

all aspects of the Lung Cancer Mortality Reduction Program adequately address the burden of lung cancer on women and minority, rural, and underserved populations.

“(6) The cooperation and coordination of all tobacco control and cessation programs within agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services to achieve the goals of the Lung Cancer Mortality Reduction Program with particular emphasis on the coordination of drug and other cessation treatments with early detection protocols.”

#### SEC. 5. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall coordinate with the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(1) in developing the Lung Cancer Mortality Reduction Program under section 399V-6 of the Public Health Service Act, as added by section 4;

(2) in implementing the demonstration project under section 6 within the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to military personnel and veterans whose smoking history and exposure to carcinogens during active duty service has increased their risk for lung cancer; and

(3) in implementing coordinated care programs for military personnel and veterans diagnosed with lung cancer.

#### SEC. 6. LUNG CANCER SCREENING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that a national computed tomography lung cancer screening demonstration project should be carried out expeditiously in order to assess the public health infrastructure needs and to develop the most effective, safe, equitable, and efficient process that will maximize the public health benefits of screening.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”), in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the other members of the Lung Cancer Advisory Board established under section 7 of the Lung Cancer Mortality Reduction Act of 2011, shall establish a demonstration project, to be known as the Lung Cancer Computed Tomography Screening and Treatment Demonstration Project (referred to in this section as the “demonstration project”).

(c) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the demonstration project—

(1) identifies the optimal risk populations that would benefit from screening;

(2) develops the most effective, safe, equitable and cost-efficient process for screening and early disease management;

(3) allows for continuous improvements in quality controls for the process; and

(4) serves as a model for the integration of health information technology and the concept of a rapid learning into the health care system.

(d) PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall select not less than 5 National Cancer Institute Centers, 5 Department of Defense Medical Treatment Centers, 5 sites within the Veterans Affairs Healthcare Network, 5 International Early Lung Cancer Action Program sites, 10 community health centers for minority and underserved populations, and additional sites as the Secretary determines

appropriate, as sites to carry out the demonstration project described under this section.

(e) QUALITY STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR LICENSING OF TOMOGRAPHY SCREENING FACILITIES.—The Secretary shall establish quality standards and guidelines for the licensing of hospitals, outpatient departments, clinics, radiology practices, mobile units, physician offices, or other facilities that conduct computed tomography screening for lung cancer through the demonstration project, that will require the establishment and maintenance of a quality assurance and quality control program at each such facility that is adequate and appropriate to ensure the reliability, clarity, and accuracy of the equipment and interpretation of the screening scan and set appropriate standards to control the levels of radiation dose.

(f) TIMEFRAME.—The Secretary shall conduct the demonstration project under this section for a 5-year period.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the projected cost of the demonstration project, and shall submit annual reports to Congress thereafter on the progress of the demonstration project and preliminary findings.

#### SEC. 7. LUNG CANCER ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a Lung Cancer Advisory Board (referred to in this section as the “Board”) to monitor the programs established under this Act (and the amendments made by this Act), and provide annual reports to Congress concerning benchmarks, expenditures, lung cancer statistics, and the public health impact of such programs.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

(2) the Secretary of Defense;

(3) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

(4) the Director of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration;

(5) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology; and

(6) one representative each from the fields of clinical medicine focused on lung cancer, lung cancer research, radiology, imaging research, drug development, minority health advocacy, veterans service organizations, lung cancer advocacy, and occupational medicine to be appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

#### SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

To carry out this Act (and the amendments made by this Act), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2016.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 132—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING THE ZOOS AND AQUARIUMS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 132

Whereas the 223 zoos and aquariums accredited by the Association of Zoos and

Aquariums support more than 142,000 jobs nationwide, making such zoos and aquariums a valuable part of local and national economies;

Whereas according to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, accredited zoos and aquariums generate more than \$15,000,000,000 in economic activity in the United States annually;

Whereas according to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, accredited zoos and aquariums attract more than 165,000,000 visitors each year and are a valuable part of regional, State, and local tourist economies;

Whereas according to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, accredited zoos and aquariums have formally trained more than 400,000 teachers, and such zoos and aquariums support science curricula with effective teaching materials and hands-on opportunities and host more than 12,000,000 students annually on school field trips;

Whereas according to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, accredited zoos and aquariums provide a unique opportunity for the public to engage in conservation and education efforts, and more than 60,000 people invest more than 3,000,000 hours per year as volunteers at such zoos and aquariums;

Whereas public investment in accredited zoos and aquariums has dual benefits, including immediate job creation and environmental education for children in the United States;

Whereas accredited zoos and aquariums focus on connecting people and animals, and such zoos and aquariums provide a critical link to helping animals in their native habitats;

Whereas according to the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, accredited zoos and aquariums have provided more than \$90,000,000 per year over the past 5 years to support more than 4,000 field conservation and research projects in more than 100 countries; and

Whereas many Federal agencies have recognized accredited zoos and aquariums as critical partners in rescue, rehabilitation, confiscation, and reintroduction efforts for distressed, threatened, and endangered species: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the zoos and aquariums of the United States;

(2) commends the employees and volunteers at each zoo and aquarium for their hard work and dedication;

(3) recommends that people in the United States visit their local accredited zoo and aquarium and take advantage of the educational opportunities that such zoos and aquariums offer; and

(4) urges continued support for accredited zoos and aquariums and the important conservation, education, and recreation programs of such zoos and aquariums.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 133—TO REQUIRE THAT NEW WAR FUNDING BE OFFSET

Mr. FRANKEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 133

*Resolved*,

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “Pay for War Resolution”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL WAR SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of budget enforcement and except as provided in this section, it shall not be in order for the Senate to consider budget authority for overseas

contingency operations if it increases the on-budget deficit over the period of the budget year and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(b) **OFFSETS.**—Budget authority provided for overseas contingency operations in a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report shall be considered deficit neutral for the purpose of this section if such authority—

(1) is considered subsequent to an Act of Congress that raises revenue for the designated purpose of paying for such overseas contingency operations; or

(2) includes new reductions in spending authority.

(c) **IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN.**—For purposes of this section, the following amounts are not required to be offset with respect to the overseas contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan:

(1) For fiscal year 2012, \$118,000,000,000.

(2) For fiscal years 2013 through 2016, an amount equal to the President's budget request for that fiscal year for overseas contingency operations funds for Iraq and Afghanistan.

(d) **BUDGET DETERMINATIONS.**—Compliance with this section shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(e) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—The provisions of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on my pay-for-war resolution, which I am submitting today. This resolution would change the way we pay for war spending, and it would change the way we deliberate about going to war.

This is not a symbolic resolution. It would return us to the traditional American way of paying for wars, where the Congress and the Nation confront head-on the financial cost, commitment, and sacrifice of going to war. This is something I believe in strongly. It is an issue I have been working on for months. This did not start with Libya, though Libya certainly gives it a new urgency.

A number of my friends on both sides of the aisle have expressed concerns about the potential costs of the war in Libya, but this resolution is broader than Libya. It is about how we are going to pay for any wars in the future. The resolution seeks to reestablish a fiscally responsible way of paying for our wars.

It is fiscally responsible because it would require that war spending be paid for or offset, as we say in the Senate. It is also morally and politically responsible because it would reestablish the connection between the citizenry of the United States and the cost of going to war—a burden that is now shared solely by the men and women of

the military and their families, while the rest is passed on to future generations in the form of debt.

Over the last 10 years, our wars have been paid for by borrowing, mostly from China and other countries willing to finance our debt, and by giant emergency spending bills. That is unusual in American history and, frankly, my resolution is aimed at making sure it stays unusual. Iraq and Afghanistan have cost us well over \$1 trillion. In fact, the Congressional Research Service's most recent estimate is that, including this fiscal year, Congress will have approved \$1 ¼ trillion for Iraq and Afghanistan—\$806 billion for Iraq and \$444 billion for Afghanistan.

That is a staggering sum of money, and it has been financed through debt, through borrowing from other countries, and emergency supplemental spending bills which go on our debt. What is more, the Iraq war was accompanied by a massive tax cut. That failed fiscal experiment created the impression that going to war requires no financial sacrifice. We know that is not true.

The question is, Who will bear the financial sacrifice, the generation that has decided to go to war or its children and grandchildren? The Iraq and Afghanistan wars drove up our deficit. They didn't single-handedly create our deficit problem, but they made it much worse. If we are going to fix our deficit problem, rejecting how we finance those wars must be part of the solution.

We have to ensure that the manner of funding—by borrowing—the Iraq and Afghanistan wars remains an anomaly in American history. That is exactly what my resolution seeks to do. It will ensure that future wars don't make our deficit and debt problem worse. It will ensure that Congress and the American people face the financial sacrifice of going to war, and it will force us to decide whether a war is worth that sacrifice.

A huge gap has grown between the majority of the American people and the small proportion who serve in the military. So much sacrifice has been asked of them and their families, yet so little of the rest of us. My resolution will reconnect those who serve and our larger society.

The Obama administration is taking an important step in seeking to reduce reliance on emergency spending bills and, instead, budget for war through the regular budget process. They have included an overseas contingency operations account over and above the budget for the day-to-day operations of the Defense Department. That account is where we now find our war funding. But the improvements the Obama administration has made are not enough. The momentous decision to go to war deserves a way of paying for those wars that matches the seriousness of that decision.

Overseas contingency operations should be paid for. Thus, my resolution

simply says that if there is a new overseas contingency operation requiring new funding beyond the Defense base budget, that funding must be offset. It does not specify how that offset is to be found, leaving it up to Congress to decide. Different people have different ideas. Some may propose spending cuts, others may propose revenue increases or a combination of the two. But the bottom line is, Congress must find a way to pay for the cost of new wars we decide to undertake.

More specifically, this pay-for-war resolution creates a point of order so any Senator can object to a legislative proposal that allows for spending on new overseas contingency operations that is not deficit neutral. But it has some flexibilities. First, it allows the cost for war in a given year to be offset over 10 years. Because of how the budgeting process works now, spending cuts must be found in the same year of funding as the war spending. But if there is any offset on the revenue side, it can be spread out over 10 years.

My resolution also allows the offset requirement to be overridden by a vote of 60 Senators. So if three-fifths of us deem it important enough to spend on an overseas contingency operation without paying for it ourselves, that can happen. I believe this fully addresses any concern people might have about unduly tying the hands of the President or of the Congress, for that matter. If there were a genuine emergency that required immediate military response in the short term, and that could not be covered by the base defense budget, my resolution would not tie our hands. Any true emergency would certainly motivate enough of us to vote to waive the point of order.

Similarly, if at a particular time our economic circumstances make it especially ill-advised to offset the spending on a war, we would be able to waive or override the offset requirement with 60 votes here in the Senate.

Let me talk briefly about how this resolution handles Iraq and Afghanistan. Unfortunately, we are where we are on Iraq and Afghanistan. This resolution is not meant to drive policy on those wars. It is forward looking. Earlier I mentioned the Obama administration's praiseworthy effort to reduce reliance on emergency supplemental spending bills. My resolution would strengthen that effort by exempting the spending on those wars from this offset requirement but only up to the amount of the President's regular budget request. Anything above that cap would be subject to the offset requirement. For example, for fiscal year 2012 the President requested \$118 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan. Any costs over and above that request would need to be offset. That number should go down as we draw down from Iraq and Afghanistan. This idea is derived, by the way, from a recommendation of the President's fiscal commission.

The idea that we should pay for our wars is not a Democratic idea. It is not

a Republican idea. It is not left or right, it is not antiwar, it is not prowar—it is common sense. That is why my resolution has garnered expressions of support from a diverse range of organizations and defense and budget experts. It is supported by the Center for American Progress Action Fund, by the Bipartisan Policy Center, and by the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Noted fiscal hawk David Walker, the former Comptroller General of the United States, has expressed his support. So has Maya MacGuineas of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

A number of experts have stated the rationale for the bill very powerfully. Here is what Michael O'Hanlon of the Brookings Institution said:

Senator Franken's proposal is serious and smart. It seeks to remedy a major problem of the last decade—fighting wars while not asking the broader nation for sacrifice and commitment and meanwhile racking up Federal debt in a way that endangers the economic progress of future generations.

Here is what William Niskanen and Ben Friedman of the Cato Institute said:

Democracies cannot accurately evaluate policies with hidden costs. Deficit financing sends war bills to future taxpayers. That limits the extent to which voters and their Representatives weigh the wars' costs against other priorities. The effect is to make war feel cheaper than it is.

Here is what Dean Baker of the Center for Economic and Policy Research said:

The vast majority of people in the country have no direct connection to the people serving in the military. If we think that a situation requires the men and women in our military to risk their own lives, then the rest of us should at least be willing to pay for the costs of this adventure with our tax dollars.

My resolution makes budgetary sense and it makes moral and political sense. That is why I am confident my resolution will garner the support of my colleagues and of the American people. I think Americans understand that the way we have gone about paying for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan—by borrowing and putting the financial burden on later generations instead of taking it on ourselves—is not good budgeting and, frankly, it is not good decisionmaking about war. Right now we are hiding the costs of war by shifting their financial burden to future generations and we are refusing to consider the real sacrifices that war requires of a nation—not just the members of the military. That has to change. We need to start paying for war and it needs to be part of the larger conversation about how we address our Nation's deficit and debt.

SENATE RESOLUTION 134—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL AS PARKINSON'S AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr.

JOHANNIS, and Mrs. HUTCHISON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 134

Whereas Parkinson's disease is the second most common neurodegenerative disease in the United States, second only to Alzheimer's disease;

Whereas even though there is inadequate comprehensive data on the incidence and prevalence of Parkinson's disease, as of 2011, it is estimated that the disease affects over 1,000,000 people in the United States;

Whereas although research suggests the cause of Parkinson's disease is a combination of genetic and environmental factors, the exact cause and progression of the disease is still unknown;

Whereas there is no objective test for Parkinson's disease, and the rate of misdiagnosis can be high;

Whereas symptoms of Parkinson's disease vary from person to person and include tremors, slowness, difficulty with balance, swallowing, chewing, and speaking, rigidity, cognitive problems, dementia, mood disorders, such as depression and anxiety, constipation, skin problems, and sleep disruptions;

Whereas medications mask some symptoms of Parkinson's disease for a limited amount of time each day, often with dose-limiting side effects;

Whereas ultimately the medications and treatments lose their effectiveness, generally after 4 to 8 years, leaving the person unable to move, speak, or swallow;

Whereas there is no cure, therapy, or drug to slow or halt the progression of Parkinson's disease; and

Whereas increased education and research are needed to help find more effective treatments with fewer side effects and, ultimately, an effective treatment or cure for Parkinson's disease;

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of April as Parkinson's Awareness Month;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Parkinson's Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments, and eventually, a cure for Parkinson's disease;

(4) recognizes the people living with Parkinson's who participate in vital clinical trials to advance knowledge of this disease; and

(5) commends the dedication of local and regional organizations, volunteers, and millions of Americans across the country working to improve the quality of life of persons living with Parkinson's disease and their families.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S DISCONTINUING TO DEFEND THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. INHOFE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 11

Whereas on February 23, 2011, President Barack Obama ordered the Department of Justice to drop its defense of a central part of the 1996 law that bars the Federal Government from recognizing same-sex unions, the Defense of Marriage Act (adding section 7 of title 1, United States Code), and both Presi-

dent Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder concluded the law is unconstitutional;

Whereas President Obama himself has said that marriage is something sanctified between a man and a woman;

Whereas, passed by significant majorities in both chambers of Congress and signed into law by President Bill Clinton, the Defense of Marriage Act has never been overturned in any Federal lawsuit challenging that Act's constitutionality by a Federal court, yet the Department of Justice has decided not to defend that Act in Federal court;

Whereas, on the contrary, the Department of Justice is vigorously defending in numerous Federal courts across the country President Obama's signature health care reform law, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the related Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), after the bills involved barely passed both chambers of Congress on party line votes, and whose critical individual mandate provision has been declared unconstitutional by separate Federal district courts in the cases of *Florida v. United States Department of Health and Human Services*, Case No.: 3:10-cv-91-RV/EMT (N.D. Fla., Jan. 31, 2011), and *Virginia ex rel. Cuccinelli v. Sebelius*, 728 F. Supp. 2d 768 (E.D. Va. 2010); and

Whereas the vast majority of Americans believe that marriage should continue to be what it always has been—the legal and spiritual union between one man and one woman: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That Congress—

(1) condemns the Obama administration's direction that the Department of Justice should discontinue defending the Defense of Marriage Act; and

(2) demands that the Department of Justice continue to defend the Defense of Marriage Act in all instances.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 6, 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 6, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Role of the Accounting Profession in Preventing Another Financial Crisis."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 6, 2011, at 9:15 a.m. in Dirksen 406 to hold a hearing entitled, "State and Local Perspectives on Transportation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.