

standing of United States as the world leader in medical device innovation.

S. 44

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) 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. 45

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 45, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the taxation of income of controlled foreign corporations attributable for imported property.

S. 81

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor 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. 82

At the request of Mr. JOHANNIS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 with respect to the expansion of the adoption credit and adoption assistance programs, to repeal the sunset of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act with respect to increased dollar limitations for such credit and programs, and to allow the adoption credit to be claimed in the year expenses are incurred, regardless of when the adoption becomes final.

S. 102

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 102, a bill to provide an optional fast-track procedure the President may use when submitting rescission requests, and for other purposes.

S. 136

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 136, a bill to establish requirements with respect to bisphenol A.

S. 185

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to provide United States assistance for the purpose of eradicating severe forms of trafficking in children in eligible countries through the implementation of

Child Protection Compacts, and for other purposes.

S. 211

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and performance of the Federal Government.

S. 228

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 228, a bill to preempt regulation of, action relating to, or consideration of greenhouse gases under Federal and common law on enactment of a Federal policy to mitigate climate change.

S. 239

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to support innovation, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, and for other purposes.

S. 281

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 281, a bill to delay the implementation of the health reform law in the United States until there is a final resolution in pending lawsuits.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S.J. RES. 3

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

S. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 27, a resolution designating January 26, 2011, as "National Kawasaki Disease Awareness Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 11

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 11 intended to be proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 14

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 14 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 32

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 32 proposed to S. 223, a bill to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 293. A bill to modify the authority to use Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for proliferation threat reduction projects and activities outside the states of the former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I introduce the Nunn-Lugar Global Cooperative Threat Reduction Improvement Act of 2011.

For many years, I have labored to ensure that the global Nunn-Lugar program has the flexibility it needs. Now that the global Nunn-Lugar program has begun to undertake important biological threat reduction campaigns in Africa and other regions, I believe the need has arisen to reexamine the authorities we have provided to the program to ensure that it can effectively implement projects around the globe. These projects protect the American people from nuclear, chemical and biological proliferation.

The record of the global Nunn-Lugar program has been impressive. The results now total: 7,599 strategic nuclear warheads deactivated; 791 intercontinental ballistic missiles, ICBMs, destroyed; 498 ICBM silos eliminated; 180

ICBM mobile launchers destroyed; 669 submarine launched ballistic missiles, SLBMs, eliminated; 492 SLBM launchers eliminated; 32 nuclear submarines capable of launching ballistic missiles destroyed; 155 bombers eliminated; 906 nuclear air-to-surface missiles, ASMs, destroyed; 194 nuclear test tunnels eliminated; and 507 nuclear weapons transport train shipments secured. We have also upgraded security at 24 nuclear weapons storage sites; built and equipped 20 biological monitoring stations; and neutralized 1,742 metric tons of Russian and Albanian chemical weapons agent.

In addition to authorities to operate worldwide, the global Nunn-Lugar program has been granted much needed flexibility in carrying out its mission. The global Nunn-Lugar program has been granted notwithstanding authority to spend up to 10 percent of annual program funds notwithstanding any other provision of law. The Secretary of Defense has the authority to accept funds from foreign governments and other entities to contribute to activities carried out under the global Nunn-Lugar program.

This flexibility came after more than a decade of work to eliminate annual certifications on global Nunn-Lugar assistance that hampered the ability of the United States to use the global Nunn-Lugar program quickly and effectively. The certification and waiver processes consumed hundreds of man-hours of work by the State Department, the Intelligence Community, the Pentagon, as well as other departments and agencies. I argued that this time could be better spent tackling the proliferation threats facing our country. Former Under Secretary of State Bob Joseph noted during his confirmation process that, at the time, more than a dozen individual steps were required in the State Department alone to complete these annual certifications and waivers. After a strong vote in the Senate, Congress eliminated these annual certifications.

In 2003, I sought authority to use Nunn-Lugar funds outside states of the former Soviet Union. This was favored by the Bush administration. The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004, as amended by the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2008, provides that the Secretary of Defense may spend Nunn-Lugar/Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for a proliferation threat reduction project or activity outside the states of the former Soviet Union if the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines that such projects or activities will assist the United States in the resolution of a critical emerging proliferation threat or permit the United States to take advantage of opportunities to achieve long-standing nonproliferation goals. The law specifies that the Secretary of Defense may not obligate funds for projects or activities until the Secretary of State concurs in a de-

termination regarding these projects and activities and in notifying Congress. The Secretary of State is also involved in subsequent steps before the global Nunn-Lugar program can put boots on the ground.

Unfortunately, the State Department has not been efficient in carrying out concurrences required by existing law. It is troubling that, after eliminating the lengthy certification processes of the 1990s, equally burdensome and ultimately un-executable interagency concurrence, determination and notification processes for the global Nunn-Lugar program are limiting accomplishments.

The bill I introduce today remedies this situation by providing that the Secretary of Defense be given sole authority regarding global Nunn-Lugar funds—to include making all relevant determinations and notifications to Congress. Originally, this authority had been given to the President. I worked to delegate it to the Secretary of Defense. When it was given by Congress to the Secretary of Defense, State Department officials insisted they had a role in the process. We have now had time to observe how this works in practice, and the result is clear: it does not function in a manner consistent with the intent of law. Congress clearly intended that efficiency and immediacy accompany this authority.

I do not believe that reserving this authority to the Secretary of Defense means that the State Department does not play a role in other efforts; however, in the reorganized non-proliferation and arms control bureaus who oversee these matters within the State Department, as well as in its regional bureaus, it is the case that simply adding bureaucratic boxes to check has had little positive result. Too often, bureaucratic politics and inertia have intervened to prevent timely success.

We must work to ensure that our implementers have the tools and authorities they need to perform their missions in the Defense Department. It is to this end that I offer this simple bill. I look forward to working with Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Member MCCAIN on the Armed Services Committee on this legislation.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Ms. SNOWE):

S. 297. A bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today, along with my colleague Senator SNOWE of Maine, I am introducing legislation to exempt universal service contributions and the universal service

support programs from what is commonly referred to as the Antideficiency Act.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 demonstrated our long-standing commitment to ensuring the availability of telecommunications to all Americans at reasonable prices. This concept known as universal service has been the responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, since its beginnings in 1934. As a result of the 1996 Act, the Universal Service Fund, USF, was established in 1997. This fund is administered by the Universal Service Administrative Company, USAC, whose Board of Directors is appointed by the Chairman of the FCC.

USAC administers the High Cost, Low Income, Rural Health Care, and Schools and Libraries, E-rate, universal service programs. USAC makes commitments, through letters, to schools for each school year under FCC rules, and it is obviously important these commitments be made before the beginning of the school year to assist schools in their planning processes and achievement of educational goals. The letters of commitment are based upon funds the USF is authorized to collect, and the USF can adjust the contribution factor quarterly to ensure its receipts.

While the USF receives no Federal monies, FCC staff directed USAC in late September 2004 to treat E-rate and Rural Health Care commitment letters as government obligations subject to ADA requirements. Among the ADA requirements is the demand for cash on hand to cover all obligations. This requirement disrupted the distribution of funds for four months. Congress realized how ill-advised it is to subject these funds to the ADA and enacted legislation to provide for a one-year exemption of the USF from the ADA, through December 31, 2005, and this exemption has been extended for one-year increments in each subsequent year. The current extension expires December 31, 2011. Congress has made permanent similar exemptions for at least fourteen different programs, and we believe the time has come to end these annual one-year extensions and simply make the exemption permanent. This will allow USAC to continue administering these important programs in the most sensible and effective way.

It is important to understand that there is precedence to provide a permanent exemption. There are 14 agencies that currently have a permanent exemption for the ADA, including the Federal Aviation Administration, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 298. A bill to drive American innovation and advanced vehicle manufacturing, to reduce costs for consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Charging

America Forward Act, based on similar legislation I offered last year, to drive innovation and advance vehicle manufacturing and to lower costs for consumers when they buy these great new cars and trucks of the future which, by the way, I would remind folks are being made in Michigan. So we want people to be buying those automobiles.

In his State of the Union Address, President Obama called on us to rise to the challenge of the 21st-century economy to outinnovate, outeducate, and outbuild the rest of the world. We can do that.

He also challenged us to put 1 million electric vehicles on the road by 2015. The bill I have introduced today will help us achieve that goal. By investing in electric vehicle innovation, we can create the jobs of the future in America. We are already creating those jobs in Michigan with these investments.

We all know new technologies are always the most expensive, which is why we passed a tax credit of up to \$7,500 on the purchase of a new electric vehicle. My bill makes that work even better for consumers. It turns that credit into a rebate that can be used at the time of purchase so that when you buy a car, you would get up to the \$7,500 off at the beginning, at the dealership, rather than waiting until you fill out your tax forms the next year.

Right now there is a cap on how many people can take advantage of these credits. My bill would double that so more people can get the savings from these particular credits and buy these new, great vehicles. Right now, when we see gas prices anticipated to rise like crazy into the summer, wouldn't it be great if you had an automobile that went 200 or 300 miles on a gallon of gas, or maybe didn't need any gas at all? That is what this is about.

The bill also increases investments in battery technology and innovation. We know that by supporting American innovation and manufacturing, we can bring jobs back. In fact, we are bringing jobs back from other countries because of what we have been doing through our investment efforts in the Recovery Act, and we can continue to create jobs in manufacturing in America.

We have invested \$2 billion in the Recovery Act toward advanced batteries—the kind of batteries that power these electric vehicles. Before we made that investment, the United States made 2 percent of the world's advanced batteries. In just 4 years, because of that investment, we will be making 40 percent of the world's advanced batteries. That is a big deal, an effective investment.

My bill calls for doubling this smart investment and building on these partnerships to create even more jobs. We want to make our country the undisputed leader in advanced battery technology, manufacturing, and development, and we are on the way to doing that. We need to keep focused and we will get there.

The Charging America Forward Act also extends a tax credit for businesses that purchase hybrid medium and heavy-duty trucks. This will help keep those technologies more affordable for our companies and job creators, in addition to the savings they will get from better fuel efficiency.

The bill extends an important tax credit to support charging stations, so we have the infrastructure needed in our homes or in our garages to be able to power the electric vehicles.

Innovation is the reason America has the strongest economy in the world, even with our challenges. We have always been the leader. To compete in the 21st century economy, we need a strong, vibrant investment strategy, an economy that looks to the future, not the past. That is what Charging America Forward is all about. With the right investments, we can create jobs today that will last for years and years to come.

We are in a race for the future. We need to outcompete our global competitors around the world. We can do that. We will do that if we outinnovate, outeducate, and outbuild. That is what this legislation is about—investing in the future to win that race, investing in advanced vehicles so we can get to that future we all want.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 51. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 52. Mr. NELSON of Nebraska submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 53. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. BEGICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 54. Mr. REID of Nevada submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 55. Mr. REID of Nevada submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 56. Mrs. MCCASKILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 223, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 51. Mr. UDALL of New Mexico submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 223, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation

Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 311, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 733. PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR AIRCRAFT PASSENGER SCREENING WITH ADVANCED IMAGING TECHNOLOGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 44901 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF ADVANCED IMAGING TECHNOLOGY FOR SCREENING PASSENGERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) shall ensure that advanced imaging technology is used for the screening of passengers under this section only in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF AUTOMATED TARGET RECOGNITION SOFTWARE.—Beginning January 1, 2012, all advanced imaging technology used as a primary screening method for passengers shall be equipped with automatic target recognition software.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) ADVANCED IMAGING TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘advanced imaging technology’—

“(i) means a device that creates a visual image of an individual's body and reveals other objects on the body as applicable, including narcotics, explosives, and other weapons components; and

“(ii) includes devices using backscatter x-rays or millimeter waves and devices referred to as ‘whole-body imaging technology’ or ‘body scanning’.

“(B) AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION SOFTWARE.—The term ‘automatic target recognition software’ means software installed on an advanced imaging technology machine that produces a generic image of the individual being screened that is the same as the images produced for all other screened individuals.

“(C) PRIMARY SCREENING.—The term ‘primary screening’ means the initial examination of any passenger at an airport checkpoint, including using available screening technologies to detect weapons, explosives, narcotics, or other indications of unlawful action, in order to determine whether to clear the passenger to board an aircraft or to further examine the passenger.”.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2012, the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security Administration) shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of section 44901(1) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of all matters the Assistant Secretary considers relevant to the implementation of such section.

(B) The status of the compliance of the Transportation Security Administration with the provisions of such section.

(C) If the Administration is not in full compliance with such provisions—

(i) the reasons for such non-compliance; and

(ii) a timeline depicting when the Assistant Secretary expects the Administration to achieve full compliance.

(3) SECURITY CLASSIFICATION.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted, to the greatest extent practicable, in an unclassified format, with a classified annex, if necessary.

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—