

S. Res. 615. A resolution congratulating the recipients of the 2012 Nobel Prize in Chemistry; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 2212

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2212, a bill to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) title 28, United States Code.

S. 2347

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2347, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services.

S. 3231

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3231, a bill to provide for the issuance and sale of a semipostal by the United States Postal Service to support effective programs targeted at improving permanency outcomes for youth in foster care.

S. 3237

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3237, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 3275

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3275, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 3460

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for startup businesses to use a portion of the research and development credit to offset payroll taxes.

S. 3616

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3616, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the expansion of tax benefits for adoption enacted in 2001 and to permanently reinstate the expansion of tax benefits for adoption enacted in 2010, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3311

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3311 intended to be proposed to S. 3637, a bill to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3319

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3319 intended to be proposed to S. 3637, a bill to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3320

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3320 intended to be proposed to S. 3637, a bill to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3323

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3323 intended to be proposed to S. 3637, a bill to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3324

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3324 intended to be proposed to S. 3637, a bill to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 3671. A bill to provide certain assistance to North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Liquefied Natural Gas, LNG, for NATO Act.

The United States is in possession of vast resources that could directly contribute to the energy security of our closest NATO allies, who face over-reliance on Russian and Iranian gas sources. In 2009, the United States overtook Russia as the world's largest natural gas producer due to vast unconventional reserves. At current U.S. consumption rates, the United States possesses perhaps a century of gas supply. This development has caused U.S. natural gas prices to fall to nearly a half to a third of gas prices in other key European and Asian markets and has prompted numerous applications for export licenses of U.S. liquefied natural gas exports.

Pursuant to Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, gas exports are subject to approval by the Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which must certify that a particular export is

in the U.S. public interest. For destination countries with which the United States has a free trade agreement, a presumption is created that the export is in the public interest, and the license is automatic. For non-free trade agreement nations, a study must be conducted to determine the public interest, entailing a notice and comment period. Several companies have submitted applications to retrofit U.S. LNG import terminals for regasification and export; to construct new LNG export terminals; and to export cryogenic natural gas to Latin America by rail and ship. After approving one application, the Obama administration deferred others until at least 2013, pending a study completed last week. This study found that under any scenario, LNG exports will be a net benefit for the U.S. economy. Moreover, continued development of unconventional gas suppliers is an important source of job creation in the United States.

U.S. shale gas reserves are already transforming European natural gas markets since LNG previously destined for the United States has now been made available for Europe. The United States can do much more to both use LNG exports to benefit NATO allies facing energy insecurity in Europe and to promote economic growth in the United States.

Turkey currently relies on Iran for 20 percent of its gas imports, which could come under increased pressure when the European Council's decision of October 15, 2012 to prohibit the "purchase, import or transport of natural gas from Iran" is implemented. Moreover, several allies and partners in Central and Southeastern Europe, Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Greece, the Czech Republic, and Moldova, will see their long-term contracts with Gazprom expire in the coming years. For these countries, targeted U.S. LNG exports, along with infrastructure investment and other policy responses, could help alleviate energy insecurity. It is possible that several other NATO allies and partners may opt for U.S. natural gas imports, and even paying a reliability premium for them, if the opportunity existed.

Meanwhile, European nations are ramping up capacity to import LNG. At present, Europe imports LNG primarily from Algeria, Egypt, Oman, and Qatar to meet about 26 percent of its gas needs, due in large part to a lack of LNG import terminals, which are mostly located in Western Europe, as well as underdeveloped onward interconnectors and storage capacity in Europe. However, numerous European countries, some with financing from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, EBRD, are considering construction of additional LNG import terminals, including Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Turkey, and Ukraine. In light of these dynamics, the United States is well-positioned to

become a strategic energy supplier of LNG to NATO allies in need of diversification.

The LNG for NATO Act would not direct supply, which should remain exclusively the function of private industry. Instead, this legislation would affect Section 3 the Natural Gas Act to create a presumption that licenses to export U.S. natural gas to NATO allies is in the U.S. public interest, giving NATO allies the same preferential treatment enjoyed by our free trade partners. Specifically, swift passage of this act will make gas export licenses automatic for Turkey, which relies on Iran for 20 percent of its gas demand, and those NATO countries, whose long-term gas contracts with Russia's Gazprom expire in the coming years.

Through market forces, NATO allies will be more secure and the Alliance will be stronger. While the U.S. Congress will no doubt continue to debate full liberalization of natural gas exports, the LNG for NATO Act follows other precedents for narrowly tailored exceptions to our export licensing regime.

I am hopeful that the LNG for NATO Act can command bipartisan support and swift passage.

By Mr. CORKER:

S. 3673. A bill to provide a comprehensive deficit reduction plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am here to introduce a bill that would address entitlement reforms and the debt ceiling called the Dollar for Dollar Act. I continue to hope Speaker BOEHNER and President Obama will negotiate a deal north of \$4 trillion before year end. However, I think we should also prepare now for the possibility that they will not, especially based on recent conversations. The next opportunity we have to make the structural, transformative reforms to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid that will save these programs and put our country on a path to fiscal solvency will be during the debt ceiling vote which will come up after the first of the year as soon as we get back.

I am introducing the Dollar for Dollar legislation that will raise the debt ceiling by roughly \$1 trillion in exchange for roughly \$1 trillion in reforms to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. This puts into legislative language many of the concepts laid out in a bipartisan Simpson-Bowles and Domenici-Rivlin proposal. This meets our obligations to older and younger Americans.

Young Americans expect us to solve their fiscal issues so they are not saddled with debt and robbed of opportunity for the American dream. Seniors expect us to honor the commitments we have made to them. If we act now, we will be addressing the debt ceiling more than 3 months before we reach it.

Let me walk through those changes that are well known to policymakers

and Congress and the administration. I will begin with Medicare. Medicare's trust fund has \$27 trillion in unfunded liabilities, and it is expected to be insolvent by the year 2024. According to an Urban Institute study, an average income of a married family will contribute about \$119,000 in payroll taxes to Medicare in today's dollars over their lifetime and consume about \$357,000 in today's dollars in Medicare benefits. Obviously, this is unsustainable. Everybody in this room knows this. The pages in front of me know it. Medicare needs to be structured in a way to provide care for current and future beneficiaries in a fiscally responsible manner.

This bill would structurally transform Medicare, keeping fee-for-service Medicare in place forever, while having it compete side-by-side with a reformed Medicare Advantage program called Medicare Total Health. Seniors would maintain the option of choosing fee-for-service Medicare or a private plan as they do today. I think most of us know that about 25 percent of the people in our country who are on Medicare are in a private plan today.

The competition created by these reforms would significantly reduce Medicare costs by \$290 billion—and this is very important—without a spending cap on the program. This proposal is similar to one backed by Alice Rivlin, former Budget Director for Bill Clinton.

In addition, this bill would update cost-sharing requirements to reflect 21st-century health care practices, such as capping out-of-pocket expenditures for beneficiaries and unifying deductibles and coinsurance structures. This bill also would improve solvency by requiring higher income beneficiaries to pay more for their premiums.

Finally, it would raise the eligibility age incrementally from 65 to 67 by the year 2027. Moving to Medicaid, the bill would provide increased flexibility for States to achieve Medicaid savings by establishing a waiver process for States to better manage their Medicaid programs. It also would eliminate a massive "bed tax" gimmick used to bilk Federal taxpayers out of \$50 billion over a 10-year period.

Next, let me walk through Social Security changes. Although some have suggested we should ignore the impending crisis in Social Security funding, we should address it now because it is already beginning to cause the Federal Government to spend more than it takes in, and the Social Security trust fund is projected to be exhausted in the year 2033. It also will be much more painful to make these adjustments to achieve solvency in Social Security if we procrastinate.

In order to return the program to long-term solvency, the bill would enhance the progressivity of benefit calculations. In addition, it would adopt chained CPI in measuring inflation to calculate annual cost-of-living adjust-

ments. Chained CPI is the Bureau of Labor Statistics most modern and most accurate measure of inflation. By the way, the bill would apply chained CPI government-wide, which would also affect revenues, and it would reflect revenues in a positive way as it relates to our budget deficits. It would slowly raise the retirement age to better reflect longevity increases.

Finally, the bill would strengthen the disability insurance program by moving beneficiaries into Social Security insurance at an earlier age. This part of Social Security will go bankrupt by the year 2017 if we do nothing.

In conclusion, I am offering a bill that would implement structural entitlement reforms and, in exchange, it would raise the debt ceiling dollar for dollar. Dealing with this now would avoid facing a crisis next year when we hit that debt ceiling in February or March, which would rattle financial markets and generate tremendous uncertainty in our country and around the world. We need to get our fiscal problems behind us so that businesses, investors, and all of the American people can have confidence about the future. If we do that, the economy will truly take off.

So if I could, if one of the pages could take this to the desk, I am introducing this bill. I hope Senator REID will put in place a process through regular order for bills of this nature to be introduced and go through the appropriate committees. I hope when we deal with the debt ceiling in this coming year, we do so on a dollar-for-dollar basis, just as has been recently established this last year—the precedent has been set—that during this fiscal dilemma we are dealing with, when we raise the debt ceiling, we actually lower spending by a dollar. Up until this point, almost all the things we have talked about have been through discretionary spending. Thus far, we really haven't addressed entitlement reforms.

Again, let me reiterate that I hope the President and Speaker BOEHNER come to some accommodation over the next couple of weeks that actually deals with some maybe \$4 trillion in size that would actually put this in the rearview mirror. But as the conversations continue, and not much substance is coming forward, that is looking doubtful. So I hope as we end this year and move into next year we will begin to put in place an open process whereas we move toward the debt ceiling and use the same precedent we have already used this last year, so that when we raise the debt ceiling by a dollar, we will reduce spending by a dollar.

We have all said we need revenues and we need entitlement reform. What I have done today is to lay out a way—and I know other Senators will have ideas, and I hope they will bring them to the floor—for us to raise the debt

ceiling by around \$1 trillion and in return have entitlement reform on a dollar-for-dollar basis, saving and reforming these programs, so that seniors in the future certainly will have the opportunity to continue these programs they depend upon so much, and the young people who are coming behind us will have the certainty that we, as mature adults, I hope, have dealt with these issues in an appropriate way.

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

S. 3675. A bill to expand the HUBZone program for communities affected by base realignment and closure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, with Senator SNOWE, to expand the geographic boundaries of HUBZones located at former U.S. military installations that have been closed through the so-called Base Closure and Realignment—or BRAC—process. These military installations were often the economic heart of the community in which they were located, and those communities can struggle for years to overcome the closure of those facilities.

In recognition of this fact, Congress passed legislation providing “HUBZone” status for 5 years to military facilities closed through the BRAC process. Last week, the Defense Reauthorization bill passed by the Senate included language, authored by Senator SHERROD BROWN of Ohio, to extend HUBZone status for these facilities for an additional five years.

The HUBZone program provides certain federal contracting preferences to small businesses located within a HUBZone. In addition to the BRAC-related HUBZones I have already mentioned, HUBZones are located in “economically distressed communities,” that suffer from low income, high poverty rates, or high unemployment.

According to the Congressional Research Service, there are currently 127 BRAC-related HUBZones in the United States. Unfortunately, for many of the military bases that have been closed, HUBZone status has not brought the benefits we had hoped for. One of the reasons is simple—the law defines the geographic boundaries of a BRAC-related HUBZone to be the same as the boundaries of the base that was closed. When that is combined with the requirement that 35 percent of the employees of a qualifying business must live within the HUBZone, the problem is clear: very few people live on these former bases, so it is difficult or impossible for businesses to get the workers they need to meet the requirements of the HUBZone program.

One of these HUBZones is located at the former Brunswick Naval Air Station, in Brunswick, Maine. This facility closed in 2011, as a result of the 2005 BRAC round. When the Navy left, the host community lost more than 2400 military and civilian personnel. Brun-

wick and its neighbor, Topsham, have a combined population of just 22,000, so losing the Naval Air Station has had a significant economic impact on these communities. Because so few people actually live within the boundaries of the former base, its HUBZone designation does not provide any real assistance to these communities.

My legislation would expand the geographic boundaries of BRAC-related HUBZones to include the town or county where the closed installation is located, or census tracts contiguous to the installation, up to a total population base of 50,000. This would provide a large enough pool of potential workers to enable qualifying businesses to locate within the HUBZone, and to help host communities overcome the loss of military installations closed through the BRAC process.

The Association of Defense Communities has endorsed the concept of expanding BRAC-related HUBZones in this manner. In a letter to Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman LEVIN and Ranking Member MCCAIN, the ADC noted how important it is that “Congress restore its intent to support BRAC-impacted communities attracting small businesses to help build and strengthen their local economies.”

Steve Levesque, the Executive Director of the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority, or MRRA, which oversees the redevelopment of the former Brunswick Naval Air Station, also urges Congress to modify the HUBZone program. In a letter, Steve explained that BRAC facilities do not have the residential areas needed to support the 35 percent residency requirement for businesses located within the HUBZone. As a consequence, these businesses cannot “realize the HUBZone benefits for BRAC’d installations as envisioned by Congress.”

This point was underscored in a letter from Heather Blease, an entrepreneur who is hoping to locate a new business at the former Brunswick Naval Air Station. Ms. Blease describes the HUBZone law as “flawed,” because the 35 percent residency requirement makes it impossible for businesses like hers to achieve HUBZone status.

I ask my colleagues to consider the legislation I am offering today to help communities get back on their feet after the loss of a military installation closed through the BRAC process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSOCIATION OF DEFENSE
COMMUNITIES,

Washington, DC, December 11, 2012,

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN MCCAIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MEMBER
MCCAIN: The Association of Defense Commu-

nities (ADC) admires your longstanding support of current and former military communities. ADC, the leading organization representing those communities, always appreciates the opportunity to share information with you and your staff that may help strengthen communities with active installations and those that continue to redevelop following base closure or realignment.

Communities that have been impacted by Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) often face severe economic distress for years, especially during times of national economic difficulty. To assist in these communities’ recovery, Congress authorized in the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 1997 that BRAC-impacted communities would receive Small Business Administration HUBZone certification, a federal initiative that further helps small businesses in disadvantaged areas to compete for federal contracts. The designation gives small businesses relocating to closed military installation areas equal footing with businesses in other disadvantaged areas that receive the designation because of their location in under-utilized census tracts.

While the intent of Congress was to provide the HUBZone designation to help closed military installations attract small businesses, one aspect of the HUBZone program actually works against these redevelopment areas. To maintain HUBZone status, 35 percent of a business’ employees must also live in a HUBZone area. Because a military installation’s HUBZone area encompasses only the base itself, many closed military installations do not have a substantial number of HUBZone-certified residential areas from which to draw sufficient future employees for the businesses desiring to locate on those properties. Thus, it is often impossible for a business to qualify for HUBZone status and compete fairly against other small businesses.

Many defense community leaders are hopeful this issue can be resolved without additional spending, creation of a new government program or a change in government contracting goals. Senator Susan Collins is also working to address this issue during the final stages of the FY 2013 National Defense Authorization Act. We look forward to sharing further information with your office and hers to help explain why it is important to defense communities that Congress restore its intent to support BRAC-impacted communities attracting small businesses to help build and strengthen their local economies.

As always, ADC appreciate your service and support and hopes you will contact us if we may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

ROBERT M. MURDOCK,
President, Association
of Defense Communities.

MIDCOAST REGIONAL
REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
December 11, 2012.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: I represent the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority, which is charged with redeveloping the former Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine that closed in 2011 and is now known as Brunswick Landing.

We seek your assistance in modifying the current federal program related to SBA HUBZones to make it a more effective tool for businesses locating at Brunswick Landing. Over the past several years, we have had several companies inquire about the current HUBZone status of the former NAS Brunswick. In fact, we are currently working with one company who is willing to locate here

and create upwards of 200 jobs, if we are successful in getting the current HUBZone program for closed military installations broadened.

With the implementation of the latest 2005 BRAC round, a number of military installations have been closed across the country resulting in severe economic distress for those communities and States that have realized these closures. Redeveloping these BRAC'd properties proved quite difficult in good economic times, and now it is made even more difficult with the national and State economic recession we are experiencing.

While it would seem that the HUBZone designation for a closed military installation would be an aid to its redevelopment efforts, the 35% residency rule in the existing law actually makes the program not a very effective redevelopment tool for these properties at all. With the exception of closed military installations, most of the HUBZones in the Country are census tract based. Under current law, only the closed military base itself (i.e., the geographic area which used to be the former base) is designated as a HUBZone, which is a much smaller area than the census tract basis. Furthermore, many closed military installations do not have a substantial amount of residential areas from which to draw sufficient future employees (35%) for the businesses desiring to locate on those properties.

In addition the above, the Small Business Act established a five year time-frame for the duration of the HUBZone from the actual date of base closure. This is of particular concern given that the actual transfer of properties from the military services to the base closure communities often occurs many years following closure. Thus, these properties are not available for business development until actually transferred.

The net effect is that eligible HUB businesses seeking new or expanded opportunities on closed installations cannot meet these requirements and thus are not able to realize the HUBZone benefits for BRAC'd installations as envisioned by Congress. This issue exacerbates the difficulties for us and other similar communities to overcome the devastating economic effects of base closures.

In order to make the BRAC HUBZone designation an effective economic development tool for Brunswick Landing, as well as all the other closed installations across the country, the attached amendment language to the existing law is recommended. It should be noted that these recommendations do not create a new program, require additional government spending, or increase federal contracting goals.

Thank you for your service to our Country and the State of Maine and your thoughtful consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

STEVEN H. LEVESQUE,
Executive Director.

DECEMBER 12, 2012.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
*U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: I have established a new contact center business that focuses on providing service to the federal government. A key strategy for our success hinges upon the establishment of my business as a HUBZone certified entity.

As a native of Brunswick, Maine, I am keenly interested in locating my business at the former Brunswick Naval Air Station, now called Brunswick Landing. As a BRAC facility, the SBA rules limit the boundary of the HUBZone geographically to base property which has very few housing units.

In order to achieve HUBZone certification, 35% of my employees need to reside within the HUBZone.

As the law is written, I cannot locate at Brunswick Landing and hope to achieve HUI3Zone status. The BRAC HUBZone law is flawed as written. Our Congress attempted to create an economic development vehicle to help communities recover from base closures, but unless the law is tweaked, the HUBZone designation is meaningless.

Please help modify the existing definition for BRAC HUBZones by broadening the boundary of the HUBZone for closed military installations to include the surrounding community. In the case of my company, it provides me with HUBZone employees to put to work so I can meet the HUBZone certification requirements.

If the law is changed, I will locate my business at Brunswick Landing and provide hundreds of jobs to the economically depressed area. Otherwise, I will need to seek out other alternatives.

Thank you for your service to our country, the State of Maine and your interest in helping small businesses thrive.

With greatest respect,

HEATHER D. BLEASE,
CEO, Savi Systems, LLC.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of a bill that I am co-sponsoring today with my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, that will ensure that the Small Business Administration's, SBA, Historically Underutilized Business Zone, HUBZone, program will support the many communities around this Nation that have been negatively impacted by base closures.

Over the course of my career, my state has experienced two major base closures—Loring Air Force Base was closed by the 1991 BRAC round and Brunswick Naval Air Station was closed by the 2005 BRAC round. Like every community around the Nation that has experienced a base closure, Brunswick and Loring have fought tirelessly to replace the jobs and economic impact of their military installations.

Unfortunately, theirs is an exceptionally difficult task. Consider, for instance, that the closure of Brunswick Naval Air Station directly eliminated nearly 3,300 military and federal civilian jobs, and indirectly caused the loss of approximately 3,800 additional jobs from the region. Overcoming the effects of such dramatic changes in a local employment and economic market is, without question, a long-term challenge that is made even more difficult in a period of prolonged economic recession.

That is why I have always argued that the Nation has a responsibility to do everything within our power to help those communities that have supported our military infrastructure for decades to recover from the devastating economic impacts of a base closure.

One way that we can assist in their recovery is to encourage the location and growth of small businesses in and around closed military installations. As Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I frequently talk with small business owners and employees about their challenges and needs. In many cases, they tell me about the dif-

ficulties they face in competing against larger and more established businesses for federal contracts.

That is why, in my efforts to champion our Nation's small businesses and to promote their interests, I have supported the Small Business Administration's HUBZone Empowerment Contracting program. Congress established this program as part of the Small Business Reauthorization Act in 1997 in order to spur business development and employment opportunities in economically distressed areas of the country. In 2004, with my support, we took the critical step of expanding the HUBZone program to include "base closure areas," which directly addressed military installations that have been closed through any of several military base closure and realignment authorities, including BRAC rounds.

Although this was an important step forward, the 2004 expansion to include closed military installations in the HUBZone program was limited to areas within the physical boundaries of the military base. Current law requires that 35 percent of the employees of a HUBZone qualified small business concern also must live within the HUBZone designated area.

However, small businesses that are interested in establishing a location at a closed military installation in order to gain the benefits of becoming a HUBZone small business concern are likely to discover that not very many people live on the grounds of that closed base, leaving them without sufficient workers to meet the 35 percent requirement. This, of course, defeats the very purpose of the HUBZone designation for closed military installations by serving as a disincentive for small businesses to open shop at a redeveloping base.

In light of these facts, and considering that the economic and employment impacts of closing a military installation are unquestionably and disproportionately felt by the people who reside in the communities around former military installations—not just within the fencelines of former bases—it is clear that the HUBZone designation for closed military installations needs to be clarified.

That is why the bill that I have co-sponsored with my colleague adjusts the designation of a base closure area to include the geographic area that is the municipality, county, or census tract in which the installation is located (as well as the adjacent census tract), which incorporates up to 50,000 people. And so, to my friends and colleagues here in the Senate, I urge you to join me in supporting this bill and showing your strong support for providing the maximum benefits of the HUBZone designation to the many communities around our nation that have been impacted by base closures.

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 3676. A bill to promote high-quality, cost-efficient, and effective administrative support services to agencies

overseas; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Reducing Duplication Overseas Act of 2012.

At a time when the Federal Government is facing significant fiscal challenges, we must explore all potential avenues to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal programs. This bill seeks to ease some of our current fiscal pressures by eliminating duplication of certain administrative services at overseas posts and reducing administrative operational costs.

The Department of State oversees the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services, ICASS, system, which provides and shares the cost of administrative support services for overseas employees, such as vehicle maintenance or leasing services. The purpose of developing this system was to ensure more efficient delivery and quality of overseas administrative support services. Although the level of agency participation varies, as use of ICASS for most administrative services is voluntary, last year, more than 40 agencies participated in ICASS and the cost of the services totaled approximately \$2 billion.

In 2004, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, reported that ICASS had not achieved efficient delivery of administrative support services because it failed to eliminate duplicative services and contain costs. GAO recommended that there be one provider for each service at American facilities overseas. The ICASS Executive Board took steps to reduce costs, but still had not implemented GAO's recommendation that there be a single service provider.

In 2010, former Senator Voinovich and I requested that the GAO review the delivery of administrative services at overseas posts. In their report issued earlier this year, GAO concluded that, although agency participation in ICASS has increased, agencies chose to provide their own services about one third of the time, resulting in duplicative administrative services and missed opportunities to decrease costs.

Duplication and overseas administrative costs can and must be decreased. The Reducing Duplication Overseas Act seeks to eliminate duplicative services and reduce overall costs to the Federal Government by requiring agencies to use ICASS for services. Although the GAO recommends that agencies consolidate all services with ICASS, this bill starts with only a few services in order to determine best practices for consolidation, as well as whether consolidation is appropriate for all services.

Specifically, the Act would require agencies to participate in the ICASS for household furniture, furnishings, appliance pools, and motor pool services, unless the agency provides an explanation on how providing the service outside the ICASS system will not in-

crease overall costs to the Federal Government or if it certifies that the mission of the agency cannot be achieved by participating in ICASS system.

Additionally, the bill would allow an agency to provide administrative services at an overseas post in place of the existing ICASS provider if it can provide the administrative service more efficiently and agrees to provide the administrative service to all ICASS customer agencies at the overseas post.

The Act would also require the ICASS Executive Board and the Comptroller General of the United States to submit reports to Congress on agency use of ICASS services and the impact consolidating these services has on cost-efficiencies and redundancies at overseas posts. Nothing in this bill is intended to interfere with the existing authorities of the Chief of Mission at each overseas post.

I believe that this bill is an important step towards improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government operations overseas. Although I will not have the opportunity to push for this bill in the next Congress, it is my hope that my colleagues will take up and pass 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. 3676

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 "Reducing Duplication Overseas Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to promote high-quality, cost-efficient, and effective administrative support services to agencies overseas.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" means a department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch performing any foreign affairs functions.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES SYSTEM.—The term "International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system" means the mechanism established pursuant to section 23 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2695) by which the United States Government manages and funds administrative support services at overseas posts.

(4) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES CUSTOMER AGEN-

CIES.—The term "International Cooperative Administrative Support Services customer agencies" means agencies participating in the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system.

(5) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES EXECUTIVE BOARD.—The term "International Cooperative Administrative Support Services Executive Board" means the highest-level International Cooperative Administrative Support Services policy-making body comprised of senior representatives of agencies participating in the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system.

SEC. 4. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, each agency with operations overseas under the authority of the Chief of Mission pursuant to section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927) shall participate in the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system for purposes of obtaining household furniture, furnishings, and appliance pools services, motor pool services, and management services unless—

(1) the agency provides a detailed explanation for evaluation and decision by the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services Executive Board that describes—

(A) how the agency will provide the service outside of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system;

(B) the cost to the agency of the service; and

(C) how providing the service outside the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system will not increase overall costs to the United States Government; or

(2) the agency submits a detailed explanation for evaluation and decision by the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services Executive Board certifying that the mission of the agency cannot be achieved by such participation in the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The motor pool services requirement under subsection (a) applies to administrative services, and shall not be construed as superseding, removing, or limiting any statutory or programmatic requirements related to agency use or procurement of vehicles.

SEC. 5. USE OF ALTERNATE SERVICE PROVIDERS.

The International Cooperative Administrative Support Services Executive Board shall allow an agency to act as an alternate service provider for administrative services at an overseas post in place of the existing International Cooperative Administrative Support Services provider for purposes of reducing overall costs to the United States Government if the agency—

(1) demonstrates through a business case that it can provide the administrative service more efficiently; and

(2) agrees to provide the administrative service to all other International Cooperative Administrative Support Services customer agencies at the overseas post.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) BIENNIAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services Executive Board, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system.

(2) CONTENT.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) establish performance goals to define the level of performance to be achieved in providing efficient, effective, and equitable administrative services to International Cooperative Administrative Support Services customer agencies;

(B) establish a balanced set of performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing progress toward each performance goal;

(C) describe how the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system ensures the accuracy and reliability of the data used to measure progress; and

(D) identify strategies and the resources required to achieve performance goals.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a review of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system.

(2) CONTENT.—The review required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an evaluation of whether requiring agencies to participate in the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system for household furniture, furnishings, and appliance pools services and motor pools services has increased cost-efficiency and reduced administrative redundancies;

(B) recommendations, if warranted, for further consolidation of services in the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system;

(C) an evaluation of how implementation of this Act is affecting the performance of International Cooperative Administrative Support Services customer agencies; and

(D) recommendations, if warranted, for improving the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services system and implementing this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 614—CELEBRATING THE WORLD PEACE CORPS MISSION AND THE WORLD PEACE PRIZE

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 614

Whereas the World Peace Corps Mission is an international organization that operates according to the core spirit of advancing peace, justice, and inter-religious collaborations;

Whereas the World Peace Prize is a prestigious award presented by the World Peace Corps Mission that celebrates individuals who have contributed tremendously to peace and enlightenment for humanity;

Whereas past recipients of the World Peace Prize include President Ronald Reagan of the United States, President Abdurrahman Wahid of Indonesia, and President Nakamura of Palau;

Whereas in 2010, the World Peace Prize Awarding Council recognized His Holiness Dorje Chang Buddha III (referred to in this preamble as “H.H. Dorje Change Buddha III”) for his devotion to an immensely wide scope of humanitarian activities directed at individuals from different communities throughout the world;

Whereas H.H. Dorje Chang Buddha III has received numerous awards, including the

United States Presidential Gold Award, which the Chairman of the President's Advisory Commission on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders presented on behalf of President George W. Bush to H.H. Dorje Chang Buddha III for the outstanding contributions of H.H. Dorje Chang Buddha III to the arts, medicine, ethics, Buddhism, spiritual leadership, and United States society; and

Whereas in 2010, the World Peace Prize Awarding Council also recognized the Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman for being a lifelong champion of human rights who has fought world hunger, narcotics abuse, and narcotics trafficking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the World Peace Corps Mission for advancing peace, justice, and inter-religious collaborations; and

(2) celebrates the World Peace Award and the recipients of the World Peace Award.

SENATE RESOLUTION 615—CONGRATULATING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2012 NOBEL PRIZE IN CHEMISTRY

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. HAGAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 615

Whereas the Nobel Prize is an international award administered by the Nobel Foundation in Stockholm, Sweden;

Whereas the Nobel Prize has been awarded for outstanding achievements in physics, chemistry, physiology or medicine, literature, and peace since 1901;

Whereas the Nobel Prize in Chemistry is awarded by the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences in Stockholm, Sweden to recognize scientific advancements that have increased our understanding of chemical processes and their molecular basis;

Whereas the 2012 Nobel Prize in Chemistry is awarded jointly to Robert J. Lefkowitz, M.D., a Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigator and James B. Duke Professor of Medicine and Biochemistry at Duke University Medical Center in Durham, North Carolina, and Brian K. Kobilka, M.D., Professor and Chair of Molecular and Cellular Physiology at the Stanford University School of Medicine in Stanford, California, for their studies on G-protein-coupled receptors;

Whereas G-protein-coupled receptors are a class of cell surface receptors that catch chemical signals from the outside and transmit their messages into the cell, providing the cell with information about changes occurring within the body;

Whereas the studies completed by Robert J. Lefkowitz, M.D., and Brian K. Kobilka, M.D., have significantly advanced our scientific understanding of G-protein-coupled receptors and their functions;

Whereas the groundbreaking discoveries made by Robert J. Lefkowitz, M.D., and Brian K. Kobilka, M.D., have made it possible to target and treat diseases more precisely and effectively, as nearly half of all medicines used in the world are aimed at G-protein-coupled receptors;

Whereas the National Institutes of Health supported the work done by Robert J. Lefkowitz, M.D., and Brian K. Kobilka, M.D., through research grants with the goal of advancing scientific knowledge and improving public health; and

Whereas the accomplishments and discoveries of Robert J. Lefkowitz, M.D., and Brian K. Kobilka, M.D., are significant achievements in the field of scientific and medical research and further promote the United

States as a world leader in science: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the recipients of the 2012 Nobel Prize in Chemistry, which is awarded for their outstanding scientific achievements and discoveries; and

(2) recognizes Duke University Medical Center in Durham, North Carolina, and the Stanford University School of Medicine in Stanford, California for their leadership role in advancing medical research.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3329. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3637, to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3330. Mrs. HAGAN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3637, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3331. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 343, to amend Title I of PL 99-658 regarding the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau, to approve the results of the 15-year review of the Compact, including the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Palau Following the Compact of Free Association Section 432 Review, and to appropriate funds for the purposes of the amended PL 99-658 for fiscal years ending on or before September 30, 2024, to carry out the agreements resulting from that review; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3332. Mr. DURBIN proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4310, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 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.

SA 3333. Mr. MENENDEZ proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4310, supra.

SA 3334. Mr. COONS (for Mr. RUBIO) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3783, to provide for a comprehensive strategy to counter Iran's growing hostile presence and activity in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3329. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 3637, to temporarily extend the transaction account guarantee program, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. . ADDITIONAL FEES TO ADDRESS DEPLETION OF INSURANCE FUNDS.

If the amendments made by this Act would result in the inability of the Deposit Insurance Fund of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (in this section referred to as the “Corporation”) or the Share Insurance Fund of the National Credit Union Administration (in this section referred to as the “Administration”) to fully cover insured losses, the Corporation and the Administration shall impose additional fees on insured depository institutions and insured credit