moreover, this unfair payment rate cut is being assessed across the board, even for home health agencies that showed a decrease in their clinical assessment scores. If an individual home

health agency is truly gaming the system, CMS should target that one agency, not penalize everyone.

The research method, data and findings that CMS has used to justify the administrative cuts also raise serious concerns about the validity of the payment rate cuts. For example, while changes in the need for therapy services significantly affect the case mix “score,” the CMS research methodology disregards those changes in evaluating whether the patient population has changed. Moreover, the method by which CMS evaluates changes in case mix coding is not transparent, does not allow for true public participation, and is not performed in a manner that ensures accountability to Medicare patients and providers in terms of its validity and accuracy of outcomes.

The legislation we are introducing today will establish a reliable and transparent process for determining whether payment rate cuts are needed to account for improper changes in “case mix scoring” that are not related to changes in the nature of the patients served in home health care or the nature of the care they received. This process will still enable the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enact rate adjustments provided there is reliable evidence that higher case mix scores are resulting from factors other than changes in patient conditions. The legislation will also prevent the implementation of future Medicare payment rate cuts in home health until the Secretary is able to justify the payment cuts through the improved process set forth in the bill.

Home health care has consistently proven to be a compassionate and cost-effective alternative to institutional care. Additional deep cuts will be completely counterproductive to our efforts to control overall health care costs. The Home Health Care Access Protection Act of 2011 will help to ensure that our seniors and disabled Americans continue to have access to the quality home health services they deserve, and I encourage all of my colleagues to sign on as cosponsors.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 660. A bill to protect all patients by prohibiting the use of data obtained from comparative effectiveness research to deny or delay coverage of items or services under Federal health care programs and to ensure that comparative effectiveness research accounts for advancements in personalized medicine and differences in patient treatment response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KYL. 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. 660

*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 “Preserving Access to Targeted, Individualized, and Effective New Treatments and Services (PATIENTS) Act of 2011” or the “PATIENTS Act of 2011”.

**SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN USES OF DATA OBTAINED FROM COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH; ACCOUNTING FOR PERSONALIZED MEDICINE AND DIFFERENCES IN PATIENT TREATMENT RESPONSE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(1) shall not use data obtained from the conduct of comparative effectiveness research, including such research that is conducted or supported using funds appropriated under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5) or authorized or appropriated under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), to deny or delay coverage of an item or service under a Federal health care program (as defined in section 1128B(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7b(f))); and

(2) shall ensure that comparative effectiveness research conducted or supported by the Federal Government accounts for factors contributing to differences in the treatment response and treatment preferences of patients, including patient-reported outcomes, genomics and personalized medicine, the unique needs of health disparity populations, and indirect patient benefits.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or the Public Health Service Act.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 665. A bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Selecting Employment Clusters to Organize Regional Success, SECTORS, Act, which Senator SHERROD BROWN and I are introducing. This legislation would amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish an industry or sector partnership grant program administered by the Department of Labor.

The SECTORS Act provides grants to industry clusters—interrelated group of businesses, service providers, and associated institutions—in order to establish and expand sector partnerships. By providing financial assistance to these partnerships, this legislation would create customized workforce training solutions for specific industries at a regional level. A sector approach is beneficial because it can focus on the dual goals of promoting the long-term competitiveness of industries and advancing employment opportunities for workers, thereby encouraging economic growth. Existing sector partnerships have long been rec-

ognized as key strategic elements within some of the most successful economic development initiatives throughout the country. Unfortunately, current federal policy does not provide sufficient support for these critical ventures.

As Co-Chair of the bipartisan Senate Task Force on Manufacturing, one of my key goals is to ensure that manufacturers have access to a capable workforce. Unfortunately, manufacturers across the country have raised significant concerns about whether the next generation of workers is being trained to meet the needs of an increasingly high-tech workplace.

In fact, in my home State of Maine, the manufacturing sector has shed an alarming 26,200 jobs in the past ten years, or 1/3 of the State’s manufacturing employment. And since the beginning of 1990, our state has lost 43,000 jobs. It is therefore critical that we as a Nation provide unemployed manufacturing workers the training needed to excel as our manufacturing sector becomes increasingly technical. This legislation provides a crucial link between establishing worker training programs and fostering new employment opportunities for those who have been affected by the manufacturing industry’s decline. By promoting this innovative partnership, we will take a crucial step toward rejuvenating our economy.

Throughout the country, sector partnerships are being used to promote the long-term competitiveness of industries and to advance employment opportunities. For example, the State of Maine has created the North Star Alliance Initiative. The Alliance has brought together Maine’s boat builders, the University of Maine’s Advanced Engineered Wood Composites Centers, Maine’s marine and composite trade association, economic development groups, and investment organizations for the purpose of advancing workforce training.

Our Nation’s capacity to innovate is a key reason why our economy, despite difficult times, remains the envy of the world. Ideas by innovative Americans across the spectrums of professions and industries have paid enormous dividends, improving the lives of millions throughout the world. We must continue to encourage all avenues for advancing our nation’s economic well-being if America is to compete at the vanguard of innovation. The SECTORS Act will help align America’s workforce with the needs of our Nation’s employers to promote a robust and growing economy.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 666. A bill to require a report on the establishment of a Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center or Polytrauma Network Site of the Department of Veterans Affairs in the northern Rockies or Dakotas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 666

*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 “Veterans Traumatic Brain Injury Care Improvement Act of 2011”.

**SEC. 2. REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A POLYTRAUMA REHABILITATION CENTER OR POLYTRAUMA NETWORK SITE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN THE NORTHERN ROCKIES OR DAKOTAS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The States of the northern Rockies and the Dakotas are among those States in the United States with the highest per capita rates of veterans with injuries from military service in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(2) Traumatic brain injury (TBI) has become known as one of the “signature wounds” of military service in Iraq and Afghanistan due to its high occurrence among veterans of such service.

(3) A recent RAND Corporation study estimates that as many as 20 percent of the veterans of military service in Iraq and Afghanistan have a traumatic brain injury as a result of such service, and many of these veterans require ongoing care for mild, moderate, or severe traumatic brain injury.

(4) The Department of Veterans Affairs recommends that all veterans experiencing a polytraumatic injury be referred to a Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center or a Polytrauma Network Site.

(5) The Department of Veterans Affairs Polytrauma System of Care includes 4 Polytrauma Rehabilitation Centers and 22 Polytrauma Network Sites, none of which are located in North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Montana, eastern Washington, or Wyoming, an area that encompasses approximately 740,000 square miles.

(6) The vastness of this area imposes significant hardships on veterans residing in this area who require care within the Department of Veterans Affairs Polytrauma System of Care and wish to live close to home while receiving care within such system of care.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of establishing a Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center or Polytrauma Network Site for the Department of Veterans Affairs in the northern Rockies or the Dakotas. One of the locations evaluated as a potential location for the Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center or Polytrauma Network Site, as the case may be, shall be the Fort Harrison Department of Veterans Affairs hospital in Lewis and Clark County, Montana.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The report required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the adequacy of existing Department of Veterans Affairs facilities in the northern Rockies and the Dakotas to address matters that are otherwise addressed by Polytrauma Rehabilitation Centers and Polytrauma Network Sites.

(B) A comparative assessment of the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs for individuals with traumatic brain injuries in urban areas with the effectiveness of such

programs for individuals with traumatic brain injuries in rural and frontier communities.

(C) An assessment whether the low cost of living in the northern Rockies and the Dakotas could reduce the financial stress faced by veterans receiving care for traumatic brain injury and their families and thereby improve the effectiveness of such care.

(D) An assessment whether therapies that can prevent or remediate the development of secondary neurologic conditions related to traumatic brain injury can be interrupted by stress caused by living in an urban area.

(3) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with appropriate State and local government agencies in the northern Rockies and the Dakotas in preparing the report required by this subsection.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HATCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KYL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BURR, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 671. A bill to authorize the United States Marshals Service to issue administrative subpoenas in investigations relating to unregistered sex offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I seek recognition today to introduce and speak in favor of the Finding Fugitive Sex Offenders Act of 2011, which would give administrative subpoena authority to the Director of the U.S. Marshals Service for the investigation of sex offenders who have failed to register as required by the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act. The language of the bill is the product of bipartisan negotiations during the last Congress, which was included in a broader child crimes bill last year that passed both the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate, but did not become law.

To understand the need for this bill, it is important to understand the history of recent child crimes legislation in Congress. When the Adam Walsh Act, which I cosponsored, was enacted in July 2006 to create a more uniform and enforceable sex offender registry system, over 150,000 convicted sex offenders were believed to be unregistered and missing from the various state sex offender registries. A key component of the Walsh Act, one requested by John Walsh himself, was to give the U.S. Marshals Service primary enforcement authority to locate and arrest unregistered sex offenders who had crossed state lines or had earlier been convicted under federal law. The Walsh Act, however, did not provide the Marshals Service with administrative subpoena authority to perform these investigations, which can span jurisdictions and move quickly. The Finding Fugitive Sex Offenders Act will fix this gap in the law and grant the Marshals Service this long-needed authority.

It is very surprising that this authority does not already exist in light of

the hundreds of administrative subpoena authorities that are in place for various federal agencies, including the EPA, the DEA, the FBI, the CFTC, and even the Appalachian Regional Commission. In March 2006, the Congressional Research Service reported that “[t]here are now over 300 instances where federal agencies have been granted administrative subpoena power in one form or another.” In reality, that number is even higher. According to the Department of Justice’s 2002 Report to Congress on the Use of Administrative Subpoena Authorities by Executive Branch Agencies and Entities, the Office of Legal Policy “identified approximately 335 existing administrative subpoena authorities held by various executive branch entities under current law.” Most of these authorities are for civil enforcement or regulatory compliance—matters far less critical and time-sensitive than locating a fugitive sex offender who has intentionally evaded registering his location or place of employment to avoid detection by law enforcement.

There is no reason why the Marshals Service should not have this type of authority. In these fast-moving investigations across state lines, law enforcement simply cannot afford delays, especially on weekends and holidays when U.S. Attorney’s Offices are closed and grand jury subpoenas are unavailable. Assistant Attorney General Rachel Brand explained the delays and limitations of traditional grand jury subpoenas in fast-moving investigations when she testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee on another administrative subpoena proposal in June 2004:

Although grand jury subpoenas are a sufficient tool in many investigations, there are circumstances in which an administrative subpoena would save precious minutes or hours. . . . For example, the ability to use an administrative subpoena will eliminate delays caused by factors such as the unavailability of an Assistant United States Attorney to immediately issue a grand jury subpoena, especially in rural areas; the time it takes to contact an Assistant United States Attorney in the context of a time-sensitive investigation; the lack of a grand jury sitting at the moment the documents are needed (under federal law, the ‘return date’ for a grand jury subpoena must be on a day the grand jury is sitting); or the absence of an empaneled grand jury in the judicial district where the investigation is taking place, a rare circumstance that would prevent a grand jury subpoena from being issued at all.

The reality is that sex offenders often fail to register precisely so they can evade detection and move to a new place where they won’t face scrutiny. During the hearings and floor debates on the Adam Walsh Act, the Senate heard of the heart-breaking tragedies caused when sex offenders knowingly evaded registration so they could disappear from detection. Senators from Washington and Idaho went to the floor to describe the registry failures and disappearance of Joseph Duncan, who shortly after his release from custody in 2005, absconded from Minnesota

and traveled across the country to Idaho, where he kidnapped Dylan and Shasta Groene from their home in the middle of the night. In the course of the kidnapping, he murdered the children's mother, brother, and the mother's boyfriend by beating them to death with a framing hammer. He then took the children to remote campgrounds across the state line into Montana, where he brutally abused them and later killed Dylan. As one Senator explained during the debate: "Joseph Duncan was essentially lost by three States. He moved from State to State to avoid capture. No one knew where he was nor even how to look for him."

A similar tragic story involved the convicted sex offender who killed Florida 9-year-old Jessica Lunsford. John Couey had failed to tell authorities that he was living in a trailer just feet from Jessica's home. In 2005, he kidnapped Jessica from her bedroom and took her to his home where he raped and killed her. Ernie Allen, the President of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, cited Couey in his congressional testimony in support of the Walsh Act, explaining that he "was not where he was supposed to be and [his] presence was unknown to the police or Jessica's family even though he lived 150 yards down the street from her and had worked construction at her elementary school."

As the Lunsford and Groene cases demonstrate, some sex offenders evade the registry requirements because they want to offend again. In these cases, time is law enforcement's enemy. According to the Department of Justice's guide for families with missing children, "the actions of parents and of law enforcement in the first 48 hours are critical to the safe recovery of a missing child." The Lunsford case illustrates how vital it is for law enforcement to quickly locate sex offenders during a missing child investigation. John Couey reportedly told law enforcement that he kept young Jessica alive for three days before he smothered her inside a plastic trash bag. In a case like Jessica's, this type of authority literally could mean the difference between life and death.

This legislation has broad support. When I drafted this language last Congress, I shared it with the Marshals Service and lawyers who work in the field of protecting children from exploitation. These professionals were not only supportive, but also very clear about the need for this subpoena authority.

I strongly support this legislation and am thankful to the broad bipartisan group, including Senators BLUMENTHAL, HATCH, KLOBUCHAR, GRASSLEY, WHITEHOUSE, CORNYN, KYL, GRAHAM, LEE, COLLINS, THUNE, COBURN, BURR and CHAMBLISS, who have agreed to cosponsor this legislation. I hope the full Senate will take up and pass this legislation soon.

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. 671

*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 "Finding Fugitive Sex Offenders Act of 2011".

**SEC. 2. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY FOR THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.**

Section 566(e)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) issue administrative subpoenas in accordance with section 3486 of title 18 solely for the purpose of investigating unregistered sex offenders (as that term is defined in section 3486 of title 18)."

**SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE SUBPOENA STATUTE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3486(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i)(II), by striking "or" at the end;

(B) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(C) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

"(ii) an unregistered sex offender conducted by the United States Marshals Service, the Director of the United States Marshals Service; or"; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

"(D) As used in this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'Federal offense involving the sexual exploitation or abuse of children' means an offense under section 1201, 1591, 2241(c), 2242, 2243, 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423, in which the victim is an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years; and

"(ii) the term 'sex offender' means an individual required to register under the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.)."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3486(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)(A), by striking "United State" and inserting "United States";

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking "or (1)(A)(ii)" and inserting "or (1)(A)(iii)"; and

(3) in paragraph (10), by striking "paragraph (1)(A)(ii)" and inserting "paragraph (1)(A)(iii)".

By Mr. REID (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. THUNE, and Ms. SNOWE)):

S. 672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to extend the Section 45G short line freight railroad tax credit.

Section 45G creates an incentive for short lines to invest in track rehabilitation by providing a tax credit of 50 cents for every dollar spent on track improvements. If this credit is allowed to expire at the end of the year, pri-

vate-sector investments in infrastructure in our communities will fall by hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Short line" railroads are small freight rail companies responsible for bringing goods to communities that are not directly served by large railroads. Supporting small railroads allows the communities surrounding them to attract and maintain businesses and create jobs. The evidence of the success of this credit can be found in communities across America.

This credit has a real impact for the people of my state. West Virginia is the second biggest producer of railroad ties in the country. Since the credit first was enacted, approximately 750,000 railroad ties have been purchased above what would have otherwise been purchased with no incentive. Those railroad ties translate directly into jobs. This credit does not create just West Virginia jobs, it benefits manufacturers of ties, spikes, and rail all across America.

Over 12,000 rail customers across America depend on short lines. This credit creates a strong incentive for short lines to invest private sector dollars on private-sector freight railroad track rehabilitation and improvements. Shippers rely on the high quality service these railroads provide to get their goods to market. Unfortunately, this credit is scheduled to expire at the end of 2011.

This bill would extend the 45G credit through 2017 and provide the important long-term planning certainty necessary to maximize private-sector transportation infrastructure investment. 54 Members of this body sponsored legislation that extended this credit last Congress and I hope there will be similar support again this year.

I thank the Chair and ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation that will benefit small businesses throughout the country.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 111—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD REJECT ANY PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF A SYSTEM OF GLOBAL TAXATION AND REGULATION

Mr. VITTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 111

Whereas many proposals are pending in Congress—

(1) to increase taxes;

(2) to regulate businesses; and

(3) to continue runaway Government spending;

Whereas taxpayer funding has already financed major, on-going bailouts of the financial sector;

Whereas the proposed cap-and-trade system would result in trillions of dollars in new taxes and job-killing regulations;