



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2010

No. 94

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

Washington, DC, June 22, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HINOJOSA) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Lane Bembenek, Joy Lutheran Church, Moore, South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

God of grace and glory, in Your goodness and love You created humanity to

live together in unity and peace. We are different and yet the same.

Thank You for the gift of communities around the world, large and small, and for the many ways in which our hands are an extension of Your graceful hands.

Empower the leaders of the House in their important work as they serve to make our communities safe, productive, and beautiful places to live and work.

Grant each person here wisdom in the important work that You have called them to do. Their work is Your work and their voices are Your voice as they labor together for the sake of this great land and for those around the world.

Bless all that is done here today and every day. We ask all this, O God, in Your holy and precious name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMENDING IVY TECH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

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

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ivy Tech Community College in South Bend, Indiana. Last week, Ivy Tech's South Bend campus was approved by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education to become the first college in Indiana to offer an associate's degree in the field of nanotechnology.

As demonstrated by advances made at the Midwest Institute for Nanoelectronics Discovery in South Bend, north central Indiana is a growing leader in the Nation's nanotechnology research and development.

As our Nation is faced with an expanding and increasingly competitive global economy, it is crucial to promote efforts such as a nanotechnology education to not only keep America competitive, but to thrive and win.

Investments today in nanotechnology will result in quality, rewarding Hoosier jobs of the future. I commend Ivy Tech for their efforts to prepare students, our next generation of innovators for the future.

JUDGE OVERRULES ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, real people in the gulf region are affected by the hasty, overreaction by the Federal Government to shut down deep-water drilling for 6 months in the Gulf of Mexico. The Obamatorium will bankrupt businesses and put thousands of people in the gulf region out of work.

The Feds are in an apparent violation of the law which requires affected parties to be consulted before regulators dictate new regulations. Affected parties would be the oil industries that are shut down and the people of the Gulf States.

So these people have sued the Federal Government and asked a Federal

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4639

judge to impose an injunction against the Federal Government's unscientific drilling ban. And in just the last hour, a U.S. district judge has ruled the administration was wrong in illegally summarily stopping deepwater drilling. It is unfortunate the administration has to be sued by the people of this country to keep it from destroying American jobs.

And that's just the way it is.

COMMENDING ARIZONA EDUCATORS

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, to succeed in today's global economy, our children need a great education. And as any mom knows, a great education comes from great teachers, working hard and giving every student the attention they deserve.

Though schools are starting their summer breaks, Arizona's teachers, administrators, and support staff are still putting in very long days. They are taking the time to get ready for fall so they can work with parents to help their students along the path to college or the job they want.

Even as many of our State's educators face layoffs and pay cuts this year, they remained devoted to making sure our kids can realize their potential and their dreams. In my district, where we have been hit hard by the downturn, they are finding creative ways to do their jobs with fewer resources.

As parents and as citizens, we owe our teachers, administrators, and support staff thanks for all their efforts. This Congress should do whatever it can to better support them in the coming school year.

NATIONAL MEDIA REVEAL DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, the current House majority leader said enacting a budget was "the most basic responsibility of governing."

Now he says that the Democratic majority will not even pass a budget this year. The House has passed a budget every year since the Budget Act became law in 1974. If House Republicans had failed to pass a budget during an economic crisis such as this, it would be the lead story on every network news program and the lead editorial in every newspaper.

Instead, the national media have collectively yawned and have given the Democrats a free pass. The Democratic majority doesn't want to pass a budget because it will expose their run-away spending.

Americans want Congress to pass a responsible budget that will get gov-

ernment spending under control and reduce the national debt.

COMMENDING REAL MEN COOK FOR CHARITY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Real Men Cook for Charity in Chicago for its annual event which was held on Sunday, Father's Day, at the Kennedy King College for the purpose of promoting healthy lifestyles, family values, and community spirit.

As is usually the case, it was well-attended by hundreds of individuals and their families as a tribute to fathers. I again commend them for this great activity.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF PASSING A BUDGET

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, when hardworking Arkansans receive their paychecks, they are forced to make difficult decisions about their finances and how to spend their money. Arkansas families are forced to tighten their belts in this economic climate and change their spending habits, and they expect Washington to do the same.

It is the job of Congress to be responsible stewards of taxpayer money, but not passing a budget is far from responsible. It is a failure by the majority to govern at its most basic level.

The level of discretionary spending increases and spending in the past year has become unsustainable. Failing to produce a budget only places future burdens on our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

We need fiscal discipline and a balanced budget that controls the national debt, does not raise taxes, and achieves lower deficits. Not passing a budget for the first time in modern history demonstrates how out of touch Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER are with the American people. We owe it to the American people to do better.

HONORING ALFONSO OBREGON

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of an outstanding citizen of Pearsall, Texas, for his educational contributions to the community.

Mr. Alfonso Obregon recently retired as a public school superintendent with 30 years of experience. He retires with an exceptional background, having earned a bachelor's degree in education and a master's degree in education ad-

ministration. Mr. Obregon has dedicated 38 years to education, including 30 years as an accomplished superintendent. He started off in the 1970s teaching elementary and junior high school. He was promoted to superintendent for the Dilley Independent School District. From there he went to Progreso Independent School District, Asherton Independent School District and recently retired from the Charlotte Independent School District.

Throughout his career, he has been one who has served the public and has taught our children the difference between right and wrong.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to have time to recognize Mr. Alfonso Obregon, a great educator for south Texas.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, Capitol, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 18, 2010 at 2:57 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 33.

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 3962.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 242.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6 p.m. today.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 288) supporting National Men's Health Week.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 288

Whereas despite the advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of more than 5 years less than women and African-American men have the lowest life expectancy;

Whereas 9 of the 10 leading causes of death, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, affect men at a higher percentage than women;

Whereas between the ages of 45 and 54, men are 1½ times more likely than women to die of heart attacks;

Whereas men die of heart disease at 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas men die of cancer at almost 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas testicular cancer is one of the most common cancers in men between the ages of 15 and 34, and when detected early, has a 96 percent survival rate;

Whereas the number of cases of colon cancer among men was almost 49,470 in 2010, and almost half of such men died from the disease;

Whereas the likelihood that a man will develop prostate cancer is 1 in 6;

Whereas the number of men developing prostate cancer in 2010 will reach more than 217,730 and an estimated 32,050 of them will die from the disease;

Whereas African-American men in the United States have the highest incidence of prostate cancer in the world;

Whereas significant numbers of male-related health problems, such as prostate cancer, testicular cancer, infertility, and colon cancer, could be detected and treated if men's awareness of such problems was more pervasive;

Whereas more than half of the elderly widows now living in poverty were not poor before the death of their husbands, and by age 100 women outnumber men 4 to 1;

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems will result in reducing rates of mortality for these diseases;

Whereas appropriate use of tests such as Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA) exams and blood pressure and cholesterol screens, in conjunction with clinical examination and self-testing for problems such as testicular cancer, can result in the detection of many of these problems in their early stages and increases in the survival rates to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas women are twice as likely as men to visit the doctor for annual examinations and preventive services;

Whereas men are less likely than women to visit their health center or physician for regular screening examinations of male-related problems for a variety of reasons, including fear, lack of health insurance, lack of information, and cost factors;

Whereas National Men's Health Week was established by Congress and first celebrated in 1994 and urges men and their families to engage in appropriate health behaviors, and the resulting increased awareness has improved health-related education and helped prevent illness;

Whereas the Governors of all 50 States issue proclamations annually declaring Men's Health Week in their States;

Whereas since 1994, National Men's Health Week has been celebrated each June by dozens of States, cities, localities, public health departments, health care entities, churches, and community organizations throughout the Nation that promote health awareness events focused on men and family;

Whereas the National Men's Health Week Web site has been established at www.menshealthweek.org and features Governors' proclamations and National Men's Health Week events;

Whereas men who are educated about the value that preventive health can play in prolonging their lifespan and their role as productive family members will be more likely to participate in health screenings;

Whereas men and their families are encouraged to increase their awareness of the importance of a healthy lifestyle, regular exercise, and medical checkups; and

Whereas June 14 through June 20, 2010, is National Men's Health Week, which has the purpose of heightening the awareness of preventable health problems and encouraging early detection and treatment of disease among men and boys: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) supports the annual National Men's Health Week; and

(2) requests that the President of the United States issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Men's Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present House Concurrent Resolution 288 for consideration. This resolution expresses our support for the goals and ideals of the annual National Men's Health Week, the observance of which is designed to heighten awareness of preventable health problems and encourage early detection and treatment of disease among men.

H. Con. Res. 288 was introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), on June 14, 2010. It was reported out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by unanimous consent on June 17, 2010. H. Con. Res. 288 enjoys bipartisan support from over 50 cosponsors.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 9 of the 10 leading causes of death in America among men, including heart disease and cancer, affect men at a significantly higher percentage than women. In addition, the CDC has reported that women are 100 percent more likely than men to seek annual medical examinations and preventative health care. Moreover, health statistics also indicate that despite advances in medical care, men continue to live an average of approximately 6 fewer years than women, with African American men having the lowest life expectancy.

Nonetheless, many male-related health problems, including prostate

cancer, testicular cancer, and colon cancer are treatable upon early detection. Specifically, the use of prostate cancer-specific antigen exams, blood pressure screenings, and other exams, when coupled with clinical examination and self-testing for testicular cancer, can lead to early detection and increase survival rates to nearly 100 percent.

Accordingly, we must do more to encourage healthy behavior and disease prevention within America's male population. A more concentrated focus upon male-related health conditions such as prostate, colon, and testicular cancer, along with a genuine commitment to addressing heart health, will go a long way toward ensuring that men have access to critical health information.

In addition, it is important to remember that prevention and treatment of men's health conditions are critical not only to men, but also to the health and well-being of the American family. Having just recently celebrated Father's Day, I believe that it is important for this legislative body to recognize men's health from a family perspective.

Furthermore, while an effort to encourage prevention and wellness among the male population can help meet our primary goal of improving health outcomes, in the aggregate, utilization of these preventive services can lower health costs that currently are spiraling out of control.

Mr. Speaker, since 1994, National Men's Health Week has served as a catalyst for increased attention towards men's health issues. So I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 288, recognizing the tremendous importance of these efforts.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 288, supporting National Men's Health Week. In 1994, Congress established National Men's Health Awareness Week to be celebrated the week leading up to Father's Day. This week brings national attention to the critical health issues facing men and highlights the preventative measures that are necessary and available.

Every day men are reminded about the benefits of living a healthy life. Whether it's through exercise, a balanced diet, or regular visits to the doctor, these simple steps can lead to long, vibrant lives. Sadly, many men still neglect the basic preventative measures and often fail to realize the ripple effect their declining health can have on those around them.

Men have a shorter lifespan than women. On average, men live 5 years less than women. Men are also 1½ times more likely to die from heart attacks, heart disease, and cancer than

women. The reality is that men all too often neglect to seek out the medical initiatives they need. Early detection is vital and, in many cases, increases the chances for survival.

Men's Health Awareness Week helps bring this information to light and highlights the proactive steps that men can take to improve their chances for a long, healthy life. The benefits of a more proactive approach to men's health extends not only to the individual, but to their family, friends, taxpayers, and employers.

I urge my colleagues not only to support this resolution but honor its message. Men's Health Awareness Week helps broaden our understanding of serious health risks and the simple steps we can all take to help mitigate their effects.

I ask my fellow Members to join me in support of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it's now my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this resolution, the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland, Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. My appreciation also goes out to Chairman TOWNS for moving this resolution recognizing National Men's Health Week through the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

This past Sunday, many of us celebrated Father's Day, which also marked the end of National Men's Health Week that is celebrated from June 14 through June 20. The need for this legislation could not be more evident. Despite advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of more than 5 years less than women, and African American men have the lowest life expectancy of all groups.

Further, 9 out of the 10 leading causes of death, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, affect men at a higher percentage rate than women. Men simply are not getting the care they need. Women are twice as likely as men to visit the doctor for annual examinations and preventive services.

By the way, the research shows that most men who are the beneficiaries of early diagnosis and treatment with regard to many, many diseases have been urged to go to the doctor by a woman in their life, a significant other, a sister, a wife. But women are quite often the ones who also make the decisions for the family and sometimes drag us men to the doctor's office kicking and screaming.

Men are also less likely than women to visit their health center or physician for regular screening examinations or gender-related problems for a variety of reasons, including fear, lack of health insurance, lack of information, and cost factors. Quite often, men believe in this macho concept that they can get over anything, that it's

just a small thing. Although their heart is aching, they say, well, I will get over it and everything will be all right. And the next thing you know, he lands in the hospital or, sadly, lands in the cemetery.

The disparity in men's health has led to increased risks of death from heart disease and cancer. But these problems do not only affect men. More than half of the elderly widows now living in poverty were not poor before the death of their husbands. And by age 100, women outnumber men four to one.

We simply must get more men the early care and education they need to lead long and healthy lives. That is why I am advocating for the recognition of June 14 through 20 as National Men's Health Week. We need to educate both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems that will result in reducing rates of mortality for common diseases.

Appropriate use of tests such as prostate-specific antigen exams, blood pressure screenings, and cholesterol screenings, in conjunction with clinical examination and self-testing for problems such as testicular cancer, can result in the detection of many of these problems in their early stages and increases in their survival rates to nearly 100 percent.

The number of men developing prostate cancer in 2010 will reach more than 217,000, and an estimated 32,000 of them will, sadly, die from this disease. This week is designed to encourage men and their families to engage in appropriate health behaviors, and the resulting increased awareness has improved health-related education and helped prevent illness.

National Men's Health Week was established by Congress in 1994. And on a more local note, just a few weeks ago I invited men to come in to Mercy Hospital in my district in downtown Baltimore to get prostate exams. I also invited women to come in to get mammograms. I just received a report today that of the 100 or so people that came in, 20 percent of them, 20 percent of them were in a position where they needed care, and if they did not get the care, it probably would have led to very, very, very serious debilitating circumstances or even death. So that's a perfect example of why we need to emphasize men's health and, by the way, women's health.

Men who are educated about the value that preventive health can play in prolonging their lifespan and their role as productive family members will be more likely to participate in preventive care. One of the things that a lot of people don't think about is the fact that there are many men, if they simply took the precautions, if they simply got the exams, they would be around for a lot more Father's Days. And a lot of folks don't realize that to have loved ones around for many, many years is so very, very significant, and, as the commercial says, it is simply priceless.

Again, I want to thank Chairman TOWNS and Chairman DAVIS for their support, and I encourage my colleagues to join me and the 60 other cosponsors in supporting this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend, again, Representative CUMMINGS for his introduction of this very important resolution. I also want to commend the community health centers in my congressional district, and especially the Near North Health Corporation, for their focus on men's health.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Representative CUMMINGS for introducing H. Con. Res. 288, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Men's Health Week, and to urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

National Men's Health Week took place from June 14–20, ending with Father's Day, this past Sunday. The United States celebrated National Men's Health Week to encourage men to live healthy lives, in particular by undergoing precautionary health tests. National Men's Health Week is of vital importance as it helps heighten awareness of preventable health problems and also encourages early detection and treatment of disease and injury among not only men, but young boys as well. Early detection lessens the impact and cost of disease, improves, and often save lives. By encouraging preventive National Men's Health Week and treatment of men's health issues is essential because these issues not only affect men across the nation, but the women, children and all other families members involved in a man's life.

The lessons of Men's Health Week have a personal significance for me. Nearly 20 years ago, I went in for a check-up due to constant fatigue and found out that I had Hepatitis C. Thanks, in part, to early detection, I was able to get proper treatment and fight back fiercely against the disease. I am able to stand here now, medication-free and healthy, because of early detection and treatment.

Today, thanks to this Congress, everyone in the United States—including men—have access to affordable health. The health reform law that I supported provides incentives to seek preventive care and makes that care affordable. I urge my male colleagues in Congress and men around the country to see their doctor for regular check-ups, to get screened and tested, and to do what they can to live healthier lives.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution which encourages men to take simple steps for a longer, healthier, and happier life.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that one of the most important factors in access to medical care is health insurance. Recent Center of Disease Control and Prevention data show that young men are 36 percent more likely to be uninsured than young women. Additionally, young adults without insurance are four times as likely as those with private insurance to have unmet medical needs.

However, even when young men have insurance, they are less likely to seek medical care. Less than 60 percent of young men with Medicaid coverage had an annual doctor visit, compared to over 90 percent of young women. These behavior patterns can lead to missed opportunities for early intervention in a number of medical conditions and chronic illnesses, especially those that are exclusive to or disproportionately effect men.

Beyond expanding health insurance coverage, therefore, it is necessary to improve men's uptake of healthcare services. The first step towards this goal is to increase awareness about men's health issues. I applaud the current resolution in support of National Men's Health Week, as well as the request that interested groups observe with appropriate ceremonies and activities. By educating men about the available predictive screening and preventive care, we can help our nation's fathers, husbands, brothers and sons to live longer, healthier lives.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 288.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 546) recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 546

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the Southwestern States, for more than 2 years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as Juneteenth Independence Day, as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African-Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas for more than 135 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas although Juneteenth Independence Day is beginning to be recognized as a national, and even global, event, the history behind the celebration should not be forgotten; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(2) the House of Representatives supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation; and

(3) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future; and

(B) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 546, a resolution that recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day and expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future. I am delighted that we can bring this measure to the floor today.

I introduced H. Res. 546 on June 15, 2009, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered it to be reported by unanimous consent on June 17, 2010. It comes to the floor with over 60 cosponsors. I am pleased to join with them in recognizing this important day.

Juneteenth, or the 19th of June, recognizes June 19, 1865, when, in Galveston, Texas, Union General Gordon Granger announced freedom for all slaves in the Southwest.

□ 1430

This was the last major vestige of slavery in the United States following the end of the Civil War. This event occurred more than 2½ years after the Emancipation Proclamation was issued by President Abraham Lincoln. Upon reading of General Order No. 3 by General Granger, the former slaves celebrated jubilantly, establishing America's second independence day celebration and the oldest African American holiday observance.

Since that time over 145 years ago, the descendants of slaves have observed this anniversary of emancipation as a remembrance of one of the most tragic periods in our Nation's history. The suffering, degradation, and brutality of slavery cannot be repaired; but the memory can serve to ensure that no such inhumanity is ever perpetrated again on American soil.

Today, Juneteenth celebrates African American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures. This celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States. I, therefore, ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of this measure.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 546, recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day. It is important to once again remember a day when the wants and needs of the people brought our country out of one of the darkest stages of its history. It is through recognition of such an incredible achievement that we are able to pave the way for many more like it.

On June 19, 1865, 2,000 Federal soldiers marched into Galveston and notified the slaves of Texas that their lives of servitude were over. Amazingly, this action took place more than 2 years after President Lincoln's famous Emancipation Proclamation speech was delivered.

Over 100 years later, Juneteenth serves as a time when we can celebrate the true end to slavery in the United States. June 19, commonly known as Juneteenth, also reminds us that it is our duty to constantly work to better our country. On this day, we celebrate culture and, more importantly, emancipation. It is important that our children learn along with our families about the times surrounding the Civil War, but also of this monumental achievement that followed that June day in Galveston.

By taking time to celebrate Juneteenth Independence Day, we honor the richness, diversity, and heritage of all races in our Nation. I ask all my fellow Members to join me in support of H. Res. 546.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of "Juneteenth," the oldest nationally celebrated commemoration of the

ending of slavery in the United States. Originally a celebration of the announcement of the abolition of slavery in Galveston, Texas in 1865, the holiday has come to symbolize our Nation's most significant moment of moral and social progress: the end of the Civil War, the abolition of slavery throughout the full United States, and the freedom of enslaved African Americans after hundreds of years of untold oppression and hardship endured.

The observance of June 19th as the African American Emancipation Day originated in Galveston, Texas in 1865, and is now celebrated around the United States. This day was chosen because it was on June 19, 1865 that the Union soldiers landed at Galveston, Texas with news that the war had ended and informed the enslaved population that they had been set free under President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation a full two and one half years earlier. The day was largely celebrated within African-American communities until the Civil Rights Movement, when Reverend Ralph Abernathy called for people of all races, economic strata, and professions to come to Washington, D.C. to show support for the impoverished and oppressed at the Poor Peoples March on June 19, 1968. Many of the participants returned home and initiated Juneteenth celebrations in their own communities.

Every year, the celebration of Juneteenth grows in popularity across the United States. It is a day when we recognize and remember the evils of slavery, the suffering it caused, and the lives it took. But it is also a day that celebrates African American freedom and achievement with celebrations, guest speakers, picnics, and family gatherings. Participants of all races, nationalities and religions celebrate and take the time to reflect on the past and rejoice in the present and future. Finally, it is an opportunity to emphasize the need for continued efforts to promote educational, economic, political, and social equality throughout our country.

Mr. Speaker, in the wonderfully diverse 37th District, we share as a community a legacy of overcoming difficulties, working to defeat our obstacles, and empowering ourselves to improve our lives and our neighborhoods. I am proud that, this year, in the 37th district, the cities of Carson, Compton, and Long Beach, as well as the neighborhoods of Watts and Willowbrook, all held Juneteenth celebrations. I was fortunate enough to attend the celebration in Compton and can say that it was at once a solemn remembrance of those who struggled against slavery and oppression, an inspiring celebration of freedom, and an opportunity to revisit the past in order to improve our collective future.

As we celebrate Juneteenth, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to recognize this day and take a moment to honor the women and men that dedicated their lives to ending slavery and promoting freedom and equality in our Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H. Res. 546 recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenge of the future. I would like to applaud my colleague Representative DAVIS for his persistence in celebrating this momentous occasion in U.S. history.

When Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation into law in 1863, he freed the slaves in the confederate states. Though they were free on paper many slaves continued with their lives unaware of their freedom. Such was the case in Galveston, Texas. For two years the black population of this city lived their lives as slaves, as opposed to other southern states like Georgia and North Carolina in which the black population knew of the Emancipation Proclamation. On June 19th, the situation changed when Union General Gordon Granger announced the news of their freedom to the black citizens of Galveston. Seen as one of the last bastions of slavery, General Granger's announcement brought about the end of slavery in Texas.

We often praise this country for the great freedom that it affords its citizens, yet Juneteenth serves as a consistent and glaring reminder of our darker past. While it is true that significant strides have been made since then, it is important that we not forget from whence we come and learn from it. I'm proud to represent the state of Georgia in the United States House of Representatives, but I also recognize that the great state I serve did allow the oppression of blacks as slaves. History is a tool to be used for growth—a means through which we can understand and face the challenges of tomorrow.

Today Juneteenth, also known as Freedom Day, is now recognized as a state holiday in 36 states and primarily serves to remind, inspire, and encourage future generations. Mr. Speaker, I stand proudly to support this resolution and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Con. Res. 546, legislation commemorating a monumental day in the history of liberty, Juneteenth Independence Day. Juneteenth marks the events of June 19, 1865, when slaves in Galveston, Texas learned that they were at last free men and women. The slaves of Galveston were the last group of slaves to learn of the end of slavery. Thus, Juneteenth represents the end of slavery in America.

I hope all Americans will take the time to commemorate Juneteenth. Friends of human liberty should celebrate the end of slavery in any country. The end of American slavery is particularly worthy of recognition since there are few more blatant violations of America's founding principles, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, than slavery. I am particularly pleased to join the recognition of Juneteenth because I have the privilege of representing Galveston.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this resolution, which I am proud to co-sponsor. I thank the House leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge all of my colleagues to honor the end of slavery by voting for H. Con. Res. 546.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 546 recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day. On June 19th, 1865 Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, landed at Galveston, Texas with news that the war had ended and that the enslaved were now free. This news was declared two and a half years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. Because the slaves spent two years unnecessarily enslaved, this day had been declared a holiday; Juneteenth is the

oldest holiday in the United States commemorating the ending of slavery. The Juneteenth holiday is a day where peoples of all races can reflect on the evils and suffering of slavery and recognize the contributions that African Americans have made to society since Juneteenth.

When I first came to this body, these were the same issues that my constituents and the African American community at-large faced. As we commemorate Juneteenth, there will be celebrations, but I hope there will also be reflections. Even today, the vestiges of slavery still impose the cycle of poverty on the descendants of the freedmen. As time has passed, many have said the free market would take care of these people, but it is clear that it has left them behind. As we commemorate today, we must not forget to pursue the unfinished business of equality that emancipation began so long ago.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 546 which recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future.

On June 19, 1865, the day Union soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved African-Americans were free, "Juneteenth Independence Day" was born. On this historic day, legend has it, while standing on the balcony of Galveston's Ashton Villa, Granger read the contents of "General Order No. 3":

The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves an absolute equality of personal rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves, and the connection heretofore existing between them becomes that between employer and hired labor. The freedmen are advised to remain quietly at their present homes and work for wages. They are informed that they will not be allowed to collect at military posts and that they will not be supported in idleness either there or elsewhere.

In that moment, Galveston streets were filled with jubilant celebrations and the following year, the commemoration of June 19th or Juneteenth celebrations began in Texas. The newly freed African-Americans pulled what few resources they had to purchase land in their communities to have these gatherings. Houston's Emancipation Park, Mexia's Booker T. Washington Park, and Emancipation Park in Austin are the present day result of these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I can image how the words of President Lincoln resonated in their hearts and souls; life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all equal citizens was no longer a dream, they were a reality. Hundreds of thousands of American citizens were released from the grips of bondage; we are freed men and women. However, while it is a celebration of our emancipation, it is also a reminder of the progress we have yet to make.

The Emancipation Proclamation Abraham Lincoln issued on September 22, 1862, with an effective date of January 1, 1863, had minimal initial effect in some States. Let this be a reminder, that words are meaningless without action. We must be steadfast and willing to do our parts as citizens to uphold and carry out

the will of the people and the laws of our great Nation. The United States has made great strides of improvement and we continue to press forward to obtain those values in which we hold dear.

Juneteenth became an official State holiday through the efforts of Al Edwards, an African-American State legislator from Texas in 1980. The successful passage of this bill marked Juneteenth as the first emancipation celebration granted official State recognition. As of March 2010, 36 States have followed suit in the celebrations and the adoption of this historic day. In my district, we actively celebrate this holiday through, reenactments, of the reading of the Emancipation Proclamation at Ashton Villa and various parades and musical events all across Houston.

Juneteenth is a day to reflect upon the African-American experience and it includes all races, ethnicities and nationalities. It is a symbolic reference point of our progress and the contributions we have made to make this country what it is today. Juneteenth is a time to reconnect with loved ones and have a renewed sense of community.

In conclusion, I am reminded of what President Obama stated 2 years ago pertaining to Juneteenth and the continued pursuit of the values embedded in this day:

We pause to remember that our nation has made tremendous progress, but has many miles to go on the long march toward finally fulfilling the ideals of this country. When too many Americans go without affordable healthcare or a quality education; when neighborhoods unravel due to a housing market in crisis; when special interests hold their thumbs on the scale of opportunity; we have more work to do.

Juneteenth is a day for celebration of freedom and family, but also a day that calls us all to rededicate ourselves to the convictions at the heart of our American experiment. It reminds us that with the work of each successive generation, we come closer to the realization of that more perfect union.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 546.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL CARIBBEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1369) recog-

nizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1369

Whereas people of Caribbean heritage are found in every State of the Union;

Whereas emigration from the Caribbean region to the American Colonies began as early as 1619 with the arrival of indentured workers in Jamestown, Virginia;

Whereas during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, a significant number of slaves from the Caribbean region were brought to the United States;

Whereas since 1820, millions of people have emigrated from the Caribbean region to the United States;

Whereas like the United States, the countries of the Caribbean faced obstacles of slavery and colonialism and struggled for independence;

Whereas also like the United States, the people of the Caribbean region have diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds;

Whereas the independence movements throughout the Caribbean during the 1960s and the consequential establishment of independent democratic countries in the Caribbean strengthened ties between the region and the United States;

Whereas Alexander Hamilton, a founding father of the United States and the first Secretary of the Treasury, was born in the Caribbean;

Whereas many influential Caribbean-Americans have contributed to the rich history of the United States, including Jean Baptiste Pointe du Sable, the pioneer settler of Chicago; Claude McKay, a poet of the Harlem Renaissance; James Weldon Johnson, the writer of the Black National Anthem; Celia Cruz, the world-renowned queen of Salsa music; and Shirley Chisholm, the first African-American Congresswoman and first African-American woman candidate for President;

Whereas the many influential Caribbean-Americans in the history of the United States also include Colin Powell, the first African-American Secretary of State; Sidney Poitier, the first African-American actor to receive the Academy Award for best actor in a leading role; Harry Belafonte, a musician, actor, and activist; Al Roker, a meteorologist and television personality; and Roberto Clemente, the first Latino inducted into the baseball hall of fame;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans have played an active role in the civil rights movement and other social and political movements in the United States;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans have contributed greatly to the fine arts, education, business, literature, journalism, sports, fashion, politics, government, the military, music, science, technology, and other fields in the United States;

Whereas Caribbean-Americans share their culture through festivals, carnivals, music, dance, film, and literature, which enrich the cultural landscape of the United States;

Whereas the countries of the Caribbean are important economic partners of the United States;

Whereas the countries of the Caribbean represent the United States' third border;

Whereas the people of the Caribbean region share the hopes and aspirations of the people of the United States for peace and prosperity throughout the Western Hemisphere and the rest of the world;

Whereas since the passage of H. Con. Res. 71 in the 109th Congress by both the Senate

and the House of Representatives, a proclamation has been issued annually by the President declaring June National Caribbean-American Heritage Month; and

Whereas June is an appropriate month to establish a Caribbean-American Heritage Month; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Caribbean-American Heritage Month;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe Caribbean-American Heritage Month with appropriate ceremonies, celebrations, and activities; and

(3) affirms that—

(A) the contributions of Caribbean-Americans are a significant part of the history, progress, and heritage of the United States; and

(B) the ethnic and racial diversity of the United States enriches and strengthens the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I begin, I know that Representative BARBARA LEE, who is the author of this resolution, had wanted to be here to express her opinions and positions on it. Unfortunately, she could not.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1369, a resolution that recognizes National Caribbean-American Heritage Month. Congress has taken time each year since 2006 to recognize Americans of Caribbean descent for their contributions to our Nation, and I am glad we can bring this measure to the floor today.

H. Res. 1369 was introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE, on May 18, 2010, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered it to be reported by unanimous consent on June 17, 2010. It comes to the floor with over 50 cosponsors, and I am pleased to join them in celebrating the rich heritage of Caribbean Americans.

Millions of people from the Caribbean islands have emigrated to our shores for centuries. We acknowledge that many arrived here in bondage and against their will as slaves and indentured servants, and their struggles for freedom reverberate even today.

Today, we are a better Nation for having them here. Caribbean Americans include such cultural figures as the poet Claude McKay, musician and television star Hazel Scott, actor and activist Harry Belafonte, as well as political leaders from Alexander Hamilton to former Secretary of State

Colin Powell and our current Attorney General, Eric Holder. These and countless other Caribbean Americans have made invaluable contributions to our Nation, and it is right that we honor them today.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1369, recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month. For the past 4 years, our country has proudly recognized the contributions that Caribbean Americans have made to our lives and our country. Since 1619, when the first Caribbean people came to the United States as indentured servants to Jamestown, the Caribbean people have held a place in our growth and development.

We are proud to count among them, as we heard earlier, leaders in government, the military and the arts. The first Secretary of the Treasury and one of our Founding Fathers, Alexander Hamilton, was born in the Caribbean. Former General and Secretary of State Colin Powell; Academy Award winner and musician, Sydney Poitier; and social activist, Harry Belafonte, are all of Caribbean heritage.

There are many similarities in the histories of the United States and the countries of the Caribbean. The United States and the countries of the Caribbean both have endured the trials of slavery, colonialism, and the struggle for independence. The separate countries of the Caribbean share a diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious background that is comparable to our multicultural Nation. These similarities are but a few ties that bind our countries together.

The countries of the Caribbean are also important economic partners of the United States and, importantly, represent the United States' third border. They share our commitment to peace and prosperity throughout our hemisphere. These common goals make our countries both strategically and culturally long-time allies.

I ask all my fellow Members to join me in celebrating National Caribbean-American Heritage Month and recognizing the contributions Caribbean Americans have made to the history of the United States.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1369, recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage month. This resolution acknowledges the important contributions Caribbean-Americans have made to our nation's history and culture.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman TOWNS, Ranking Member ISSA, and the staff of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for helping to bring this bipartisan resolution to the floor today. I would also like to thank Congressman DAVIS for managing the floor and for graciously submitting my statement for the RECORD in my absence.

I would also like to recognize my colleagues—Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, Con-

gresswoman CLARKE, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, Congresswoman WATERS, Congressman PAYNE, and Congressman BURTON—and others for their tremendous leadership on Caribbean issues.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Claire Nelson and the Institute of Caribbean Studies—and all the other Caribbean-American organizations in Washington, my home state of California, and across the country that have worked and continue to work to make Caribbean-American Heritage Month a great success.

As a long-time supporter of the Caribbean and a frequent visitor to the region, I was very proud to see us celebrate this important commemorative month for the fifth straight year. Since Congress unanimously passed H. Con. Res. 71 in February 2006, the President has issued a proclamation annually recognizing June as Caribbean-American Heritage Month. This year, President Obama issued a proclamation on May 28.

People of Caribbean heritage reside in every part of our country. Since before our nation's founding, millions of people have emigrated from the Caribbean to the United States.

Throughout U.S. history we have been fortunate to benefit from countless individuals of Caribbean descent who have contributed to American government, politics, business, arts, education, and culture—including one of my personal mentors, the Honorable Shirley Chisholm.

Shirley Chisholm was a woman of Ba-jan and Guyanese descent, who never forgot her roots in the Caribbean. She was the first African American woman elected to Congress and the first woman to run for President.

My political involvement began as a volunteer during her historic presidential campaign in 1972. Through her mentorship, she strengthened my interest in issues of importance to the African Diaspora both here in the U.S. and abroad.

During Caribbean-American Heritage Month, we recognize the important contributions of people like Shirley Chisholm, as well as Alexander Hamilton, Hazel Scott, Sidney Poitier, Wyclef Jean, Eric Holder, Colin Powell, Harry Belafonte, Roberto Clemente, Celia Cruz—and yes, Congresswomen DONNA CHRISTENSEN, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and YVETTE CLARKE—and many other persons of Caribbean descent who have helped shape this country.

Caribbean-American Heritage Month reminds us of the large and diverse constituencies of Caribbean-Americans in our nation, and provides us with an opportunity to send a message of good will to the community at home and abroad.

Caribbean-American Heritage Month also provides us with an opportunity to celebrate and share in the rich culture of the Caribbean-American community through showcases of Caribbean art, festivals, concerts, and film.

In my own district of Oakland, California, individuals and organizations celebrate the rich heritage of people of Caribbean descent through musical concerts and family picnics.

In addition to presenting us with an occasion to celebrate the legacy of Caribbean-Americans, this month also provides us an opportunity to strengthen our long-term partnership with nations of the Caribbean Community.

From trade, energy, and immigration to disaster preparedness, HIV/AIDS and—as recent

events in Jamaica have made clear—drug-related violence, we share a number of mutual policy interests with our Caribbean neighbors. These challenges are regional in nature, so we must confront them together and in partnership.

One issue which I think deserves a special mention is the recent earthquake and resulting tragedy that has unfolded in Haiti. Like many of my CBC colleagues, I have followed Haiti's progress for some time now and have visited the country on multiple occasions.

The American people, including Haitian Americans, have responded incredibly to the tragedy just off our shores—and along with the international community we have conducted one of the largest humanitarian responses in history.

Once the cameras are gone and Haiti slips off the front pages and the 24-hour news cycle, it is up to us to ensure that the United States maintains its attention on the plights of the Haitian people.

Last year, I introduced H.R. 417, the Next Steps for Haiti Act, to create a professional exchange program to assign U.S. professionals, particularly Haitian-Americans, in Haiti to provide technical assistance in fields critical to development. Such an initiative would tap into the vast energy and knowledge of the Haitian Diaspora to promote long-term capacity building.

H.R. 417 is just one of a number of initiatives that the U.S. can establish to promote the reconstruction of the country.

The recent tragedy in Haiti provides us, to use an oft-quoted phrase, with an opportunity to “rebuild Haiti differently.” I believe that in order to rebuild differently, in a manner that is sustainable and works to end—not promote—Haiti's dependence on foreign aid, we must promote ownership amongst the Haitian people.

It is critical that any long-term reconstruction and development agenda is Haitian-led, that Haitian civil society and the Haitian Diaspora play a central role, and that such an agenda focuses on building the capacity of the Haitian Government to provide basic services and protect the social, civil, and political rights of its people.

Only by empowering Haitians to rebuild their own lives and their own country will we truly “rebuild differently.”

I would like to end by stating that although the Caribbean faces many challenges, we understand that we must face them together. Despite the often turbulent history between the United States and Caribbean countries, our ties cannot be pinned down to geography alone, or economics alone, or even history alone. The region continues to shape us as Americans as much as we here continue to shape the Caribbean.

So I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to honor the Caribbean-American community, and to honor the rich gifts that they have given and continue to give this country.

Let us continue to celebrate the rich diversity of this nation of immigrants and recognize that it will forever be the great blessing and strength of our country.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of H. Res. 1369, which recognizes the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month.

As a child of Jamaican parents, I understand the importance of recognizing the influence Caribbean cultures continues to have on

the many facets of these United States. Growing up, my parents instilled in me a strong appreciation for the Caribbean values they learned in Jamaica: a strong work ethic and tremendous pride in my heritage. As a parent, I have passed on these same values to my own children, so they will develop a sense of pride in their Caribbean heritage and acknowledge the many roles Caribbean people play in shaping this nation. I wholeheartedly support this resolution that commemorates Caribbean heritage, history, culture and contributions to the United States.

In her 1970 autobiography, Shirley Chisholm, the first black woman elected to Congress, credited her success to the education she received while attending school in Barbados. She wrote, "Years later I would know what an important gift my parents had given me by seeing to it that I had my early education in the strict, traditional, British-style schools of Barbados. If I speak and write easily now, that early education is the main reason."

This is a nation built by immigrants. From as early as the 17th century there have been individuals from the Caribbean Islands, working here in the United States as indentured servants in the colony of Jamestown, Virginia. They worked in fields picking cotton, tobacco and crops just as the slaves did.

Caribbean immigrants have been contributing to the well-being of American society since its founding. Alexander Hamilton, the First Secretary of the Treasury was from the Caribbean island of St. Kitts. We count among our famous sons and daughters, Secretary of State Colin Powell, Cicely Tyson, W.E.B. Dubois, James Weldon Johnson, Harry Belafonte and Sidney Poitier to name a few.

Moreover, this is a nation that reaches out to immigrants. None of us will forget the earthquake that shook Haiti to its very foundations in every sense of the word on January 12, 2010. Since then, we have all seen the outpouring of support to the Haitian people and their families on behalf of the American people.

What fewer notice perhaps, are the powerful contributions that Haitians have made to America, its history and its culture. In 1779 soldiers from then Saint Dominique, now Haiti, fought alongside American revolutionaries. Despite the fact that the then slave-holding United States did not look favorably upon an Independence Movement it saw as a dangerous slave rebellion, many historians attribute the Louisiana Purchase partly to the fact that Haitian slaves rose up against their French masters from 1794 to 1801. Haitian born Jean Baptiste Pointe du Sable founded Chicago, one of our great cities. And Americans from coast to coast have enjoyed the contributions Wyclef Jean, another of Haiti's sons, has made to our musical culture. Indeed, from history to food to music, Haiti has a long history of helping to shape America.

H. Res. 1369 recognizes the significance of Caribbean people and their descendants in the history and culture of the United States. Our nation would not be what it is today without these significant contributions of the Caribbean people and we should honor these accomplishments with the passing of this legislation. The contributions of Caribbean-Americans are a significant part of the history, progress, and heritage of the United States and play an important role in the unique diversity that enriches and strengthens our nation.

By passing this legislation we continue to honor the friendship between the United States and Caribbean countries. We are united by our common values and shared history, and we should celebrate the rich Caribbean Heritage and the many ways in which Caribbean Americans have helped shape this nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to pay tribute to the common culture and bonds of friendship that unite the United States and the Caribbean countries.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1369.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SUPPORTING HIGH-PERFORMANCE BUILDING WEEK

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1407) supporting the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1407

Whereas the High-Performance Building Congressional Caucus Coalition has declared the week of June 13 through June 19, 2010, as "High-Performance Building Week";

Whereas the House of Representatives has recognized the importance of high-performance buildings through the inclusion of a definition of high-performance buildings in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007;

Whereas our homes, offices, schools, and other buildings consume 40 percent of the primary energy and 70 percent of the electricity in the United States annually;

Whereas buildings consume about 12 percent of the potable water in this country;

Whereas the construction of buildings and their related infrastructure consumes approximately 60 percent of all raw materials used in the United States economy;

Whereas buildings account for 39 percent of United States carbon dioxide emissions a year, approximately equaling the combined carbon emissions of Japan, France, and the United Kingdom;

Whereas Americans spend about 90 percent of their time indoors;

Whereas the value of all United States construction alone represents more than 13 per-

cent of the Nation's Gross Domestic Product and the value of the Nation's structures is estimated at over \$28 trillion;

Whereas poor indoor environmental quality is detrimental to the health of all Americans, especially our children and the elderly;

Whereas high-performance buildings promote higher student achievement by providing better lighting, a more comfortable indoor environment, and improved ventilation and indoor air quality;

Whereas high-performance residential and commercial building design and construction should effectively guard against natural and human-caused events and disasters, including fire, water, wind, noise, crime, and terrorism;

Whereas high-performance buildings, which address human, environmental, economic, and total societal impact, result from the application of the highest level of design, construction, operation, and maintenance principles—a paradigm change for the built environment;

Whereas nearly 7,500,000 Americans are employed in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance sectors and require education and training to achieve and maintain high performance; and

Whereas the United States should continue to improve the features of new buildings and adapt and maintain existing buildings to changing balances in our needs and responsibilities for health, safety, energy and water efficiency, and usability by all segments of society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week;

(2) recognizes and reaffirms our Nation's commitment to high-performance buildings by promoting awareness about their benefits and by promoting new education programs, supporting research, and expanding access to information;

(3) recognizes the unique role that the Department of Energy plays through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy's Building Technologies Program, which works closely with the building industry and manufacturers to conduct research and development on technologies and practices for building energy efficiency;

(4) recognizes the important role that the National Institute of Standards and Technology plays in developing the measurement science needed to develop, test, integrate, and demonstrate the new building technologies; and

(5) encourages further research and development of high-performance building standards, research, and development.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1407, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1407, supporting the

goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week.

In 2008, my colleague Representative JUDY BIGGERT and I came together to form the bipartisan High-Performance Buildings Caucus. We both recognized that any conversation about our energy future and the creation of clean-energy jobs must involve our built environment. Investing in building energy-efficiency measures is the most immediate and effective way to reduce carbon pollution, lower energy demand, create good clean-energy jobs, and save American families and businesses money.

The built environment has a larger impact on the overall environment than many think. Each year, our homes, offices, schools, and other buildings account for about 40 percent of our total energy consumption. They consume 70 percent of all electricity from the grid, 60 percent of all raw materials, and 12 percent of all potable water in the United States alone. Through more efficient building practices and new technologies, we are beginning to address these problems in our built environment, but there is still much more to do.

I am a strong advocate of increasing the number of high-performance building technologies and construction throughout the U.S. A high-performance building is one that incorporates an entire-systems approach to building which includes energy and water efficiencies, lifecycle cost analysis, and other environmental attributes into designs that are accessible, secure, resilient, and in many cases, historically preserved.

□ 1445

High-performance buildings are more important in these difficult economic times because of their reduced energy cost, higher building values, and lower overall operating and maintenance costs.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit with many companies and manufacturers that work in this field. The majority of all building products are American-made and manufactured. This is key because here in the U.S., building construction is responsible for 15 percent of GDP per year. And according to the U.S. Green Building Council, greater building efficiency can meet 85 percent of future U.S. demand for energy, and a national commitment to green building has the potential to generate 2.5 million American jobs.

The retrofitting of existing buildings or the design and construction of new high-performance buildings will have enormous impacts on the growth of our economy and securing our energy independence.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1407, supporting the goals and ideals of

High-Performance Building Week. The congressional High-Performance Buildings Caucus declared the week of June 13 through June 19 High-Performance Building Week in order to support and foster the engineering and innovation required for the construction of high-performance buildings.

High-performance buildings seek to address human, environmental, and economic issues inherent in the development process through the application of the highest level of design, construction, operation, and maintenance principles. These buildings can effectively guard against natural and human-caused events and disasters, including fire, flood, wind, noise, crime, and terrorism. When high-performance standards are used in schools, they also promote higher student achievement with better lighting, a more comfortable indoor environment, and improved ventilation and indoor quality.

Nearly 7.5 million Americans are employed in building design, construction, operation, and maintenance. These professions require high levels of education and training, the need for which will only intensify as the number of high-performance buildings increases. The resolution before us today seeks to promote awareness of the benefits of high-performance buildings and to illustrate continued support for research, education, and access to information in these areas.

We also recognize the important roles the Department of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology play in developing the science necessary to create, test, integrate, and demonstrate new building technologies. Moreover, we recognize the innovative spirit and commitment of Americans to achieving excellence in this field. Our Nation's economy faces a number of obstacles, and we recognize the importance of construction and the value of every job created and maintained by this sector of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution honoring the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to join my colleagues in designating the week of June 13th as High-Performance Building Week. Green buildings present an important opportunity: we can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, help people lead healthier, more productive lives, and spur vital economic development through retrofitting, redevelopment and new development of high performing buildings.

As I travel around the country, I have seen the importance of green buildings in communities everywhere. People are realizing that not only do green buildings decrease long term maintenance and utility costs, improve the health of their residents and workers and reduce our impact on the environment, they play an important role in spurring economic development and centering livable communities.

I am particularly excited by the work of Mr. Anthony Malkin, who is taking on the bold and

visionary plan of retrofitting the Empire State Building. When it was built, the Empire State Building marked the beginning of a new era in American cities. It's a testament to the pioneering American spirit that we're taking what was a 20th century engineering marvel and turning it into an example of what is revolutionary and necessary in the 21st century. By the time Mr. Malkin and his team are done, the Empire State Building tenants will use 49 percent less energy and provide a cleaner, healthier space for all who work there. I'm glad to see that this American landmark will help lead the way to a cleaner, greener economy.

I can't talk about the green economy without discussing what's happening in my hometown of Portland, Oregon. Officials there are currently finalizing designs and plans for one of the first major living buildings. The Oregon Sustainability Center will be net zero for both energy and water, will be built and operated without using any toxic chemicals common to building materials, and will source materials and workforce from the local area. It will serve as a collaborative hub for Oregon's sustainability industry, encouraging collaboration between organizations, local governments and research facilities, and will show the rest of America showing what's possible. The Oregon Sustainability Center will be the first of the next generation in high performance buildings and I am proud that Portland is leading the way.

I am proud to support this resolution today and hope that my colleagues will join me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H. Res. 1407, which enumerates the ideas and goals of High-Performance Building Week. The High-Performance Building Congressional Caucus Coalition has designated the week of June 13 through June 19, 2010, as "High-Performance Building Week," in recognition of the importance of efficient, green building technology in our quest for energy independence. I believe consideration of the environmental impact of each of our buildings is vital to the future of American society, and I agree with the High-Performance Building Congressional Caucus Coalition on the need for awareness of the benefits of high-performance construction.

As a Georgia representative, I am proud of the leadership our universities and agencies have shown in the national movement toward environmental responsibility. Several of Atlanta's foremost institutions are stellar examples of American excellence in high-performance building. Emory University's Whitehead Biomedical Research Building was the first building in the southeast to be certified as green. With a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating of Silver from the U.S. Green Building Council, the Whitehead Research Building uses high-performance technologies, such as rainwater harvesting, to operate its 150 laboratories. This building marked the inception of Emory's policy of requiring all newly constructed buildings to obtain a minimum LEED rating of Silver.

Also located in Atlanta are the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, whose Division of Laboratory Science in 2005 became the first U.S. government building to receive a LEED Gold certification. Its unique sun-shade structure takes in light and reflects it throughout the building, while simultaneously time

blocking solar heat. Aside from the dozens of technological innovations the building boasts, its green design solutions have also saved the CDC an estimated \$1 million in annual operating costs. I am excited about the leaps in the science of high-performance building we have seen in my State and across the country over the past decade, and applaud the designation of High-Performance Building Week as I look forward to the bright future of environmentally-friendly construction.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1407.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL HURRICANE PREPAREDNESS WEEK

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1388) supporting the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1388

Whereas the Atlantic and central Pacific hurricane season begins June 1, 2010, and ends November 30, 2010, and the eastern Pacific hurricane season runs from May 15, 2010, through November 30, 2010;

Whereas an average of 11 tropical storms develop per year over the Atlantic Ocean, the Caribbean Sea, and the Gulf of Mexico, and an average of 6 of these storms become hurricanes;

Whereas in an average 3-year period, roughly 5 hurricanes strike the coastlines of the United States, sometimes resulting in multiple deaths, and 2 of these hurricanes are typically labeled "major" or "intense" category 3 hurricanes, as measured on the Saffir-Simpson Hurricane Scale;

Whereas millions of Americans face great risks from tropical storms and hurricanes, as 50 percent of Americans live along the coast and millions of tourists visit the oceans each year;

Whereas the 2009 Atlantic hurricane season included 9 named storms, including 3 hurricanes, 2 of which were category 3 or higher;

Whereas during a hurricane, homes, businesses, public buildings, and infrastructure may be damaged or destroyed by heavy rain, strong winds, and storm surge;

Whereas damage from a hurricane is usually substantial, as debris can break windows and doors, roads and bridges can be washed

away, homes can be flooded, and destructive tornadoes can occur well away from the storm's center;

Whereas experts at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Hurricane Center and the National Weather Service agree that it is critical for all people to know if they live in an area prone to hurricanes, to figure out their home's vulnerability in the event of a storm surge, flooding, and heavy winds, and to develop a written family disaster plan based on this knowledge;

Whereas the National Hurricane Center recommends that people in areas prone to hurricanes prepare a personal evacuation plan that identifies ahead of time several options of places to go in the event of evacuation, the telephone numbers of these places, and a local road map;

Whereas the National Hurricane Center recommends that people in areas prone to hurricanes prepare a disaster supply kit before hurricane season begins that includes a first aid kit with essential medications, canned food, a can opener, at least 3 gallons of water per person per day for 3 to 7 days, protective clothing, rain gear, bedding or sleeping bags, a battery-powered radio, a flashlight, extra batteries, special items for infant, elderly, or disabled family members, and written instructions on how to turn off electricity, gas, and water in the event authorities advise these actions;

Whereas the National Hurricane Center recommends that citizens know that a "hurricane watch" means conditions are possible in the specified area, usually within 36 hours, and a "hurricane warning" means hurricane conditions are expected in the specified area, usually within 24 hours;

Whereas in the event of a hurricane warning, the National Hurricane Center recommends people listen to the advice of local officials, evacuate if told to do so, complete preparedness activities, stay indoors and away from windows, be alert for tornadoes, and be aware that the calm "eye" of the storm does not mean the storm is over;

Whereas in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, inland flooding was responsible for more than half the deaths associated with tropical storms and hurricanes in the United States;

Whereas the National Weather Service recommends that when a hurricane threatens the United States, people in potential flood zones evacuate if told to do so, keep abreast of road conditions through the news media, move to a safe area before access is cut off by flood water, develop a flood emergency action plan, and do not attempt to cross flowing water in an automobile, because as little as 6 inches of water may cause one to lose control of the vehicle;

Whereas the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration provides more detailed information about hurricanes and hurricane preparedness via its website, <http://www.nhc.noaa.gov/HAW2/>; and

Whereas National Hurricane Preparedness Week will be the week of May 23 through 29, 2010: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week;

(2) encourages the staff of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, especially the National Weather Service and the National Hurricane Center, and other appropriate Federal agencies, to continue their outstanding work of educating people in the United States about hurricane preparedness; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to recognize such a week as an opportunity to learn more about the work of the National Hurricane Center in forecasting hurricanes

and educating citizens about the potential risks of the storms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1388, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on June 1, hurricane season began in the Atlantic Ocean. Hurricane forecasters have predicted an above-average year for tropical storms and hurricanes for 2010. As we enter hurricane season, it is therefore very timely to consider this resolution recognizing the importance of hurricane preparedness.

Hurricanes are among the most powerful forces of nature we experience. As the tragedies from past storms have taught us, it is vitally important that Federal, State, and local governments work together to better prepare the coastal communities for these powerful storms to minimize the loss of life and costly physical damage. Part of this effort is educating the public about hurricanes and hurricane preparedness. The National Hurricane Center at NOAA is a critical resource in this effort. In addition to providing us with the hurricane forecasting information that coastal communities all rely on, the National Hurricane Center also focuses considerable effort in educating coastal communities about hurricane preparedness. This includes recommendations from what supplies to have handy if you live in a hurricane-prone region to encouraging people to craft personal evacuation plans in the event of a storm. These seemingly small steps can make an enormous difference in saving lives.

We don't have any hurricanes in my home State of Missouri, but these same lessons of preparedness for deadly weather can be seen in the Midwest. Living in "Tornado Alley," we know all too well the consequences of not being prepared for action when the tornado warnings go off. Unfortunately, all too often the results from being unprepared is a loss of life.

It really is hard to understate the importance of adequate preparation and preparedness in these regions of our country that are susceptible to dangerous weather. I want to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) for introducing this important resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1388, supporting the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week.

Every year, our coastal areas face the threat of hurricanes and tropical storms. These storms feature high wind speeds, heavy rains, and storm surges which can cause flooding and coastal erosion. With millions of Americans living within 50 miles of a vulnerable shoreline, these factors, unfortunately, can also cause loss of human life and substantial property destruction.

Over the last several decades, the increasing population density along the Nation's coastlines has contributed to the rising cost of recovering from hurricane damage. Thus, it is critical governments prepare for evacuation, ensure emergency supplies are readily available, and require adequate safety standards for infrastructure and buildings.

Each year since 1998, the National Weather Service has issued a seasonal outlook forecasting the number of storms likely to arise during the hurricane season, June 1 through November 30. This year, the National Weather Service is projecting between eight and 14 hurricanes. Storms with sustained wind speeds of 74 miles per hour or greater will form in the Atlantic basin, and between three and seven of these storms could be major hurricanes with wind speeds of at least 111 miles per hour.

Although not all storms will make landfall, a greater number of possible storms this season indicates landfall is more likely. This resolution encourages people to utilize the knowledge gained from past disasters, to learn about the potential risk of being caught in a hurricane, and how to prepare for the associated hazards.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1388.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise today in support of the resolution, but I really wanted to support the previous resolution, but I was in a conference.

As the co-chair of the High-Performance Buildings Caucus, I am delighted to join my colleague and caucus co-chair, Congressman RUSS CARNAHAN, to recognize June 13 through June 19 as High-Performance Building Week, House Resolution 1407.

Last week's celebration was marked by numerous events, including Hill briefings and offsite green infrastructure tours, and I would like to thank the National Institute for Building Sciences, the American Society for Landscape Architects, and the National Institute for Standards and Technology for organizing these tours throughout last week.

Congressman CARNAHAN and I first formed the High-Performance Buildings Caucus in 2008 to heighten awareness and inform policymakers about the major impact buildings have on our health, safety, and environment. Through monthly briefings, we explore the opportunities to design, construct, and operate high-performance buildings that reflect our concern for these impacts. In fact, since we first started this caucus, we've had almost 25 briefings on everything from lighting technology and building modeling to smart-grid facilities management and green job creation.

Understanding how every element of a building affects us—and our energy bill—is important. Buildings consume 40 percent of the energy used in the U.S. while emitting 39 percent of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions. Perhaps a more surprising statistic is that Americans spend, on average, 90 percent of their time indoors. With this in mind, new building construction and sustainability of our current building inventory is more important now than ever.

Consider two statistics from the U.S. Green Building Council: Students with optimum daylight in the classroom performed 20 percent faster on math tests and 26 percent faster on reading tests in 1 year than those with less daylight. Improvements with indoor environments are estimated to save \$17 billion to \$48 billion in total health gains and \$20 billion to \$160 billion in worker performance.

Most importantly, a 2009 McKinsey study on energy efficiency demonstrates the potential for the residential building sector to reduce its energy consumption by 35 percent over the next 10 years, and 40 percent in the industrial sector. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we maintain our commitment to and awareness of high-performance buildings and the benefits they offer society.

We could not honor the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week without thanking those groups that have helped us over the last 2 years. Dozens of building and standard organizations make up the High-Performance Buildings Congressional Caucus Coalition. I know I speak for myself and my fellow caucus co-chair when I say thank you for your help educating, researching, and advancing the goal of high-performance buildings.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1388, to support the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week. This important resolution urges the people of the United States to recognize this week as an opportunity to learn more about the work of the National Hurricane Center in forecasting hurricanes and educating citizens about the potential risks of the storms.

I would like to acknowledge Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for their leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor. I would also like to thank my colleague Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART, who authored this timely resolution.

As Chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response, emergency preparedness for all types of natural disasters, such as flash floods in natural parks or wildfires in southern California, is an important issue to me. I will soon be introducing legislation that emphasizes the importance and need for effective and reliable alert systems when these natural disasters occur.

In an average 3-year period, roughly 5 hurricanes strike the coastlines of the United States. The 2009 Atlantic hurricane season included 9 named storms, including 3 hurricanes, 2 of which were category 3 or higher. Because damage from a hurricane can be substantial, the National Hurricane Center recommends that people in areas prone to hurricanes prepare a personal evacuation plan that identifies ahead of time several options of places to go in the event of evacuation, the telephone numbers of these places, and a local road map. When a hurricane threatens the United States, people in potential flood zones must evacuate if told to do so, keep abreast of road conditions through the news media, move to a safe area before access is cut off by flood water, and develop a flood emergency action plan.

H. Res. 1388 encourages the staff of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, especially the National Weather Service and the National Hurricane Center, to continue their outstanding work of educating people in the United States about hurricane preparedness. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation to promote increased safety measures during hurricane season.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1388.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1330, a resolution that supports the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week. I also want to thank my colleague, the honorable MARIO DIAZ-BALART, for introducing this important resolution.

My district is in the wake of many hurricanes that make their way into the Gulf of Mexico. Hurricane season has a profound impact on our way of life in the Gulf. For example, our latest hurricane, Hurricane Ike, wreaked havoc on Texas, particularly in Galveston and Houston. As we moved forward with recovery efforts, it was clear that the impact of this storm has been widespread and many people are still in need of assistance. Lost in the discussion of Sunday's World Refugee Day was the group of internally displaced individuals from Ike, Rita, and especially Katrina.

Unfortunately, Texans are still in need of help, especially the neglected residents of North Galveston. Let us use this time to examine how FEMA and HUD are responding to citizens so that we can continue to provide the aid people desperately need to fully recover from this storm.

I continue working to ensure that Hurricane Ike victims still have access to recovery resources and call for expeditious action, urging a better response and expedited assistance from FEMA, HUD, and local officials. I also call on housing associations to re-open access to housing for Hurricane Ike victims.

Just as we saw in the 9th ward of New Orleans, Louisiana Post-Hurricane Katrina, people in North Galveston have not received the

proper access to government aid to rebuild and recover. In fact, there is still much more rebuilding and desperate need of housing that needs to be done to restore North Galveston and assist the residents who remain there.

We cannot allow the hurricane victims to be forgotten. Throughout the Post-Hurricane Ike recovery efforts, many individuals have had difficulties and challenges getting the government aid that they need to rebuild after the storm. Many have lost their jobs or are at risk of losing their employment due to damages incurred by the hurricane, including the more than 2,400 employees of the University of Texas Medical Branch, UTMB, who were recently terminated. We must protect our citizens and their means of living as we continue to recover from this storm.

There are men, women, and children who have lost so much due to flood waters and storm winds. I have been proud to stand up repeatedly in Congress to fight on their behalf by securing the necessary Federal funds. We must work together to ensure that our Nation does its part to help Hurricane Ike victims fully recover by ensuring the delivery of these funds that we worked so hard to appropriate. As a senior Member of the House Homeland Security Committee, which has oversight over the Federal Emergency Management Administration, FEMA, I am working to ensure that our communities respond expeditiously to natural disasters. The protection of our homeland and the security of our neighborhoods are at the forefront of my agenda.

For the foregoing reasons I stand in support of making this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add again my thanks to the gentlelady from Illinois for her leadership on the High-Performance Buildings Caucus and for being here to speak on behalf of the prior resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1388.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARNAHAN) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H. Con. Res. 288; H. Res. 546; and H. Res. 1407, in each case by the yeas and nays.

Remaining postponed proceedings will resume later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 288) supporting National Men's Health Week, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—388

Ackerman	Boucher	Clyburn	Dreier	Latta	Rodriguez
Aderholt	Boustany	Coble	Driehaus	Lee (NY)	Roe (TN)
Adler (NJ)	Boyd	Coffman (CO)	Duncan	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Akin	Brady (PA)	Cohen	Edwards (MD)	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Altmire	Brady (TX)	Cole	Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Andrews	Braley (IA)	Conaway	Ehlers	Linder	Rohrabacher
Arcuri	Bright	Connolly (VA)	Ellison	Lipinski	Rooney
Austria	Broun (GA)	Conyers	Ellsworth	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cooper	Emerson	Lowe	Roskam
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Costa	Engel	Lucas	Ross
Bachus	Ginny	Costello	Eshoo	Luetkemeyer	Rothman (NJ)
Baird	Buchanan	Courtney	Etheridge	Luján	Roybal-Allard
Baldwin	Burgess	Crenshaw	Fattah	Lummis	Royce
Barrow	Burton (IN)	Critz	Filner	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
Bartlett	Calvert	Crowley	Flake	E.	Rush
Barton (TX)	Camp	Cuellar	Fleming	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Bean	Campbell	Cummings	Forbes	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Becerra	Cantor	Dahlkemper	Foster	Maffei	Salazar
Berkley	Cao	Davis (CA)	Fox	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda
Berman	Capito	Davis (IL)	Frank (MA)	Manzullo	T.
Berry	Capps	Davis (KY)	Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Sánchez, Loretta
Biggert	Capuano	Davis (TN)	Franks (AZ)	Markey (CO)	Sarbanes
Bilbray	Cardoza	DeFazio	Frelinghuysen	Markey (MA)	Scalise
Bilirakis	Carnahan	DeGette	Fudge	Marshall	Schakowsky
Bishop (GA)	Carney	DeLauro	Gallegly	Matsui	Schauer
Bishop (NY)	Carson (IN)	Delahunt	Garamendi	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	DeLauro	Garrett (NJ)	McCaul	Schmidt
Blackburn	Castle	Dent	Gerlach	McClintock	Schock
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Deutch	Giffords	McCollum	Schwartz
Bocchieri	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart, L.	Gingrey (GA)	McCotter	Schwartz
Boehner	Chandler	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gohmert	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Bonner	Childers	Dicks	Gonzalez	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Bono Mack	Chu	Dingell	Gordon (TN)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Boozman	Clarke	Djou	Granger	McIntyre	Serrano
Boren	Clay	Doggett	Graves (GA)	McKeon	Sestak
Boswell	Cleaver	Donnelly (IN)	Grayson	McMahon	Shadegg
		Doyle	Green, Al	McMorris	Shea-Porter
			Green, Gene	Rodgers	Sherman
			Guthrie	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
			Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
			Hall (NY)	Melancon	Shuster
			Hall (TX)	Mica	Simpson
			Halvorson	Michaud	Sires
			Hare	Miller (FL)	Skelton
			Harman	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
			Harper	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
			Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
			Hastings (WA)	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
			Heinrich	Minnick	Smith (WA)
			Heller	Mitchell	Snyder
			Hensarling	Mollohan	Space
			Herger	Moore (KS)	Speier
			Hersteth Sandlin	Moore (WI)	Spratt
			Higgins	Moran (KS)	Stearns
			Hill	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
			Hinojosa	Murphy (NY)	Sullivan
			Hirono	Murphy, Tim	Sutton
			Holden	Myrick	Tanner
			Holt	Nadler (NY)	Taylor
			Hoyer	Napolitano	Teague
			Hunter	Neal (MA)	Terry
			Inlee	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)
			Israel	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
			Issa	Nye	Thompson (PA)
			Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Thornberry
			Jackson Lee	(TX)	Tiahrt
			(TX)	Olver	Tiberi
			Jenkins	Ortiz	Tierney
			Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tierney
			Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Titus
			Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Tonko
			Jones	Pastor (AZ)	Towns
			Kagen	Paul	Tsongas
			Kanjorski	Paulsen	Turner
			Kaptur	Payne	Upton
			Kennedy	Pence	Van Hollen
			Kildee	Perlmutter	Velázquez
			Kilpatrick (MI)	Perriello	Visclosky
			Kilroy	Peters	Walden
			Kind	Peterson	Walz
			King (IA)	Petri	Wasserman
			King (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
			Kingston	Pitts	Waters
			Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Poe (TX)	Watson
			Kissell	Polis (CO)	Watt
			Klein (FL)	Pomeroy	Waxman
			Kline (MN)	Posey	Weiner
			Kosmas	Price (GA)	Welch
			Kratovil	Price (NC)	Westmoreland
			Kucinich	Quigley	Whitfield
			Lamborn	Radanovich	Wilson (OH)
			Lance	Rahall	Wittman
			Langevin	Rehberg	Wolf
			Larsen (WA)	Reichert	Wu
			Larson (CT)	Reyes	Yarmuth
			Latham	Richardson	Young (AK)
			LaTourette		

NOT VOTING—44

Alexander	Grijalva	McNerney
Barrett (SC)	Himes	Moran (VA)
Blunt	Hinchee	Murphy, Patrick
Brown (SC)	Hodes	Olson
Butterfield	Hoekstra	Platts
Buyer	Honda	Putnam
Carter	Inglis	Rangel
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Schrader
Davis (AL)	Jordan (OH)	Sessions
Fallin	Kirk	Stark
Farr	Lee (CA)	Wamp
Fortenberry	Loeb sack	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Lofgren, Zoe	Woolsey
Graves (MO)	Matheson	Young (FL)
Griffith	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1833

Mr. AUSTRIA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 546) recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 546.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—390

Ackerman	Bocchieri	Cardoza
Aderholt	Boehner	Carnahan
Adler (NJ)	Bonner	Carney
Akin	Bono Mack	Carson (IN)
Altmire	Boozman	Cassidy
Andrews	Boren	Castle
Arcuri	Boswell	Castor (FL)
Austria	Boucher	Chaffetz
Baca	Boustany	Chandler
Bachmann	Boyd	Childers
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Chu
Baird	Brady (TX)	Clarke
Baldwin	Brale (IA)	Clay
Barrow	Bright	Cleaver
Bartlett	Broun (GA)	Clyburn
Barton (TX)	Brown, Corrine	Coble
Bean	Brown-Waite,	Coffman (CO)
Becerra	Ginny	Cohen
Berkley	Buchanan	Cole
Berman	Burgess	Conaway
Berry	Burton (IN)	Connolly (VA)
Biggert	Calvert	Cooper
Bilbray	Camp	Costa
Bilirakis	Campbell	Costello
Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Courtney
Bishop (NY)	Cao	Crenshaw
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Critz
Blackburn	Capps	Crowley
Blumenauer	Capuano	Cuellar

Cummings	King (NY)	Pingree (ME)
Dahlkemper	Kingston	Pitts
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Poe (TX)
Davis (IL)	Kissell	Polis (CO)
Davis (KY)	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy
Davis (TN)	Kline (MN)	Posey
DeFazio	Kosmas	Price (GA)
DeGette	Kratovil	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kucinich	Quigley
Dent	Lamborn	Radanovich
Deutch	Lance	Rahall
Diaz-Balart, L.	Langevin	Rangel
Diaz-Balart, M.	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Reichert
Dingell	Latham	Reyes
Djou	LaTourrette	Richardson
Doggett	Latta	Rodriguez
Donnelly (IN)	Lee (NY)	Roe (TN)
Doyle	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Driehaus	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	Linder	Rohrabacher
Edwards (MD)	Lipinski	Rooney
Edwards (TX)	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	Lowe	Roskam
Ellison	Lucas	Ross
Ellsworth	Luetkemeyer	Rothman (NJ)
Emerson	Luján	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lummis	Royce
Eshoo	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	E.	Rush
Fattah	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Filner	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Maffei	Salazar
Fleming	Maloney	Sánchez, Linda
Forbes	Manzullo	T.
Foster	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Fox	Markey (CO)	Sarbanes
Frank (MA)	Markey (MA)	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Marshall	Schakowsky
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Schauer
Fudge	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff
Galleghy	McCaul	Schmidt
Garamendi	McClintock	Schock
Garrett (NJ)	McCollum	Schwartz
Gerlach	McCotter	Scott (GA)
Giffords	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Gingrey (GA)	McGovern	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	McHenry	Serrano
Gonzalez	McIntyre	Sessions
Granger	McKeon	Sestak
Graves (GA)	McMahon	Shadegg
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Shea-Porter
Grayson	Rodgers	Sherman
Green, Al	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
Green, Gene	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
Guthrie	Melancon	Shuster
Gutierrez	Mica	Simpson
Hall (NY)	Michaud	Sires
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Halvorson	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
Hare	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
Harman	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Harper	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
Hastings (FL)	Minnick	Smith (WA)
Hastings (WA)	Mitchell	Snyder
Heinrich	Mollohan	Space
Heller	Moore (KS)	Speier
Hensarling	Moore (WI)	Spratt
Hergert	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Herseeth Sandlin	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Higgins	Murphy (CT)	Sullivan
Hill	Murphy (NY)	Sutton
Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Hirono	Murphy, Tim	Taylor
Holden	Myrick	Teague
Holt	Nadler (NY)	Terry
Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Hunter	Neal (MA)	Thompson (MS)
Inslee	Neugebauer	Thompson (PA)
Israel	Nunes	Thornberry
Issa	Nye	Tiahrt
Jackson (IL)	Oberstar	Tiberi
Jackson Lee	Obey	Tierney
(TX)	Olver	Titus
Jenkins	Ortiz	Tonko
(GA)	Owens	Towns
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Tsongas
Johnson (IL)	Pascrell	Turner
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Upton
Jones	Paul	Van Hollen
Kagen	Paulsen	Velázquez
Kanjorski	Payne	Visclosky
Kaptur	Pence	Walden
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Walz
Kildee	Perriello	Wasserman
Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters	Schultz
Critz	Peterson	Waters
Kilroy	Petri	Watson
Kind		
King (IA)		

Watt	Westmoreland	Wolf
Waxman	Whitfield	Wu
Weiner	Wilson (OH)	Yarmuth
Welch	Wittman	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—42

Alexander	Goodlatte	Loeb sack
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe
Blunt	Griffith	Matheson
Brown (SC)	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)
Butterfield	Himes	McNerney
Buyer	Hinchee	Olson
Carter	Hodes	Platts
Conyers	Hoekstra	Putnam
Culberson	Honda	Schrader
Davis (AL)	Inglis	Stark
Delahunt	Johnson, Sam	Wamp
Fallin	Jordan (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Farr	Kirk	Woolsey
Fortenberry	Lee (CA)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1841

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING HIGH-PERFORMANCE BUILDING WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1407) supporting the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 20, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—371

Ackerman	Bocchieri	Carney
Aderholt	Boehner	Carson (IN)
Adler (NJ)	Bonner	Cassidy
Akin	Bono Mack	Castle
Altmire	Boozman	Castor (FL)
Andrews	Boren	Chaffetz
Arcuri	Boswell	Chandler
Austria	Boucher	Childers
Baca	Boustany	Chu
Bachmann	Boyd	Clarke
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Clay
Baird	Brady (TX)	Cleaver
Baldwin	Brale (IA)	Clyburn
Barrow	Bright	Coble
Bartlett	Brown, Corrine	Coffman (CO)
Barton (TX)	Brown-Waite,	Cohen
Bean	Ginny	Cole
Becerra	Buchanan	Conaway
Berkley	Burton (IN)	Connolly (VA)
Berman	Calvert	Cooper
Berry	Camp	Costa
Biggert	Campbell	Costello
Bilbray	Cantor	Courtney
Bilirakis	Cao	Crenshaw
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Critz
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Crowley
Bishop (UT)	Capuano	Cuellar
Blackburn	Cardoza	Cummings
Blumenauer	Carnahan	Dahlkemper

Davis (CA) Kosmas
 Davis (IL) Kratovil
 Davis (KY) Kucinich
 Davis (TN) Lance
 DeFazio Langevin
 DeGette Larsen (WA)
 Delahunst Larson (CT)
 DeLauro Latham
 Dent LaTourette
 Deutch Latta
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lee (NY)
 Diaz-Balart, M. Levin
 Dicks Lewis (CA)
 Dingell Lewis (GA)
 Djou Linder
 Doggett Lipinski
 Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo
 Doyle LoBue
 Dreier Lucas
 Driehaus Luetkemeyer
 Duncan Lujan
 Edwards (MD) Lummis
 Edwards (TX) Lungren, Daniel
 Ehlers E.
 Ellison Lynch
 Ellsworth Maffei
 Emerson Maloney
 Engel Manzullo
 Eshoo Marchant
 Etheridge Markey (CO)
 Fattah Markey (MA)
 Filner Marshall
 Fleming Matsui
 Forbes McCarthy (CA)
 Foster McCaul
 Frank (MA) McCollum
 Frelinghuysen McCotter
 Fudge McDermott
 Gallegly McGovern
 Garamendi McHenry
 Garrett (NJ) McIntyre
 Gerlach McKeon
 Giffords McMahan
 Gohmert McMorris
 Gonzalez Rodgers
 Granger Meek (FL)
 Graves (MO) Meeks (NY)
 Grayson Melancon
 Green, Al Mica
 Green, Gene Michaud
 Guthrie Miller (MI)
 Gutierrez Miller (NC)
 Hall (NY) Miller, Gary
 Halvorson Miller, George
 Hare Minnick
 Harman Mitchell
 Harper Mollohan
 Hastings (FL) Moore (KS)
 Hastings (WA) Moore (WI)
 Heinrich Moran (KS)
 Heller Moran (VA)
 Hensarling Murphy (CT)
 Hergert Murphy (NY)
 Herseth Sandlin Murphy, Patrick
 Higgins Murphy, Tim
 Hill Myrick
 Hinchey Nadler (NY)
 Hinojosa Napolitano
 Hirono Neal (MA)
 Holden Neugebauer
 Holt Nunes
 Hoyer Nye
 Hunter Oberstar
 Inslee Obey
 Israel Olver
 Issa Ortiz
 Jackson (IL) Owens
 Jackson Lee Pallone
 (TX) Pascrell
 Jenkins Pastor (AZ)
 Johnson (GA) Paulsen
 Johnson (IL) Payne
 Johnson, E. B. Pence
 Jones Perlmutter
 Kagen Perriello
 Kanjorski Peters
 Kaptur Peterson
 Kennedy Petri
 Kildee Pingree (ME)
 Kilpatrick (MI) Pitts
 Kilroy Polis (CO)
 Kind Pomeroy
 King (NY) Posey
 Kirkpatrick (AZ) Price (NC)
 Kissell Quigley
 Klein (FL) Radanovich
 Kline (MN) Rahall

Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schauer
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schock
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Taylor
 Teague
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Towns
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Weiner
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (OH)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Wu
 Yarmuth

NAYS—20

Hall (TX)
 King (IA)
 Kingston
 Lamborn
 Mack
 McClintock
 Miller (FL)
 Paul
 Poe (TX)
 Price (GA)
 Shadegg
 Westmoreland
 Young (AK)
 Matheson
 McCarthy (NY)
 McNeerney
 Olson
 Platts
 Putnam
 Schrader
 Stark
 Wamp
 Waxman
 Wilson (SC)
 Woolsey
 Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—41

Alexander
 Barrett (SC)
 Blunt
 Brown (SC)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Carter
 Conyers
 Culberson
 Davis (AL)
 Fallin
 Farr
 Fortenberry
 Goodlatte
 Gordon (TN)
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Himes
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Honda
 Inglis
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan (OH)
 Kirk
 Lee (CA)
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1850

Messrs. GINGREY of Georgia, POE of Texas, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall vote No. 376 on H. Con. Res. 288, rollcall vote No. 377 on H. Res. 546, and rollcall vote No. 378 on H. Res. 1407. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on each of these rollcall votes.

A TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR LOUIS ANTONELLI

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, God’s blessings come to us in many forms. One of the ways the people of Rota in the Northern Mariana Islands have been most blessed by God is through His minister, the Reverend Monsignor Louis Antonelli. In September, Pale Antonelli will celebrate his 92nd birthday. For 37 of those years, he has served on the island of Rota, first as pastor of San Francisco De Borja Church in Songsong Village, then as pastor of San Isidro Church in Sinapalu.

Throughout these years, Monsignor Antonelli has presided over countless masses, baptisms, catechism classes, counseling sessions, weddings, and funerals. He has ministered to hospital patients, prison inmates, the sick, and the elderly. But in addition to being a man of the spirit, the beloved Pale Antonelli is a man of the Earth. His herd of cattle, about 100 head, and the grazing lands he has cultivated for

them are widely recognized among Rota’s finest, a product of nurture and careful breeding.

It is a long way from Sheppton, Pennsylvania, where Pale Antonelli was born, to the island of Rota. God’s ways are unfathomable. But we are all grateful that God’s ways brought Pale Antonelli to the Northern Mariana Islands.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR A BUDGET

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Majority Leader HOYER says, “It isn’t possible to debate and pass a realistic, long-term budget until we’ve considered the bipartisan commission’s deficit-reduction plan, which is expected in December.”

Well, that means the Democrats do not plan to have a budget for this cycle. Is it any wonder the White House budget director, Peter Orszag, plans to resign next month? If the hard work of budgeting can be ignored by the majority in Congress when we’re facing trillions of dollars in debt, then why worry about a budget at all? I guess there’s no reason to propose a White House budget either. So Mr. Orszag must not feel needed at the moment.

It has always been clear to me that the power of the purse resided in Congress, not in a deficit-reduction commission. We all look forward to the ideas that may come from the commission. They may be inspired and the answer to our prayers, but the commission is not a reason for abdicating our current responsibility to the people of this Nation to start work now when reducing our debt.

STANWOOD BOOMWORKS AND ABS MATERIALS

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

Mr. BOCCIERI. Today, I rise to acknowledge two businesses in my Ohio district helping to combat the BP oil disaster in the gulf and creating jobs. Stanwood Boomworks in Massillon, Ohio, is one of 10 companies in the country producing oil booms designed to help contain spilled oil. Over the past few weeks, Boomworks has hired 80 new local workers and is producing 250 booms a day. Boomworks supplied more than 1,000 oil booms for Gulf Coast workers already, and I want to honor their hard work today.

Another local company, ABS Materials in Wooster, Ohio, is taking advantage of National Science Foundation grants to create jobs at home and provide solutions for the Gulf Coast oil spill. An NSF grant helped fund research leading to the formation of ABS Materials in 2009. As a result of that

funding, it currently employs 28 people at two locations and will expand to over 100 in the upcoming year. ABS Materials is currently working on producing a more environmentally friendly way of separating oil from ocean water in the Gulf of Mexico.

I congratulate both of these companies on their perseverance and success during these tough economic times and their leadership in combating the worst oil spill in our country's history.

HONORING CHEVEZ CLARKE

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chevez Clarke, a baseball player from my hometown of Marietta, Georgia, who, along with two other Georgians, Kaleb Cowart of Cook High School and Cam Bedrosian of East Coweta High School, was drafted with the first round of the 2010 Major League Baseball draft by the Los Angeles Angels.

Clarke, who's a senior at Marietta High School, is a switch-hitting center fielder, and scouts say he has the ability to be a "game-changer." Marietta Coach Chris Stafford said Clarke is the most talented player he has ever had the chance to coach and is a "very mature, focused kid." No doubt Marietta High School benefited greatly from the playing ability of Chevez Clarke.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to Chevez Clarke's mom and dad, who I know played a big part in his success, and I wish Chevez all the best.

IN MEMORY OF ARMY SPECIALIST BENJAMIN OSBORN

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the very sad duty of reporting the tragic passing of Army Specialist Benjamin Osborn. Osborn was killed in action in Afghanistan on June 15, 2010. Specialist Osborn was assigned to the Army's 101st Airborne based out of Fort Campbell, Kentucky. A beloved son, husband, friend, and soldier from Lake George, Ben will be sorely missed by the entire Adirondack community. My heart goes out to Ben's wife, Nicole, and to his parents, William and Beverly. This true American hero made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of his Nation, and we owe him our eternal gratitude.

Ben Osborn, just 27 years old, volunteered for the position of gunner because, in the words of his sister, Bethany, "He was a proud soldier and believed in what he was doing." Specialist Osborn was willing to give his life in service to all of us and to the country that he loved. The expression of our gratitude for his sacrifice to our Nation is beyond words. This Nation

has been built by great men and women like Ben Osborn, and we must never forget the true cost of the freedoms that we hold dear. I pray that it's not just on days like today when everyone is reminded of the hardships, suffering, bravery, and sacrifices of our Armed Forces. Every day we must try to be more like Ben and dedicate ourselves to these worthy ideals for which he gave his life.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, our thoughts and prayers are with the entire Osborn family during this difficult time.

□ 1900

THE FAIRTAX

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Americans are overtaxed. The Tax Foundation estimates that it took American workers over 3 months this year to pay their share of local, State, and Federal taxes, and this Congress has raised taxes over \$500 billion on the American people so far.

You know, enough is enough. We need to reduce spending and then focus on reforming the tax code with a fairer, simpler system. That's why I have co-sponsored H.R. 25, the FairTax. The FairTax eliminates income taxes, estate taxes, capital gains taxes, Social Security, Medicare, and self-employment taxes and replaces them with one simple retail sales tax. Workers will keep 100 percent of their paychecks, and a new set of winners and losers will be there. The winners being the taxpayers, and the losers being the government.

The FairTax is common sense and abolishes the IRS, making April 15 just another day on the calendar, and maybe one day, we can pass a suspension to recognize that great accomplishment. Lower taxes, less government, and personal responsibility—that's a recipe to getting this economy back on track.

RESTORING DIGNITY AND FREEDOM TO THIS NATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 19, was the celebration of Juneteenth. Thirty-six States now recognize that as a State holiday, a holiday that is not just for one narrow community, but in actuality, is about perseverance, determination, commitment, and freedom. Major Gordon Granger landed on the shores of Galveston, Texas, to announce that those who had been enslaved are free, 2 years later, past the Emancipation Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln.

Today we have the same challenges of restoring, of being persevering and

determined to improve education, to restore summer jobs that have not been voted on yet, to pass a remedies bill that I am introducing that is going to take a new look at the gulf oil spill and restore some new processes to not have this happen again. And yes, restore some dignity to the brass as it relates to the Commander in Chief, who should always be respected. Let us restore dignity and freedom to this Nation and include the United States military brass that have to be more respectful of the President than I have seen in the last 48 hours.

BONE MARROW DONATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage participation in the National Marrow Donor Program. There are many terrible diseases, as we know, especially leukemia, where patients may very well require a bone marrow transplant, yet nearly 70 percent of patients don't match with a family member for a transplant. That's why the National Marrow Donor Program is so vital.

These patients need you. They depend on the selfless people in our community that are registered with the National Marrow Donor Program. Every name that is added greatly increases the likelihood that a patient will find the match that that person needs. And joining the registry is simple. All that is needed is a swab of the cheek, and your name will be entered. You can also order an at-home registration kit at marrow.org or sign up in person at one of the many Be the Match Registry drives throughout the country. Help save a life. Join the National Marrow Donor Program today.

RAISING TAXES

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader today gave a speech, and he indicated that we have to raise taxes. He said the deficit was so big—due in large part to the spending on the Democrat side of the aisle—that the deficit was so big, we have to raise taxes. There's no other way.

When Ronald Reagan took office back in 1980, he heard the same thing. Everybody said that the spending was out of control, that we had to do more with less, and we had to raise taxes. Ronald Reagan talked to a guy named Art Laffer, who is an economist. He said, The way to get the economy moving was to cut taxes, to give people more disposable income, to give businesses more money to invest, and the economy would right itself. And it did, and we had 20 years of prosperity.

Now the Democrats, under the leadership of Mr. HOYER, want to raise

taxes, take money out of people's pockets, take money out of businesses, and say that's going to solve the problem. It will compound the problem and make the recession much, much worse. What we need to do right now is what Ronald Reagan did—cut taxes, give people more disposable income, and give businesses the ability to grow. That's how you create jobs.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CAPRICIOUS, ARBITRARY, PUNITIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "capricious, arbitrary, and punitive." Those are the words of a Federal judge today in ruling about the moratorium for offshore drilling. The Federal judge said that the administration's decision to ban offshore drilling in the deepwater was capricious, arbitrary, and punitive—therefore, illegal. And the Federal judge granted an injunction by the hardworking folks in the gulf States to stop the moratorium because of the detrimental impact it would have.

You see, Mr. Speaker, 150,000 people would lose their jobs if that moratorium continued. There are 3,900 wells in the gulf. Those 3,900 wells produce 31 percent of the Nation's domestic oil and 11 percent of our natural gas. In the deepwater area, we receive 17 percent of the Nation's domestic crude oil from that deepwater drilling. So those affected parties—by the arbitrary, capricious, and punitive ban of the Federal Government—decided to sue, and a Federal judge ruled that the administration's moratorium was improper, granted an injunction by the affected parties, and allowed them to now drill in deepwater. The Federal judge said that the people that sued the oil-related industries would suffer irreparable harm if this ban were to continue. The government's response was, Well, their losses would be trivial. The Federal judge didn't buy their argument.

Also, before a preliminary injunction can be granted, Mr. Speaker—these are rare animals—what happens is, someone goes to court and says that because they're going to be hurt so bad, the Federal judge has to stop somebody's action. In this case, our own government's action. And also, the Federal judge said, probably if there were a trial, the plaintiffs—those suing the Federal Government—would prevail on the merits and win in a jury trial. Granted the injunction because the harm done to the gulf, to the related

industries, to the loss of jobs were massive and irreparable. When the Federal judge tried to hear what the Federal Government said about banning offshore drilling, the judge said, "The government's explanation abuses reason and common sense." In other words, there was no reason, there is no common sense in the almighty Federal Government coming in and banning deepwater drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. It made no sense. Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to ban the whole deepwater drilling because of the actions of BP.

Recently in Texas, we had a BP refinery explode. People were killed. Hundreds were hurt. But we didn't close all the refineries in the United States because of one accident. It wouldn't make sense. It defies reason and common sense. When a plane crashes and people die, that's horrible, but we don't close down the airline industry for 6 months because the Federal Government wants to eventually get around to finding out what happened.

So the Federal judge who ruled in this case did so properly, and it was important for him to do so to prevent people from losing jobs. Jobs that were lost or would be lost because of the Federal government's action, not because of BP's action. So what's the Federal Government going to do about this? They're going to appeal. They don't like the ruling, so they want to appeal to the Fifth Circuit to try to overrule this judge. Why didn't the Federal Government just follow the law and allow deepwater drilling and not destroy the economy of the whole country because of arrogance and because of the lack of reason and common sense?

So, Mr. Speaker, the disaster in the gulf continues to be the second disaster in the gulf for the lack of leadership. We still don't have a Federal plan. We don't know what the Federal Government's response is. It seems like, to me, FEMA is in charge of all of this because the results are always delay, delay, delay, but let's punish deepwater drilling.

The Federal judge's rules will be upheld. The Federal Government needs to get with the program, understand there's a sense of urgency, find out what caused this problem, not let it happen again, clean up the mess, and move on down the road. Meanwhile, follow the law. Don't destroy the jobs in the Gulf Coast, and the Federal Government needs to get out of the way and let us continue safely to drill offshore and provide the energy needs of this country and also provide good working jobs for Americans. Otherwise, these jobs will leave the country, go to Brazil and Indonesia, and never return.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING FIRST LIEUTENANT JOEL GENTZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the Seventh Congressional District of Michigan and our country lost a hero. On June 9, First Lieutenant Joel Gentz of Grass Lake, east of Jackson, was killed while completing a helicopter rescue mission in southern Afghanistan. He was 25 years old. The people that I serve will never forget the sacrifices he made because of the love of his country. I would like to share his story with you.

Joel ran cross-country at Chelsea High School, where he graduated in 2002. He attended Purdue University and graduated with honors in aerospace engineering in 2007. In June 2008, Joel married Kathryn Sullivan, his college sweetheart. They had just celebrated their second wedding anniversary when he lost his life. I spoke with Kathryn on Saturday. She has truly lost her best friend.

Joel originally wanted to be an astronaut, but through his ROTC program, he met combat rescue officers, learned about their mission, and decided what he wanted to do most was to help people. As part of the Air Force's 58th Rescue Squadron, First Lieutenant Gentz spent 2 years becoming a combat rescue officer. He completed Superman School, a training program with a 60 to 90 percent dropout rate. The intense program takes 2 years, and only the strongest finish. Joel was one of about 14 that graduated of the 90 that started in his class.

When he died, First Lieutenant Joel Gentz was flying eight helicopter rescue missions a day into hostile territory in Afghanistan to rescue both Americans and Afghans. He told his dad there was no greater joy than saving an Afghani child and seeing the look on the faces of the parents. He saved a lot of children. His mother said, He was more of a peacekeeper than a fighter, and his service to others demonstrates this.

Just a month ago, Joel emailed Ellen Harpin, the founder of The Ships Project, asking her to send toys to Afghani children that could be dropped off during his unit's missions. The Ships Project sends packages to servicemen and -women in Iraq and Afghanistan. The toys had been gathered, and she was just waiting to hear back from Joel for an address to ship them when he died. She promises to make sure they are all shipped and Joel's wishes are honored.

The Pararescue Code states, "It is my duty as a Pararescueman to save life and to aid the injured. I will be prepared at all times to perform my assigned duties quickly and efficiently,

placing these duties before personal desires and comforts. These things I do, that others may live." Joel lived and breathed this code. He knew when he chose his career that he would have to make sacrifices. He understood that someday, he might lose his life serving others.

□ 1915

First Lieutenant Gentz accepted this responsibility willingly because he wanted to help. He leaves behind not only his grieving family but his fellow officers and the people he saved who are still alive because he bravely put their lives ahead of his own.

"These things I do, that others may live."

First Lieutenant Joel Gentz is truly an American hero.

Today I offer my sincere condolences to Joel's parents, Steven and Judith Gentz; siblings Jared and Rachel; and to his loving widow, Kathryn. May God's grace be upon them. May they find peace in knowing that Joel's service and his sacrifice mean everything to our country's freedom. He will never be forgotten. Our Nation's debt to him will never fully be repaid.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TIME TO REVERSE COURSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States believes that government can do the job better than the private sector. He has proven he has believed that because he in effect is taking over the health industry and using the Federal Government to do it.

He reached into the automobile industry and took control of a large part of that, and eventually he will probably try to take control of all of it. He has reached into the financial industry across this country and has scared the financial industry to death, some with fairly good results, but the fact of the matter is it's more government control.

And now he wants to take over the energy industry. The long socialist arm of the President is reaching out and trying to take over every area of the private sector. He believes in total government control over the economy. And if you don't believe it, all you have to do is look at the record over the last year and a half.

The thing that bothers me is the detrimental effect it's having on the American people. Unemployment is still close to 10 percent. We're now see-

ing a tragedy in the gulf, as the gentleman from Texas talked about. And instead of really solving that problem, what he's doing now is compounding it by saying no drilling down there for 6 months. And all these people, as Mr. POE said, are going to lose their jobs if the ruling of the court today is reversed when it goes to a higher court.

The thing that really is funny about this is we just sent \$2 billion to Brazil so they could do offshore drilling. I guess we don't care much about the environment down there. And we're certainly going to have to buy oil from them because we're going to lose the oil that's going to be produced down in the gulf. We're going to be more dependent on Saudi Arabia, on Africa, on Venezuela, Mexico, and probably Brazil, because we want to clean up the environment by using windmills and solar panels and geothermal energy sources.

We've got the energy here in the United States to solve these problems. We don't need to be sending Mr. Soros money in Brazil so he can make more money by doing offshore drilling with our taxpayers' money. We don't need to be sending those jobs down there. As Mr. POE said, those jobs are going to go down there. They're going to go someplace else because they can't keep those rigs moving in the gulf if they're not producing. So those people who are entrepreneurs are going to take those rigs and they're going to move them someplace else. Along with them will go the jobs, and possibly the impact could be as many as 150,000 Americans will be out of work.

This administration is on the wrong track. They have been on the wrong track since the Obama administration took office. The President believes in socialism. He really believes in it. And so he's trying to put the government in control of everything, and himself at the head of the government is going to be the person pulling the strings.

The American people, I hope, are going to realize that, and I hope in the November elections they're going to say that we've got to change that and give us a House and a Senate that can stop his runaway socialistic agenda.

The way to solve our economic problems is, as I said earlier tonight in a 1-minute, the way Ronald Reagan did it, listening to Mr. Laffer, and that is to cut taxes, to get the burden of government off the backs of the businessman and the individual citizen. And if you do that, you can unleash the power of the free enterprise system and make this economy grow, cut taxes, give people more disposable income, cut business taxes, give business more money to invest, and create an environment where people can buy more because they have more money to spend.

Instead, at the end of this year the Democrats want to let all the tax cuts we put in place expire. That in effect is a tax increase. And then they're talking about additional taxes. Mr. HOYER today gave a speech saying we have to

increase taxes because the deficit is so large. They've made it so large—into the trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars. And now they're saying we have to raise taxes, take more blood out of the American taxpayer, to pay for their mistakes. That's only going to compound the problem, because if you take money out of their pocket, they won't have it to spend; and if they don't have it to spend they won't buy and there will be more unemployed. Whereas, if you do the opposite and give them more of their tax money to spend and reduce the taxes, they'll be able to buy more and the economy will flourish. Reagan knew it, Art Laffer knew it, and we had 20 years of economic expansion because of it. But these guys and the President want control of everything.

The American people have to wake up, Mr. Speaker. They have to realize what's at stake. Not only the future that we face but the future our kids face and our posterity. They're going to have a worse form of life, a worse quality of life, if we don't reverse what we're doing right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MURPHY of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SALUTING DYSTONIA SUFFERER MILAGROS (MILLIE) MUNOZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in solidarity with a wonderful and determined South Florida woman, Millie Munoz. Millie has dystonia, a little-known movement disorder that causes a person's muscles to contract and spasm involuntarily. The trademark of this disorder is repetitive, patterned and uncontrollable movements. It resembles opposing muscles competing for control of a body part. There are over a dozen forms of dystonia, and it is a symptom of many major diseases and conditions. Dystonia affects men, women and children of all backgrounds, all ages, and does not discriminate. And there is no cure.

Millie was born in Miami and had exhibited symptoms of dystonia since childhood. Each symptom was treated separately. She wore a brace on her right leg to help with walking and attended speech therapy classes throughout her school years. Other symptoms

were neglected entirely, and Millie was told to do the best she could with the pain. She went from doctor to doctor, and was often told that it was all in her head. About 6 years ago, she started exhibiting other symptoms, only to be given one misdiagnosis after another. Millie had pain in her neck, her shoulders, her wrists, her hips, and she fell constantly.

Finally in the summer of 2006, she was diagnosed with generalized dystonia, a condition where all of the muscles of her body are impacted. Shortly thereafter, Millie's life as she knew it came to an end. In a short period of time she went from climbing the Great Pyramid in Egypt to being in a wheelchair and bed bound. She was constantly in excruciating pain with chronic fatigue and involuntary movements of her arms, hands, neck, mouth, face and eyes.

Luckily, in 2008, she had deep brain stimulation surgery, which provided some relief. But she had yet another battle to fight. Her ability to swallow and eat were impacted to the point that she was on her deathbed, people thought.

Well, through her personal strength, through her resolve, Millie pulled through and she survived. Today, Millie has a feeding tube and braces on her legs, but she is as resilient and as determined as ever. She came to see me here in D.C. in my congressional office, lobbying all of the Members of Congress to be more knowledgeable about her disease dystonia.

Dystonia is a silent, brutal disease. The constant tug of war of muscles forces people to live in constant, severe pain and exhausted. But not Millie. Much of the time the body's struggles are all internal, hiding from an outside observer that the struggle with dystonia encompasses each and every moment. Those with dystonia often say that the disorder "robs you of the freedom to move." It is as terrible as it is debilitating, yet the vast majority of people with dystonia have no negative impact to their intelligence or perceptions. These individuals live their lives imprisoned by the uncontrollable actions of their body in conflict with the will of their minds.

Dystonia is unknown to most Americans, or at best misunderstood. Without proper awareness and diagnosis, the limited therapies that can help people like Millie will never be applied. Together, we must raise awareness of this disorder and support the research that can help find a cure to this silent internal storm.

Millie, I praise you. I congratulate you for your will and determination in the face of this terrible disorder. The challenges that dystonia has presented to you are exceeded by the promise and the hope that your survival has demonstrated. May your resolve, Millie, be a beacon to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who suffer from dystonia.

I welcomed you to the U.S. Capitol and I hope that you come back very

soon, Millie. You are going to find a cure because you are determined to do so.

Congratulations, Millie, and carry on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING DEWAYNE STAATS, VOICE OF THE TAMPA BAY RAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dewayne Staats, the iconic voice of the Tampa Bay Rays. Broadcasting major league baseball for over 30 years and calling games for the Rays since their inception, Dewayne will call his 5,000th major league ball game tonight when the Rays play the San Diego Padres at St. Petersburg's Tropicana Field. In fact, I think they just got started this evening. Baseball fans all across Tampa Bay and Florida have watched and listened to games called by Dewayne as the Rays have grown from an expansion team to American League champions and one of the best teams in major league baseball. I think the best.

Prior to joining the Rays, Dewayne spent years calling play-by-play for ESPN in a variety of sports, including major league baseball and NCAA baseball, basketball and football, as well as for several other major league teams, including the Houston Astros, the Chicago Cubs, and the New York Yankees. Dewayne began his career as a sports reporter while a student at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, and at the time became the youngest active broadcaster when he began calling major league games in 1976.

Remarkably, he has called six no-hitters, Wade Boggs' 3,000th base hit, and the game in which Pete Rose tied Ty Cobb's major league hits record. Among many accomplishments of an outstanding broadcast career, Dewayne Staats has been honored as one of baseball's all-time top 101 broadcasters by author Curt Smith.

Aside from masterfully calling Rays' games from the broadcast booth, Dewayne and his wife Carla are pillars in the Tampa Bay community, actively supporting the Veteran Employment Transition Foundation and Quantum Leap Farm, a therapeutic and recreational facility for wounded warriors and disabled adults.

Again, I congratulate Dewayne on the occasion of his 5,000th major league broadcast, and I look forward to hearing him call many more Rays wins.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GRAYSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1930

THE SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized for this hour. I am real pleased to be joined by several of my colleagues.

I want to raise an issue that is of real concern to the people of the State of Texas, the State of Alabama, the State of Florida, those who have, for now, generations almost, been invested in and proud of that great American accomplishment of our space program.

We are an exceptional people, and there is an awful lot of people these days that seem to be ashamed of our exceptionalism. But one of the things that we have been exceptional in since its inception is our space program. I can remember, as a young teenager, when the Russians put Sputnik bleeping over the top of my house in Houston, Texas. And we all stood out in the backyard and watched that thing with its little flashing light going across and thought, Oh, my Lord, the Russians are in space and we are not there. What are we going to do?

But being the exceptional people that Americans are, we put our nose to the grindstone and our brains to work, and in a very short time we met the pledge that President Kennedy made that we would put a man on the Moon in the next decade. So we went from behind the eight ball and watching the Russians have the first satellite in space to manned spaceflight and a trip to the Moon on multiple occasions. In fact, we have had a movie about one of the Moon trips that almost ended in disaster.

We've been open and obvious that we have taken the greatest minds that we could put together in our space program. And at the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas, we all in Houston, Texas, and in the State of Texas

have been proud of the fact of our space shuttles, of our space station that we, along with the new free enterprise Russians, have put together in outer space. Amazingly enough, we have just finally completed the space station the way it was conceived as it was started. It's all been done in small portions, putting it together. Now it's finished.

And now we have a new administration who has decided that they are no longer interested in manned space travel. And they have basically started to say we are going to do away with manned space travel and the Constellation program, which was the next phase of manned space travel, and we are going to let some friends of ours start some new businesses and try to go and let private industry go out there and do the shuttle service and launch our satellites. And basically, they have turned over the funds that would go to NASA for the manned space program and they have plans to turn it over to a few private individuals, amazingly enough, most of whom have been fairly large campaign donors of the Democrats and the Obama administration.

In fact, I think I can make an argument—we talk about earmarks in this Congress and all these terrible earmarks that people make—this has the potential, over the next few years, to be around 6 billion, with a B, dollars that the White House is going to earmark for certain individual companies, all of whom seem to have been involved in the success of that administration. Not that there is anything in a payoff in the way. Who knows?

Just a coincidence, I suppose, but we are canning manned space under our NASA program. We are going to lay off thousands of NASA workers and those contractors that work with NASA, and we are taking a new position that we are going to let new start-up companies start over and build a space program. I'm a privatization guy. I believe in privatization in everything we do, but this smacks of some strangeness, and I think that strangeness is what we are going to talk about here tonight.

I am joined by my friend Mr. HALL from Texas. I am joined by Judge POE, and I am joined by my good friend ROB BISHOP, who really informed me a lot about the immigration issue the last time we were together, and I am sure he has great insight.

So I will first recognize Judge POE for such time as he may wish to consume.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Judge CARTER. I appreciate you yielding a few moments on this very important issue.

Of course being from the Houston area and growing up with NASA, I have seen the success of this wonderful program. And like you and many others, as a mere child in 1969, I watched Neil Armstrong set foot on the Moon. And, of course, the first word when man landed on the Moon was "Houston," because that is where NASA was at the time and still is headquartered.

A lot has come from space travel. A lot of our technology, our electronic technology, our computer technology, scientific knowledge, medical knowledge, all has come because America went to space. And as you mentioned, Judge CARTER, we did so in just a few years with the challenge laid before us by President John F. Kennedy. Back in the sixties and the seventies and even in the eighties, and before that, Americans, when determined to do something, they could do it. And that is why we went to space, because nothing was going to get in the way of America going to space and landing people on the Moon.

But for some reason, and I think political reasons, we see the end of that wonderful glorious exploration, the last frontier. America has always led in the space program except, as you mentioned, when the Russians put the first Sputnik in space. And the benefits that have been received from NASA's spaceflight have been shared all over the world, from weather satellites on.

But now, because of a change in philosophy, the administration wants to go a new direction. That direction, of course, is not to space, not to the Moon, not to using the shuttle, not to keeping manned spacecraft available for Americans to go to the space station, because when that last shuttle flight is over with, we are done. We are out of spacecraft. We have no way to go into space.

So if we want to put an American in space after that last shuttle flight is over, we are going to have to hitchhike, and we are going to have to hitchhike with our good buddies the Russians. And right now the Russians charge us to fly with them as a passenger in one of their spacecraft. It started out at \$45 million, and then \$50 million, and then \$55 million, and now it's \$60 million to go into space with the Russians. But when they get the monopoly on spaceflight, when that last shuttle has finished its flight, who's to say what they'll charge us to go into space or if they'll let us even be a passenger in one of their spacecraft.

And then you have got the Chinese over here, you know, the people we owe our lives to and our debt to. They are working on a space program as well. And now there's that little tyrant in the desert, Ahmadinejad. The Iranians are working on spaceflight. They have already sent a spacecraft into outer space. I think it carried a frog, a snake, and two turtles. But now they want to go into space.

So while other countries, not really our buddies or our friends, are moving forward in space exploration because they understand the importance of it, we are backing off. America is just waving the white flag and giving up its leadership in space. That ought not to be. And we're going to lose technology. We're going to lose the education that our scientists have because it's going to disappear. And these jobs that are going to be lost, these are good jobs.

These are scientists, engineers, and they've worked on the space program for years. And now the Federal Government's coming in and saying we're going to turn all of this over to private industry.

Myself, like you, Judge CARTER, I'm a capitalist. I believe in free enterprise. But the private space exploration is 10 to 20 years behind the United States NASA program. They have 10 to 20 years to catch up to right where we are now. Can we afford to give up the leadership? Some say, well, it's to save us money. It isn't going to save us any money. We're just transferring Americans' wealth to an unproven entity, and that being the private sector. Let the private sector compete, but don't subsidize those programs.

And it's unfortunate that we're seeing the demise of NASA, a self-inflicted wound by our own Federal Government. That's unfortunate, and we should not give up our space leadership to anybody for any reason. After all, it's also a national security issue.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, the administration proposes a \$1 billion cut in NASA's manned program. And at the same time, they are pushing \$115 billion in new spending for ObamaCare after \$700 billion in stimulus spending, which we are still looking for the stimulus.

The taxpayers have already invested \$9 billion in the Constellation program, which was supposed to be the next step in the space program. It will cost \$2.5 billion to shut down the Constellation program. So we are talking about \$11.5 billion is going to be spent just to trash the program that we've already spent \$9 billion on.

And, you know, space has always been a very glorious position for us to take. And we rose above the international bickering. We shared the space station with other nations. Recently, within the last couple of years, the Japanese on one of our shuttles took a major pod containment system up there, and they've got a piece of it. The Russians have some of it. Others have put technology on the space station to where now it is what we envisioned with all the various technologies and abilities to study long distances in space. And we've taken all that, and now, as my good friend from Texas says, to get to our space station that we put together, we're going to have to hitchhike with the Russians.

Now, we all know, as we developed the space station, we also developed the rocket power and the use of rocketry, which became a great part of our national arsenal. And, in fact, we are concerned about the ability of the people in Iran who are trying to develop a nuclear weapon to get a midrange missile to deliver it in their promised attacks on Israel. The rockets that defend our Nation came from the rockets that propelled us into outer space on our great jaunt and exploration of outer space.

So when you start hitting us in our technology, as I would argue the Obama administration is doing, and wasting \$11.5 billion to shut down a program and putting us behind in the future development of these vehicles, where does this make sense? Are we just ceding the fact that now that the Obama administration is in charge of the country and they believe that American exceptionalism is a myth, they are going to prove it by taking away the things we are exceptional in? I have real issues with that. I think all of us do.

I'd like to recognize my good friend ROB BISHOP from Utah to talk to us a little bit about—he is on several committees that have looked into this. He's got a good insight into what's going on. So whatever time you wish to consume, my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Let me start, if I could, for just a second about jobs, because we are talking both inside these Halls and outside about jobs. The President and the Vice President are going on, it's called his recovery summer tour in which he's going to talk about the creation of jobs. In the talking points sent out from the White House, they are talking about the 30,000 miles of new transportation, 80,000 new homes that will be weatherized, 800 programs in parks that are being increased, 2,000 drinking water projects, all in the name of creating jobs.

The President's also asking Congress for \$20 billion in additional stimulus money to protect government jobs, in addition to the \$135 billion we did in the original stimulus bill to do that. And for only \$2 billion—now think of that, less than a tenth of what the President wants in a new stimulus bill to create and protect jobs; a rounding error in either the TARP or the TARP 2 or Son of TARP or Stimulus I or Stimulus II—this administration could protect 25,000 to 30,000 jobs in the private sector.

□ 1945

These are scientists and engineers, and these are the jobs that this administration's policy with NASA are going to let go and give their pink slips.

But early on in the Bush administration, it was decided the space shuttle era had ended. After the problems and the catastrophes with Challenger and Columbia, a Presidential commission came through and decided we wanted to come up with a newer, safer way to go to the Moon, space station and beyond; and the result of that was Constellation.

Constellation is a program that is designed to be safer than the space shuttle by a factor of 10. It's using solid rocket motors because those are the safest type of vehicles. It separates the cargo from the passengers so, if there is a problem, they can be safer. Time magazine called this the best invention of last year. This is the science that we

have to come up with the best way of going into the future, and it's built by a free enterprise company. It consists of the Orion capsule where the passengers would be, as well as the Arius rocket that will power it at the same time.

If this White House, if the administration, if NASA gets their way and decides to cancel this greatest invention of the last couple of years, there is no Constellation, there will, as has been said, still be astronauts who need to go up to the space station. As has been said, they will be going up on Russian craft, and in the next year's budget, this administration has already penciled in \$75 million per astronaut visit. As has been mentioned by the good gentleman from Texas, Russians have learned the lessons of capitalism, and they realize when they have a monopoly they can play that game. But \$75 million per astronaut trip so that we can subsidize the Russian rocket industry.

So that, indeed, as we are looking at the future and we're coming up with this, this summer of recovery is not necessarily going to be about American jobs. The summer of recovery is how we will be spending American taxpayers' money to make sure that the Russian technicians are on the line building Russian missiles. Perhaps the Chinese are on the line starting to build new Chinese missiles so that we can keep their jobs and we will rely on Russian technology because we know how effective that has been in the past, Russian technology for our astronaut visits.

We sometimes ask the question, where are the jobs? Well, in Russian, you also ask it. In their version of where are the jobs, with this policy of this administration, NASA, jobs aren't going to be here. Jobs are going to be in Russia. Jobs are going to be in China, eventually in India; and even Japan's getting in on the trick. That's where those jobs are going to go.

We are firing 30,000 American citizens who have good jobs in science and engineering to build the Constellation program and for what? To lose our leadership in space? To subsidize the Russians and the Chinese industry? To put more Americans out of work in this summer of recovery? It simply does not make sense.

I'd like to enter into an interchange with the gentleman. We've got a lot of things to talk about how this interfaces with our military commitment and what this administration is doing that is totally unusual in trying to push this program forward to destroy—we're not losing the space race this time. We're forfeiting the game.

Mr. CARTER. Perfect statement, "forfeiting the game." We were leading the game, we were winning the game until this administration came into the White House, and we just stepped up and decided to forfeit the game.

Here's an article from Labor Magazine. It was published on April 15, 2010:

"Obama is pushing the privatization of NASA and the turnover of the government agency to his financial supporters Elon Musk and Google owners Page and Brin.

"A full bore campaign is now being waged by the Obama administration to shut down the U.S. unionized space program and turn it over to 'new age' speculators who want to build a new space program in a 'regulation-free' zone in Florida."

And the plan is by billionaire and former owner of PayPal, Elon Musk. Musk has a company called Space Exploration Technologies Corporation, and the question is, "Should the United States hire Elon Musk, at a cost of a few billion dollars, to run a taxi service for American astronauts?"

"In fact, the SpaceX operation like much that Musk and his backers from Google Larry Page and Sergey Brin want the U.S. to give him \$6 billion in the next 5 years to build" this operation.

Now, that's a very interesting thing. We take a program, we put \$9 billion into it, it's cost us \$2.5 billion to shut it down, we shut it down, and we come up with \$6 billion more over the next 5 years that we're going to give to some good friends to come up with a brand new program and they are, as Judge Poe points out, way behind in developing the rocket to get them to anywhere we want to go in space.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the way the gentleman from Texas has put this. Let's face it: two concepts this administration kept throwing at it: we're going to save money in this and we're going to privatize it, both of those concepts are flat out false.

As has been said, this administration expects to spend \$6 billion more on NASA than they are right now without doing any kind of manned space flight, \$6 billion more for satellites to do climate control and feeding the hungry in the world. And in addition to that, the money that will now go to these new companies, these startup business companies, this is not free enterprise.

The Constellation went out on a bid that was won by free enterprise companies. The people building right now are free market sector companies. What this administration wants to do is to take the money away from those who are already building Constellation, scrap the program, and then turn over to any other group to come up with a new plan, a new goal. We don't have a new plan or a new goal, but they're going to give it to new companies.

This government is basically saying these private sector companies are now going to be the losers; our friends in this private sector group are now going to be the winners. But as the gentleman from Texas said, this group is not just simply a business free enterprise group. They're already being subsidized by NASA to the point of millions of dollars and have already told NASA they need more.

This has nothing to do with free enterprise. This has everything to do with this administration picking winners and losers among the free enterprise and elements. So those who have the contracts now are going to lose them and lose their jobs, and that money is going to transfer over to another group that is also being subsidized by NASA. It's not free enterprise, this bit, and this is not saving the taxpayers money. This is simply mind-boggling that we are now going to simply say we have no plan for space.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, so we're just basically saying, Obama just said I want to change this program from one free enterprise group to my guys that are on my side; and, unfortunately, they're a little behind, but we'll beef them up and we'll try to get them there by spending the American taxpayers' money. It is stimulus for a new group of private companies. It's amazing.

But who else is going to be competing? This is interesting. Taxpayers have already invested \$9 billion in the Constellation, which will be lost. This is sort of a comedy piece that my staff put together. Everyone there is Oriental, but it has to do with the recent announcement—you know, we had promised that with the new Constellation program, we were going to go back to the Moon just to do some additional research there.

The Chinese had announced in February of 2004 that they've started their Moon exploration program. Phase I involves orbiting a satellite around the Moon. Phase II involves sending a lander to the Moon. Phase III involves collecting lunar soil samples. China plans to complete its space station and a manned mission to the Moon by 2020.

So not only are we giving up the fact that we're exceptional, but those people who are trying to show how exceptional they are—and quite honestly, the Chinese have done pretty much a turnaround since they learned that capitalism really works, and now they're doing the Moon explorations. Now, I'm sure there are one world order folks that say it doesn't really matter as long as we all sing Kumbaya and go to the Moon.

But the reality is, remember what technology and the defense world came out of, the technology that we developed in our space program; and that's something we can never forget. We can never forget to make sure that American exceptionalism allows us to stay on top of those things that keep us breathing free air in this country. If we ever concede that to those who maybe wouldn't like us as much as we might think they do—they may like our money but they maybe don't like us and our system of human beings having rights and freedoms and protections under our Constitution, and maybe those same people who don't feel so good about that part of American exceptionalism would like to impose

their will on us someday. Are we going to give up our jaunts into space and our learning from that?

We're all walking around with cell phones in our pockets, some of us two or three of them up here in this crazy place we're in. All that technology developed out of the technology that started off with the space program. Simple things like Teflon and there's a million things out there in the world we don't even know about that came out of the space program, and yet industries have come out of the production of those products. I can't even remember them all, but I remember at one time we loved to talk about it when we talked about our space program. We've stopped talking about that.

But the point is, we're taking people that have dedicated their lives to the exceptional job of exploring that great wondrous thing called space, and we've told those people, we're laying you off to the tune of 20,000 to 30,000 of you in Texas and Alabama and Florida and other places so that we can start over with a bunch of our buddies in their backyards coming up with a new space program. I've got real issues with that.

But not only is China looking at a space program; the Russians are planning a manned Moon mission by 2025 to 2030, a manned Mars mission by 2035 to 2040. My Lord, everybody else sees those frontiers that we used to see. Remember when President Kennedy talked about the new frontier, space? We watched programs on television as kids about that frontier of space that we were going at, and we did it.

You know, recently we had hearings in this House where we heard from some of those pioneers, and we heard from the first man who walked on the Moon. Neil Armstrong, a man who basically stays out of the world of politics and lives a relatively quiet life for being such a national American hero, came up here and said we cannot afford to lose NASA. It will be a serious blow to the United States of America to lose NASA. In a minute, I'm going to ask my friend RALPH HALL who was at some of those hearings or heard some of these things that were said to tell us a little bit about that.

Mr. HALL, would you like to talk to us about what some of these great American heroes talked about in the NASA program?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank you, Judge, for this opportunity to discuss a stroke of the pen that affects all Americans, a stroke of the pen early in his administration, a stroke of the pen by the President of the United States that canceled out the Constellation, and that's what it's all about, and that's why we're here, and that's why we're fighting for NASA. That's why the great Neil Armstrong, first man on the Moon, stepped out, didn't know he, with his other two compatriots, had no idea when they left here that they'd ever come back alive. They're great patriots. They're great, those among us,

and we've lost some. We've had some tragedy in NASA, but we've had great successes. Those men came here and testified that it'd be outrageous to cancel Constellation.

□ 2000

Now I want to talk about that just a little bit. It's been nearly 5 months since the administration proposed the very radical changes to NASA's human space flight and exploration programs by canceling the Constellation. Just took his pen and ran a line through it. Well, I don't understand that. And I don't understand the lack of sufficient details that Congress would need to determine if it was even close to a credible plan that he suggests. Yet, in spite of our very best efforts to obtain more information from NASA, the situation has not improved; indeed, the President's trip to Kennedy Space Center on April 15 only added to the confusion as he laid out more aspirational goals, but provided no clear idea of how they fit together or how we expect to pay for these new ventures. As such, I still have basic concerns about our ability to access and use the International Space Station after the shuttle is retired.

I remain concerned with the "gap" in U.S. access to space, and I want to ensure that we can effectively use the enormous research capabilities of the International Space Station. In examining the President's plan, I still don't see any viable way to minimize the gap and provide for exciting research on the International Space Station.

The President's most recent decision to send an unmanned "lifeboat" to the space station at a potential cost of \$5 billion to \$7 billion does absolutely nothing to solve this problem and largely duplicates existing services provided by the Russians. Although we've already spent nearly \$10 billion on the Constellation system that has achieved significant milestones and is well on its way to providing continued U.S. access to space, the administration's decision to cancel Constellation has further stalled development and jeopardized our undisputed leadership in space, and that's what it's all about.

As I've said many times before, as a member of the Space Subcommittee, I am concerned with the proposed commercial crew direction of this administration. While we have long supported the development of commercial cargo operations, I believe it's prudent that we first test cargo capabilities before risking the lives of our astronauts on newly developed systems.

I have also not seen credible data to suggest that there is a viable market for commercial crew carriers, as they claim there is, with no backup, no information on it. In the absence of that data, I fear that we might be setting ourselves up for failure if or when the markets don't materialize.

Anyone can claim to be able to take over commercial crew or to take over the space program, to take over the

building of the next instruments of investigating space. Buzz Aldrin, who supports commercial crew—I've read his ideas, and I'm still looking for concrete data that they can finish what they started. It's easy to start these programs and take them over and then have the Federal Government have to step in at great loss of time, at great loss of international partners, at great loss of contractors, at great loss of employees, and great loss to the government for additional money to take over. I admire Mr. Aldrin and I will clearly inspect his suggestions.

Finally, in examining options beyond low Earth orbit, I'm unclear of when we might see the development of a heavy lift system, or whether NASA still considers the Moon as a logical destination. We've been told that a new "game changing" technology development program will provide capabilities for accessing the far reaches of space, but we have very few specifics on mission, goals, and direction.

In the absence of a defensible, credible plan, I and many of our Members continue to support the Constellation program as currently authorized and appropriated by successive Congresses. GAO will continue investigating whether NASA is improperly withholding funds and improperly applying the Anti-Deficiency Act as a means of slowing Constellation work. I believe that Congress—and when I say Congress, I mean both Democrats and Republicans—Congress has been clear that it supports the unhindered continuation of Constellation until it authorizes an alternative program.

We can no longer wait for NASA to provide justification for its radical changes. Time is running out. Our space station and those who man it—our many NASA employees, our international partners, our astronauts—await an answer that we can live with and that we can lead with. I yield back my time.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, RALPH.

Mr. HALL is the dean of the Texas delegation. We are awfully proud to have him. He has been working long and hard for many, many years to make sure that every time we shoot a human being into outer space we plan to bring them back.

It's easy to develop a space program where you can say, well, if the guy we shoot out there, if we lose him, it's no big deal, we at least have the technology to learn how it works. There are some that have developed space programs this way, but we've never developed it that way. Some people would say we're a great dinosaur, this NASA. This great dinosaur comes from the basic premise, a part of what makes Americans great, that every human life is important. Therefore, you test and retest and retest again, and you take another path and you find a new direction until you are assured of one thing: That that precious human life you put upon that exploding bomb called a rocket, you're capable of putting that

human life out into space and bringing that human being back alive.

I would argue that we're the only space program where that has been a priority. What makes us so much more exceptional than others is because we've had accidents, but they were accidents. But our planned program didn't plan in expendability. We didn't plan for people to be expendable until we learned how to do it. We did it, we got through it, and we made it work.

It's a shame to have that kind of history of a program that has dedicated itself to exploring space and still caring about that one small, little glimmer of spark called a human life, and we do it. We have no assurance that this new direction is even going to come close to having that same basic spirit that created NASA. We are threatening a great human institution.

I want to yield some more time to my friend, Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Texas again as both he and Mr. HALL were very eloquent in pointing out the problems that we are facing with the cancellation of the Constellation program by NASA.

I'd like to take one small detour from here to try and point out once again that the decision by this administration to cancel Constellation, by NASA, was done arbitrarily, capriciously, and actually without foresight of what the implications would be and their unintended consequences on our military side. For what this administration did not realize is that the people—the industrial base that builds the rockets to send a man to the moon—are the same people who build the rockets to shoot down North Korean and Iranian missiles that are coming at us. This industrial base is there with the expertise, and if you fire 20,000 to 30,000 of that base, this is not a spigot you can turn on and off and add them back, if indeed by some miraculous idea you think you need to change direction and start over again. That is what we have found—that the impact on NASA has a unique, specific, and dangerous impact on the defense of this country because if we are having a missile defense system, the fact that we are going to fire 25,000 to 30,000 people in this industrial base means that those people will not be working on our missile defense system.

The Defense Authorization Act that passed this House and is now over in the Senate, in the report language it concluded that if indeed Constellation is canceled, the cost to our military for our missile defense program will increase 40 percent to 100 percent, that the increased cost to anything that is propulsion, any of our technical missiles—the HARM missile, the Sidewinder missile, anything that has that propulsion—it will increase the cost for us to build those 40 percent to 100 percent. The Minuteman III cost will double. The Navy's missile program cost will double, and it's at a time when Secretary Gates over at Defense has

said that they want the administration to find roughly \$100 billion in cuts for next year's budget.

Now, did we ever take the time to figure out the implications of this program? Not only are we firing 30,000 of our best and brightest, our scientists and engineers, not only are we ceding space to the Chinese and the Russians and eventually the Indians and the Japanese, no longer are we forfeiting the game, no longer are we no longer taking a part, we are putting our missile defense system at risk at the very same time. This administration has naively lurched into this program without considering the unintended consequences.

If I could also say one thing in conclusion before I yield back to the gentleman from Texas. There are three things that NASA has done in trying to push this program of cutting Constellation that violate the obvious intent of Congress. Number one, Congress passed in the omnibus appropriations bill language that said the Constellation would not be cut until Congress approves those cuts. Nonetheless, first of all, they deferred the Constellation contracts, didn't terminate them—it was cute—they just deferred them so the money would not flow. Number two, they then moved the Constellation manager—didn't fire him, they just moved him—to disrupt the program. And number three, and a very novel, unique way—in fact, the spokesman said, well, these are unique circumstances—for the first time ever, ever in the history of NASA, they have said termination costs, the liability of termination costs must come from existing contracts. NASA has never done that when it terminated a program. When Congress told it to terminate a program on solid rocket motors, they always appropriated money for the closing costs. What this means is that the premarket private sector companies that are building Constellation right now have got to, from their current contracts, take money out to terminate, which means they fire their employees and they turn to their subcontractors and they break those contacts so they fire their employees. This is all a concentrated effort on the part of NASA and this administration to destroy this program before Congress has a chance to finalize our work and say whether we want it destroyed or not. I think it's very clear that this Congress has never at any time given the indication to NASA that we think Constellation should stop. But this is a program being done by the administration in violation of clearly the intent of Congress and, as the gentleman said, maybe even under the specifics of the rule of law of Congress, to force us into a fait accompli where Congress does not want to go and this Nation should not go.

This is a sad situation, this is sad, this is unprecedented on the part of NASA, and it is not good for the country. I appreciate being able to be a part

of this evening tonight because Constellation is very, very important to this country. This is our future. We should not lose that. I yield back to the gentleman from Texas and thank you for allowing me to be a part of this.

Mr. CARTER. Recapturing my time, as the gentleman was pointing out something, it just popped into my head, the old civics course that everybody in this country at least used to take in high school about the three branches of government that were created by our Founders and what they did. The laws were written by the Congress, the legislative branch, administered and enforced by the executive branch—which is the White House—and interpreted and held to the standards of the Constitution by the judicial branch. And as the gentleman pointed out, this Congress has never taken the position that we were going to trash the Constellation. In fact, we wrote specific language that said the Constellation shall remain until Congress acts.

□ 2015

Now, the President, without a law or a direction by this Congress, has decided to use magic tricks that have never been used before to delay to the point of disaster and to destroy the Constellation.

We just heard today, when Judge POE got up here and talked, that at least a court of this land has pointed out that the closing down of the gulf to offshore drilling was arbitrary and capricious, and it has granted the extraordinary relief that is very seldom done in the court system by granting an injunction against the President of the United States and the White House to prevent them, by one of the whims that they came up with, from closing down drilling in the gulf. This court has said, Sorry, boys. You can't do that.

Well, now we've got a Constitution, and we've got a Congress that has got a provision and a law that has been passed as the law of this land to be enforced by the executive branch of this government that says that we will not destroy the Constellation program until the Congress decides to do so, but the President, who, I guess, didn't take civics in high school, has decided it doesn't really matter whether Congress acts or not. He is going to destroy the program. I don't think that's the way it works. I don't think that's the way it's supposed to work.

We like to say this, and we recite this in a lot of places: We are a country of laws, not of men.

It is not what man runs the White House or what man runs some position in this country. It is what the law is. The law is passed by this Congress and by other legislative bodies around the 50 States in this Union. Our executive branch is to enforce those laws and to uphold them. Our judiciary is to remind them when they don't, and they have done so as recently as yesterday.

What is kind of strange is that the Carter administration decided to cede the Panama Canal. America would no longer manage the Panama Canal. It was going to save us money to get rid of the Panama Canal. Now, it's kind of funny. There is a Chinese flag imposed on this picture because now the Chinese manage the Panama Canal. That's kind of outsourcing American exceptionalism. We built that canal. Now we're outsourcing the Moon, potentially, to the Chinese under the Obama administration, and we are outsourcing the space program and the missiles that go along with that space program, and we're outsourcing the rocketry, which makes us exceptional.

You know, this administration has been very critical about the outsourcing of jobs outside the country. It has been pointing fingers at lots of people, saying they're destroying American jobs by outsourcing. What in the world do you think you're doing with these 20,000 to 30,000 high-paying, technical jobs—the great brain trust of America? You're outsourcing them to the Chinese, to the Indians, to the Russians—and maybe to the Japanese.

Why shouldn't we be concerned about this, Mr. President? I think that's a question we've got to ask ourselves. I think we've got to start asking, With how much are we willing to say we're no longer exceptional and that we're just going to outsource everything to everyone else?

I really believe the American people want to say to us here in Congress, Hey, wake up. Give us jobs like you've always given us jobs, and we as Americans will do those jobs, and we'll do them better than anybody else in the world. We always have and we always will. I'm not ready to give up on us, and I don't think my colleagues are ready to give up on us or on the American people.

We are still the exceptional people who put a man on the Moon in a decade like the President of the United States John F. Kennedy said. We are still the people who created the first, basically, aircraft that you could fly out into outer space—the shuttle program—a phenomenon that we used, and we landed them there on the runway just like an ordinary airplane rather than parachuting them into the ocean like the first programs we did. We have done wonders with NASA.

I hope and I pray—and I think everybody else hopes and prays—that the President will reconsider and will allow Congress to discuss this and will allow Congress to make decisions as to whether or not we're going to make these kinds of radical changes to the future of man's exploration of space and whether, when we do, if we change, we are protecting the sanctity of human life. All of these things are important. All of these things are things we ought to be concerned about. Right now, we've just got to be concerned about why this administration is giving up on American exceptionalism and

why it is outsourcing our space program to foreign countries.

I'll yield whatever time Mr. BISHOP would like so he can make a comment on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has approximately 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have only one last insight to give, and I appreciate, once again, the gentleman from Texas taking this time to point out how significant this issue is that, indeed, the Constellation program was the way forward into the future. It was to replace the space shuttle. It went through the science. It is our future. It is being built by the private sector. Yet, we are deciding to cancel it with no other goal in mind. We don't have a plan. We don't have a program. We don't even have a name. We don't have an idea for what the future may bring.

There was a study that was done after the last space shuttle catastrophe, and it said there are two things that will destroy manned spaceflight, the mission to manned spaceflight and NASA. Those are, number one, not to consider human safety, as the gentleman has said. Then number two is not to have an organized plan.

I just have, in a note of irony, a flyer that went to all of our offices that came from NASA that tomorrow, in the Rayburn foyer, there will be the new era of innovation and discovery, which means that there will be an interactive, all-day event highlighting NASA's robust Earth and space science portion, cutting-edge aeronautics, and continued leadership in human flight.

I am so grateful that there will be an interactive game that we in Congress can play about spaceflight, because, if the decisions of NASA and of this administration are allowed, there won't be a real manned spaceflight for us to see. At least we'll have a game so that we will remember what we used to do and what might have been.

I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. In reclaiming my time, that is ironic because one of the things you hear from parents is, When am I going to be able to get my kids to have their own imaginations and to not play somebody else's video games? To me, it sounds like this is somebody else's video game.

You know, you'll remember when we diverted satellites from protecting our troops in Iraq to over the poles to check on global warming. From what I'm hearing from this administration, their plans for NASA are that we're going to have low-orbit satellite programs to check on global warming. Oh, I forgot. We don't call it "global warming" anymore. It's called "climate change." I apologize. It turns out we may not be warming. Well, that's just a whole other debate. Yet it seems like all of the resources seem to be going towards desperately trying to confirm that debate.

I want to thank the gentleman for coming down, my distinguished friend

from Utah, ROB BISHOP, who is one of the smartest guys in Congress, who is a good friend of mine, and who is a classmate of mine. We came into this august body together. We share an awful lot of concerns about the future of what we are doing. I'm really happy to have ROB BISHOP looking at the scientific side of our world, because he has got great insight into it. I want to thank him for sharing that insight with us tonight.

I want to thank the Speaker for allowing us to take this time to talk about something that we are very proud of. We in Texas have a lot to be proud of. One of the things we point out that we are proud of is the manned space center in Houston, Texas. When you look on the Texas map, which tells you all the great things to come see in Texas, we highly recommend that people visit the manned space center, because we know great things were done by great men and women at that place, and great things continue to be done there.

To drive a stake in the heart of the manned space program is a tragedy, not only for the State of Texas but for the whole United States and, I think I can effectively argue, the world. Let's not outsource another of our industries. Let's not give up on American exceptionalism. Let's go back and reconsider the Obama administration's desire to trash this program. Let's go back to putting us on a path with a plan, as Mr. BISHOP pointed out, to go out and explore those new frontiers we have left to explore.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to take this opportunity here on the House floor to spend a few minutes talking about some friends of mine who are celebrating their 40th wedding anniversary, and I wanted to take a second here to say what good friends they are, what great Americans they are, and what great people they are.

HAPPY 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Bill and Margie Skeleski will be celebrating their 40th wedding anniversary this week. They have been not only tremendous supporters of me, but they have been great people in the community, and I wanted to take this opportunity to wish them a happy anniversary and many, many more years.

You have never been to a holiday breakfast unless you have been to the Skeleskis' house, but I must say there are eggs and quiche and sausage and all kinds of different desserts, and not a

day goes by when I don't see Margie Skeleski somewhere and she wants to bake me a cherry pie. So I want to thank her for all of her generosity.

She and her husband are just two of the sweetest, kindest, nicest people in our community, and they treasure all of the things that, I think, we as Americans need to spend a little more time thinking about, which are the importance of family, the importance of community, the importance of church and faith, and the importance, really, quite frankly, of a nice piece of pie. They all come together, and they have been just tremendous influences on my life, so I wanted to say thank you and congratulations to all of them and to their family as they celebrate this very special day.

CONGRATULATIONS

I would also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to extend a hearty congratulations to the president of Youngstown State University, Dr. David Sweet and his wife, Pat, who are both leaving Youngstown State University after a long tenure.

Dr. Sweet and his wife came to Youngstown State University when it was a sleepy university somewhere in the center of the city of Youngstown. They came in with a vision for the community, and they came in with a vision of the university. I think history will judge him as one of the leaders on how a university can have a transformational effect on a community.

Youngstown State University and the city of Youngstown both have been recognized for the partnerships that they have created, but Dr. Sweet, on every account that we would measure his success or failure as a president, has clearly succeeded. Enrollment is up by 25 percent. Minority enrollment is up. The university has created the first science, technology, engineering, and math college. Of all of the universities in Ohio, he took Youngstown State University and used it as an engine for not only economic growth and research, but also for helping to redefine the city of Youngstown. In so many ways, he provided leadership for our university and for our community.

I wanted here, on the floor of the House of Representatives, to recognize his leadership, his team—Hunter Morrison, Dr. George McCloud and all of the leaders that he had in his administration—and their ability to take this university, to really transform it and, in turn, to transform our community.

I wanted to say thank you, Mr. Speaker, to Dr. Sweet and to his wife, Pat, for their passion, for their contributions that they made to our community and to Youngstown State University. We stand on their shoulders as we continue this work, but clearly, we would not have been here today to make the kind strides that the university is making, doing the kind of research, hosting international energy seminars and forums and really transforming the role of that university. I want to say thank you. We clearly

wouldn't be in the position we are in today if it weren't for the leadership of Dr. Sweet and Pat Sweet. With that, I say thank you.

□ 2030

THE ECONOMY

Also, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to take this opportunity to spend a little time—and I will be joined by some of my colleagues here in the next few minutes—to talk about what has been going in our country economically and really what the plan is and what the plan has been for President Obama, the Democratic Congress, and pushing forward an agenda that I think, without dispute, has taken our country from going off a cliff, which is where we were just a couple of years ago, a year and a half ago, where the stock market was at 6,000-plus; where the economy was bleeding 750,000 jobs, almost 800,000 jobs a month; and where there was a complete collapse of the global economic system.

Because, quite frankly, there has been a debate going on in America that those of us—and my side, for sure—have been losing. The debate since 1980 has been how do we cut taxes for the wealthiest people in the country; how do we therefore raise the tax burden on the middle class; how do we cut government at every single turn; how do we deregulate and completely try to remove government out of every aspect of the financial markets and the role of regulating businesses; and, quite frankly, our friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, won that debate.

Through the 1980s, up until the current President, really with a good fight put on by President Clinton—and he made great strides in his own way—but we have been fighting the system. But over the course of the last couple of years we have seen exactly what happens when this philosophy, economic and political philosophy are implemented.

It is Milton Friedman and the supply-side economists and the Republican Party versus the Keynesian demand-side Democrats on our side. And our Republican friends in the earliest parts of this decade, up until 2006 and then 2008, controlled every lever of government; controlled the House, controlled the Senate, controlled the White House, implemented their economic policies across the board. And in Ohio, the Republicans controlled every Statewide office, including the governorship for 16 years, and the State legislature for longer.

Controlled everything and implemented their policies—their energy policy, their foreign policy, their economic policy. They deregulated Wall Street. They continued this path, this role of appointing industry lackeys to critical oversight positions on Wall Street, critical oversight positions in the oil and gas industry. Even big donors to oversee FEMA. And over the course of the last few years, we have seen how this philosophy, when implemented, works. And it works for those

multinational corporations, it works for Wall Street, it works for the oil industry. But, quite frankly, it doesn't work for anybody else.

So we saw when an industry lackey is appointed to head FEMA, we saw what happened with Katrina. You did a good job, Brownie, is what came of that. We see when the Minerals Management Agency is littered with industry people, we see that a lot of the approvals of drilling and the lack of preparation for contingency plans for emergencies was nonexistent because our friends on the other side said we don't need any government; we don't need any regulation of the oil industry. We don't need any regulation. We can just put anybody into FEMA. And we saw what happened.

But, really, the most significant event has been what happened on Wall Street, when we completely ignored deregulated Wall Street, said, Let business police themselves, ignoring decades and decades and decades of history where we know, when unchecked, businesses get greedy. It is human nature to get greedy. It is human nature not to be connected to what happens three or four moves down the line with the decision that you're making today. And so Wall Street was deregulated. Warnings were ignored. We saw the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression hit the United States of America and almost bring down the entire global economy.

And so having that philosophy implemented on all accounts—energy, Wall Street, globalization, cut taxes for the wealthiest, push the tax burden off on the middle class, borrow money and spend money and still cut taxes and run up huge deficits. In fact, it's important to note who left the huge deficits. Reagan left a \$1.4 trillion deficit. Herbert Walker Bush, \$3 trillion. President Bill Clinton had a \$5 trillion, almost \$6 trillion surplus. George W. Bush left us a \$1.5 trillion deficit in this country, with no end in sight.

And, then, not only left us that huge deficit, then we have a situation where the whole economy collapsed. The stock market tanked. Banks were going belly up. Unemployment was going through the roof. And then the first January that Barack Obama took office, we were losing almost 800,000 jobs in that month. So being left with this horrendous mess and the implementation of an economic and political philosophy that decimates government, runs up huge deficits, and here we are left to deal with it.

So we did take some bold steps with the stimulus package, with TARP, which was actually under George W. Bush. But we took some bold steps. And they all weren't very politically popular in many instances. And we would go home every weekend and have to explain to our constituents about why we were doing this stuff. But we are now seeing that the national economy is turning around. We have seen the stock market go up from a little

over 6,000 to 10,000-plus. Up to 11, back down. We have had some issues with the oil spill, with what's going on in Greece; but the stock market was back up to 11,000. We are starting the recovery. We have seen, with the issue of jobs, some level of success. Last week, we saw industrial production increased 8.1 percent during the past 11 months—the largest 11-month gain since 1997.

Now, I'm not here to say that I'm seeing the world through rose-colored glasses. I'm not saying that we're even out of the woods yet. But what I am saying is the policies that we have implemented have clearly turned the country back in the right direction. It is moving us towards a more secure future for the business community and for those people who are out in our community looking for work. Unemployment is still too high. We still have work to do with police and fire and helping the States—and teachers, to make sure they don't get laid off.

But before I kick it to my friend from Connecticut, I want to say that you can't help but look at where we were and to remember where we were and to say that we have at least shifted directions and at least changed things to at least move us in a more positive step where we can secure the future for our children; where we can secure a good economy for businesses and workers. And that's really what's important here. And that's why we have made some of these very, very difficult situations.

With that, I yield to my friend from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thanks to my friend from Ohio for setting the playing field for us this evening. I think back to when I was making up my mind about running for Congress some 4, 5 years ago, and I was in Connecticut—Cheshire, where I live today—sitting and watching a Federal Government that seemed intent on using the power that it has accumulated here in Congress and in the administration to essentially turn over government to their friends. Now, whether their friends were in the oil industry or their friends were in the health insurance industry or the pharmaceutical industry or the defense contracting industry, whatever it was, it seemed as if the reason that some people had run for office, the reason that some people had sought positions in the Bush administration was to hand over the reins of government to corporate interests; to people that, frankly, didn't have the public interest at heart.

And I think back to the reasons that I decided to run for Congress, and at the foundation of it was a real belief that we had essentially begun to privatize all sectors of the United States economy and the United States Government and that taxpayer dollars were more often being used not to accrue to the public benefit but to accrue to the benefit of a small group of people who happened to hold and wield influence here in Washington.

And so I think about what would have happened back in January and February of last year as we were setting the economic strategy toward recovery. I think about what would have happened if the folks who had been running Congress and running the administration in prior years were in charge of this economic recovery. I think about the bill we passed. I think about the fact that one-third of the stimulus bill passed in the winter of last year went to tax cuts—went to tax cuts not for the top 1, 2, 3 percent of income earners in this Nation; not tax cuts for the Fortune 100, 200, 300, but tax cuts for individuals, for middle-income folks out there, the people that I represent in Connecticut.

Now, they're not enormous tax breaks. Folks weren't getting thousands of dollars back, but they were getting a couple hundred—\$300, \$400, \$500—back in taxes. Small business tax breaks in that stimulus bill to allow for more incentives for small businesses to expand and invest in capital to maybe allow them to take some of their losses a little bit earlier than they might have otherwise been able to do in order to make the books balance for that one or two really tough years that they needed to survive.

I think about what would have happened if the Republicans had written that stimulus bill and where those tax breaks would have gone. Because I know the statistics from the Bush tax breaks. Not to say there weren't some deserving people who benefited from that tax break, but I know that the average millionaire in my district from the last round of Bush tax cuts got \$43,000 back. I know that the average-income family in New Britain, Connecticut got \$19 back from that tax break. Now things cost a little bit more in Connecticut, but that's just about enough money to buy a pepperoni pizza in New Britain. That's nothing. I know that if the Republicans had been writing that stimulus bill that we would have likely seen more of the same, that we have would have likely seen the economic recovery and the economic stimulus bill that they would have written as an excuse to hand out more tax breaks and more favors to folks that didn't need any more.

And so the reason, Mr. RYAN, that you talk about this recovery as it is in action, the reason that we see retail sales picking up, the reason that we see 10 percent growth in our economy in the last 6 months is in part because we invested our recovery strategy in the right people; we invested our recovery strategy in low-income and middle-income families who needed a little bit extra money back on their taxes so that they can pay their bills, that they could stop from going into bankruptcy themselves, and that maybe they could put a little bit of their money back into the economy. We invest it in small businesses because we know that 90 percent of the jobs in this or any other

recovery are going to come from small businesses. And we invest in future businesses as well.

We've got a company in my district called Apollo Solar. I've got to tell you, this is going to be the next big thing. They are making some really important technology that will allow individual homeowners to put solar panels on their roof, generate a whole bunch of power, and then sell it back to the grid for a profit. This is going to be in every home in the Nation, we hope, in a matter of 10 to 15 years. And the stimulus bill decided to put money into Apollo Solar so that they can not only add jobs, but point the way forward for the future of the American economy. Money in the pockets of middle-class families. Money in the bank accounts of small businesses. An opportunity to point this economy forward to the next wave of jobs that we're going to enjoy in this country in the form of renewable-energy jobs.

Mr. RYAN, you're exactly right. I still have unacceptably high levels of unemployment in the places that I represent. I've still got way too many people that are laid off. And it's no small consolation—no consolation at all to them when I, or anybody else, tries to explain that jobs are always a lagging indicator and listen, we've got to have big jumps in the production in this country and jumps in retail sales and jumps in orders for factories before all of those employers start adding jobs.

□ 2045

But I think people are coming to understand that the recovery is on its way. They hear the stories. They hear the stories from Main Street, as I did in New Milford, Connecticut, a few weeks ago where almost every retail establishment on Main Street in New Milford reported that May and June have been among their best retail months in 2 to 3 years. Factory after factory that I go to are reporting that for the first time they've seen orders make significant upward increases in the past several months. They feel that good news.

Now they know that those retail establishments and those factories need to get a couple more months of good news before they start actually adding jobs back. And they know that the first thing they're going to do is take the workers that they had furloughed for a day or two every week and put them back full time. But the trend is going in the right direction, and I think it's going in the right direction because the stimulus, written by the Democrats, championed by President Obama, was put in the right place. It gave to Main Street. It gave to middle-class families. It gave to small businesses which—we're only guessing here. I'm only guessing—but I think that if President Bush was still here or the Republicans were still in charge of Congress, that that stimulus and the people and the corporations and the institutions that it invested in would have been a very

different set of people and businesses than we see today having been invested in.

Mr. WELCH, I would be happy to turn it over to you. I'm glad to see you and Mr. BOCCIERI joining us on the floor this evening.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much. It's been a pleasure listening to you and Mr. RYAN.

We have to acknowledge something, those of us who supported the stimulus as something that was necessary because of the collapse in the economy, those of us who decided to assent to the request by President Bush to stabilize the financial system and to do something we didn't really want to do but felt it was necessary to do. And that is that despite the gross domestic product increasing, despite the positive signs that have been cited by you and Mr. RYAN, this is still a depression for any American who doesn't have his or her job. And when you have 10 percent unemployment, which I think is the real measure of the strength of this economy, you know we have an economy that continues to struggle. And we have to do a number of things. Yes, we did have to have a stimulus, and it was focused where it would do the most good. We did have to stabilize the financial system, but that's going to add a burden until that is repaid.

But one of the things we have to do is understand what is the proper role of the private sector and what's the proper role of government. This has been an ongoing debate. In the United States, people who have been frustrated that the government has gotten it wrong have come to a conclusion that it can never get it right. People who have had faith in the private sector have had a view that they can never get it wrong. And, in fact, some of both is the case. Unless we have a cop on the beat, a government that's willing to make rules that give everybody a shot who play by the rules and work hard, and whose goal in doing it, running a business, is to provide good service, to provide a good product at a fair price, then we won't have the economy that we need.

Now I want to just give a couple of examples. The financial crisis was brought on by the recklessness, largely, of Wall Street banks. Let me give an example. The famous one, of course, is Goldman Sachs. Goldman Sachs made a lot of money on subprime mortgages, a lot of money on buying and selling commodities. They went from an investment bank that made most of its money by lending money to businesses and to people who had ideas about how to create jobs and create companies and create wealth, they transformed from doing that to buying and selling derivatives, currencies, commodities, and banking money on trading. Nothing wrong with that, but it's not banking. It's not putting money into the financial sector.

When they had a client, a hedge fund billionaire, who called them up and

said, Hey, I've got an idea. I think that this explosion in real estate values is going to collapse. I want you to put together a package of subprime mortgages that you believe will fail, that I believe will fail, so that I can then sell those and bet against them, Goldman Sachs said, fine. It's a client. They are paying money. They paid big fees, and they had a request. Nothing illegal about it. Nothing useful about it, but nothing illegal about it. Goldman Sachs helped put that package together, and then they turned around and sold this package that was guaranteed—it was designed to fail, literally designed to fail.

They then went to the rolodex and called up other clients, like pension funds. Those are people like firefighters, like police officers, like teachers, and they said, Hey, we have a deal for you: AAA-rated, high-yielding subprime asset pool—can't go wrong. So Goldman Sachs literally provided a service to one client. That service was developing a product to fail. Then they called up their other clients and sold it to them where it was guaranteed to succeed. Not guaranteed. But obviously Goldman traded on its reputation. And the people they called, these pension funds—if Goldman was for it, it must be vetted, it must be good, it must be secure.

And what happened? Mr. Paulson, the hedge fund billionaire, made \$1 billion more. And those pension funds, those municipalities, those other people who relied on the good reputation of Goldman Sachs lost \$1 billion. It destroyed wealth. And what does that do to the American people? Legitimately and understandably, it erodes their confidence.

So in my view, we have a lot of reason to be justifiably furious at Wall Street practices where they strayed from what would be done on Main Street. And I ask as I'm speaking, Any one of you, in your State of Ohio, in your State, Mr. MURPHY, of Connecticut, or anyone out there from Montana to North Dakota, your local banker, can you imagine your local banker literally having one neighbor say, I want you to design something to fail, and then selling it to another neighbor where they knew they would lose? It wouldn't happen. But that was legal on Wall Street. It's wrong. It never should have happened.

Now there's a governmental role here where the government failed. The Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Reserve. This explosion in asset values and real estate values and subprime mortgages, where people were permitted who had no income, who had no job, who had no proof of assets, no proof of ability to pay were given loans for \$400,000, \$500,000 or \$600,000. The regulators had a responsibility to apply the law of financial gravity and not permit that to occur. So this is a situation where people who point the finger of responsibility at government not standing up for right, but those same

people can't say that all we should do is destroy regulation altogether and let the private sector do what it wants, because it has led, in this case, to excess, to explosion, or destruction, of value. And a lot of individual people have suffered as a result of the loss of their hard-earned income. So there's a role. There is a role and has to be a role for government to be the cop on the beat and to help folks who are working hard and playing by the rules and trying to reinvest in their own community to be successful.

I would be glad at this time to yield to my good friend from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you. It's an honor to join my colleagues here on the House floor to talk about how we got here, where we're going, and what we're doing to put our country back on track. You know, you bring up a great point. We hear from the other side that the greatest tools that the government has is to largely unregulate big business, big corporations, and provide tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. Virtually every problem that America is facing, that's the solution that's put on the table.

Now I argue that, look, our philosophy, our broad political philosophy in this political body—at least I know from our side of the aisle—is that the government needs to set the out-of-bounds markers, we need to set the goal posts, let the free market operate in between, but be a good referee. Be a good referee. Throw the flag when you have big corporations that want to bet on the price of oil going up on Wall Street. Throw the flag when you want to bet against people failing to pay their mortgage. Failing to pay their mortgage—that's what was happening on Wall Street. That's like betting against America.

I think we can do better. We don't want to take the stripes off the referee. We want to make sure that the playing field is even and fair for all Americans, and that's why we're being charged with action. Because I think all of us here tonight believe that leadership is not just about position, a political position, but it's about action. Leadership is about action. And we run for office not just to win elections but to get things done. And we want to put America back to work by investing in America and by investing in our greatest asset—that is our people.

So a lot of talk has been made about the stimulus and the economic recovery. I mean, the charts don't lie, folks. When we walked on the job here in the office of the House of Representatives, I'm in my first term, and just in May of 2009, what was handed to us from the previous administration were two unfunded, undeclared wars that cost \$1 trillion. We had an economy that was in free fall. We didn't know where we were going to land. Exploding deficits from the war and tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. We had unregulated greed on Wall Street, a banking

system in chaos. I mean, it required swift action, not just a political position but swift action.

In May of 2009, we had lost 345,000 jobs. One year later, after some of the economic policies that we put in place here in the Congress under Democratic leadership, we've turned that 180 degrees and actually had a net job gain of 431,000 jobs by May of 2010. So the facts don't lie.

Another thing that really disturbs me about our friends on the other side of the aisle is the whole notion that Democrats are not tough on deficits. And that is a complete falsehood when you look at this chart right here. This chart right here shows that deficits have been handed on by the last three Republican Presidents. We look at President Reagan, a \$1.4 trillion deficit left to the American taxpayer. We look at President George Bush. We see that he left a \$3.3 trillion deficit, and that didn't begin to turn until President Clinton turned those deficits into a \$5.6 trillion surplus. And what was left to us when we came in the door in the 111th Congress was nearly a \$12 trillion deficit by two undeclared, unfunded wars, two tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans who could afford to pay and pay their fair share, and a prescription drug plan that left huge holes, doughnut holes for our seniors who couldn't afford to pay the prescription drugs. These are the facts. And like Joe Friday used to say, "Only the facts, please, ma'am." Right now we're trying to set the facts straight, and my colleagues are appropriate in pointing out these deficiencies in the arguments by our colleagues on the other side.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, I think it's important for us to pull specific examples. I represent a district just to the east of Congressman BOCCIERI. It is very similar in nature to Mr. MURPHY's district, manufacturing, traditional manufacturing. We've actually seen in the last couple of months a couple of point decrease in the unemployment rate. It is still way too high, but this stimulus plan is coming down the pike.

It has helped in so many different ways, on so many different road projects, in different infrastructure projects. We got \$100 million in title I money for our schools which prevented tens, if not hundreds, of teachers from being laid off. We've got grants for police and fire, cops. There are 20-some cops on the beat because of the COPS grant in the city of Akron. Now if we didn't have the stimulus package, if we weren't investing Community Development Block Grant money, if we weren't putting money into roads and bridges and infrastructure, if we weren't making sure there was State support for our schools and education funds, we would have lost thousands of teachers, police, fire, and construction workers who would have never went back to work.

Now we're not saying that we've got all the answers, and we've got a corner

on the marketplace of success. But we've clearly—because years and years and years of economic philosophy prior to 1980 said, When the economy goes into a big downturn, someone has got to step up and fill the hole to prime the pump. We have had projects. We have a General Motors facility in Lordstown, Ohio, that just put on a third shift, and all of their suppliers are going to benefit from that. If the Republicans were in charge, that whole company would have been sold off piecemeal. We used \$20 million in stimulus money that leveraged \$650 million for a French company to expand 350 jobs, 500 construction jobs. This is all happening because we had a stimulus bill, and I don't blame anybody in this Chamber, Mr. BOCCIERI, for not believing me that the stimulus package has had some success.

□ 2100

But how about Bill Gates? Would anybody in here believe Bill Gates when he says, "The incredible measures," the Recovery Act and TARP, "needed to be taken to make sure there wasn't a collapse, both in terms of stabilizing the financial system and then priming the pump of the economy, because it had been slowed down so much. Now, we're seeing the benefits that those things have been done." That's Bill Gates saying it.

And you can go right down the list, Warren Buffett and others, who have said the stimulus package has worked. And my concern, quite frankly, is that we've got to do more before we get completely out of the woods on this economy. But look at the job numbers. Look at the deficit numbers.

And I want to make one final statement here, because Mr. BOCCIERI brought it up, about deficits. You grow your way out of deficits. If you don't have people working, you're not going to reduce the deficit. You can't cut your way out of some of this stuff. You've got to grow your way. And what we have is a pro-growth agenda. Tax cuts for businesses, lowest taxes for people in America since 1950. So tax cuts for the middle class, invest in infrastructure, invest in energy, get people working again. If we want to see the deficits go down, we've got to get people back to work. And that's what this whole agenda has been about, and it's working.

You look at what President Bush left us with and look where we are at now. As jobs go up, the deficit projections go down.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Let me point out this chart. We are talking about the fact that facts don't lie. Here it is. This isn't fuzzy numbers. This chart isn't rigged. This is just telling it like it is. You're looking in this chart at the last year of the Bush administration and the first year of the Obama administration. The trend is unmistakable. As the Bush administration ground to a halt, the economy went

into the tank, cratering to the point where in January of 2009, the last month of the Bush administration and first month of the Obama administration, this economy lost nearly 800,000 jobs, as Mr. WELCH and I were sworn in for our second term, Mr. BOCCIERI for his first term.

But the trend coming out of January is just as unmistakable. Every month, almost without exception, less and less jobs being lost, to the point where in the last 3 months we have added jobs. We've added 700,000 jobs just in the last 2 months. Now, that still leaves way, way too many people out of work. We still have miles to go.

But you want to talk about what policies didn't work and what policies have worked? The numbers don't lie. I want to add just one more thing to the table here. We can talk about the jobs that have been created through the stimulus bill, the jobs that have been saved through the policies of this administration, but there are other maybe not as well covered but just as important successes that are happening right underneath our feet.

Last week on page 4 or 5 or 6 of a lot of your local papers you might have noticed a story that the Chinese Government has announced that it is going to dramatically change the way that it runs its currency, that it is going to start allowing its currency to float in a way that it has never before.

That is something the Democrats in this Congress, led by Mr. RYAN, frankly, have been working on for a very, very long time. The Chinese have been essentially manipulating their currency so that they, on day one, can underprice American manufacturers sometimes by 30, 40, 50 percent just on the basis of how they manipulate the value of their currency. We have lost millions of manufacturing jobs in this country, and much of it has gone to China. Much of that is because of the funny business going on with their currency.

Now, they could get away with that under the Bush administration because that administration asked no questions when it came to trade policy. They rushed into trade agreement after trade agreement, asking little, if any, questions about what we could do when we sat across the table with our trade partners to try to force them to change their policies so that they couldn't immediately unfairly underbid American labor and American factories and American manufacturers.

Well, the Chinese can't get away with that under the Obama administration any longer. The Chinese can't get away with that with a Democratic Congress. We're not going to give a free pass to China and other Asian nations, to India and our European partners to allow them to either subsidize their industries with government dollars, to manipulate their currencies, or to run roughshod over labor and environmental policies so as to underprice and outbid American manufacturers.

The Chinese saw the writing on the wall. Now, they've got a long way to go to get this thing right, but the fact that they've finally figured out that they can no longer manipulate their currency so as to unfairly compete with American manufacturers shows that a new sheriff is in town. As Mr. BOCCIERI would say, there is a new referee here. And the whole world understands that, that when the referee is finally holding domestic corporations accountable for their actions, that's a good thing. But when the referee is also on the international playing field ready to hold our trading partners accountable for their unfair trading practices, that's transformative as well.

So the story about how we get from a point in January of 2009 when we were at an absolute disastrous point in our economy to where today we are headed unmistakably in the right direction has a lot of stories to it, Mr. WELCH. It's about job creation in the stimulus bill, but it's also about starting to stick up for American manufacturing, which we are finally doing in this Congress.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. MURPHY.

You know, when you are talking about the Chinese yuan and currency manipulation, that's far removed from most people on Main Street, but it has a real impact, especially on our manufacturing economy. And I am among many in this Chamber who believe that, for America to have strong long-term economic growth, we have to revive, not abandon, manufacturing. And in the stimulus there were commitments made to do it in the energy sector. And we know, I think if we are a confident Nation, we are not going to pretend that the energy policy that we have now, relying on a 19th century fuel where we have to send almost \$900 billion of our money abroad to bring oil in, that if we take on the challenge of the new energy economy, we can create jobs.

And on the stimulus, you know, nothing worked, including the stimulus, for anybody who is still out of work. But there are very solid, very simple, straightforward examples of how it did make a difference for many people, and I want to tell one about Barre, Vermont, a small, hardworking, very proud town with a tradition of work in the granite quarries. And we are losing jobs and have been losing them for years to Chinese imports.

But we have a company called Sprague Electric. It's a small company that's been there for years, and it was really having a hard time staying ahead with the collapse in the economy. Their product was something that was used in Tasers. But the engineers there developed a product called a capacitor that could be used in electric vehicles, and of course that's all part of what we want in our new energy economy.

They had an immense amount of interest in this. They were getting inter-

est from car manufacturers. And they had to decide whether to build a plant or expand their plant in Barre, Vermont, or to do it in China to take advantage of the lower labor rates. And these folks wanted to stay in Barre if they could, but the law of economics means they've got to be able to sustain themselves.

They were within 2 days of going ahead and making a commitment to develop this plant in China when the stimulus bill was passed, and it had in there the opportunity for companies to apply to get energy grants. They applied, and they put their decision to move to China on hold. They got the grant, several million dollars. And only a few months ago, the Republican Governor of Vermont and the Democratic Congressman from Vermont joined the people of Sprague Electric at a groundbreaking, where they were opening up the construction of a brand new factory with great jobs for the people in Barre, Vermont. That's real, and it took some governmental involvement.

And that's an investment of taxpayer money that's going to come back with taxpayer revenues, but real strength in that community where they're going to have a great new factory with great new jobs developing a product that's going to have ripple effects across Vermont.

I yield to my good friend, Mr. BOCCIERI.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you. I thank the gentlemen here today for talking about how we can get our economy back on track and put America back to work.

We're beginning to see the signs of economic recovery. Ten successive months of manufacturing growth has led to an upturn in manufacturing and our output in Ohio and many Midwestern States.

We've seen the housing sector improve. The housing sector of the economy is very important to our economy because every recession since the Great Depression, the housing sector has led us out of any downturns in the economy we've ever had. And, in fact, when you think about all that goes into building a new home with steel and wood and carpeting and drapes—you build a third car garage, you've got to put a car in it—the appliances, I mean, there is a lot of economic output, especially with those household products like washers and dryers and the like that require a great deal of manufacturing output.

□ 2110

So we're beginning to see upturns in the economy because of that.

Now look, we lost a lot of jobs, millions of jobs under previous economic policies. It's going to take us a while to get back and grow the economy and get back to the confidence levels that we all share that we're in a stronger position, but we're on the right track. We're on the right track, and according to folks who study the economy daily,

like Fortune magazine, in April they said the economy has made a sharp U-turn in the past couple of months and better days for the American businesses and workers are around the corner.

Newsweek said, America is coming back stronger, better and faster than nearly anyone had expected and faster than most of its international rivals. Recovery came quickly because the public and private sectors reacted with great speed.

From the far left to the far right, economists were saying that we had to do something. We had to do something. And there's only three tools that the American Government has to jumpstart or kick the economy.

We can work to manage interest rates with the Federal Reserve. We saw that interest rates are at near-record lows, zero percent in some cases.

We saw that the other policy that we have at our fingertips is to utilize tax policies. Largest tax break in American history to small businesses and to American middle class families. In fact, USA Today said tax bills are the lowest in 2009 since 1950 thanks to tax policies that were enacted through the stimulus and other measures that helped with respect in 2009.

The other policy that we have is to inject huge amounts of capital out into the marketplace, and I think it's the right policy to help those factory workers that were struggling to meet their payments and their bills and to put bread on the table, with helping them with an unemployment check or a little bit of COBRA assistance so they could carry their health care insurance from month to month while they were looking for a job. I think that was the right investment in 2009. I think that was an investment in the American people, with jobs training and skill training, investing in our workforce. Those are real tangible things that we can take, and that's why we're getting reports like this.

As a note, we've seen some positive job gains in the 16th Congressional District. Medline Industries just added 35 jobs and will be creating quite a few more in the next 3 years with them doing business. They manufacture and distribute medical products.

We saw Nationwide Insurance add 600 jobs in Ohio, and many of them are in my congressional district.

Rolls Royce, an international company that makes fuel cells that are going to add to our electric vehicles, they're using these things in NASA right now. They just announced they're moving their fuel cell research headquarters from Singapore to Stark County, Ohio. I know they're going to be working with my colleague in the 17th District, working on some research and development; and we want to enhance them. We're going to add and retain nearly 90 jobs in my congressional district.

We see ABS company got a National Science Foundation grant, absorbent

materials company in Worchester, Ohio. They have this grant. They're doing leading-edge research, and they're helping further development of creating high-tech jobs here in the 16th Congressional District.

We also saw Barbasol add dozens of jobs in Ashland County in my congressional district.

These are real signs in a real congressional district of how some of the policies that we've enacted are helping to grow our economy. So I join my colleagues in saying that leadership is about action, not just taking a political position because you want to win the next election.

The "just say no" crowd here in Washington is not lending itself to the recovery of our country. We need their help. We need their help. We need all Americans working together to put our country back on track. We need the Republicans' help to put the country back on track. We've seen tough times before, but we've always pulled together as a Nation and made it through our toughest times.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You mentioned that we need Republicans here and you mentioned that there's support for the Democratic policies and Obama's policies across the board. Let me just add two quotes to that that you mentioned.

First, from Phil Swagel, who was assistant Treasury Secretary for Economic Policy under George Bush. This is one of Bush's top economic strategists who said, their economic policies—I think referring to the Democrats and Obama—their economic policies including the stimulus have helped move the economy in the right direction.

Mark Zandi, who is the chief economist at Moody's, a former adviser to a number of Republican candidates, says, It feels like the light switch went on in many businesses this spring. When you take it all together the response to the recession was massive, it was unprecedented, and it was ultimately successful.

You've got a broad spectrum of agreement, as you mentioned, from conservative economists to progressive economists, who say that the policies that the President and Congress have put into place have put us on the right track.

Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut and I wanted to reiterate: in the district I represent just across the border from Mr. RYAN's district and very close to Mr. BOCCIERI's district, the similar experiences that they talk about are happening in western Pennsylvania as well, and we did have a choice to make in the late winter, early spring of 2009, when we as Members of this House had to make a decision on what to do when we as a Nation were literally looking off the cliff into the abyss with an economy that was on the verge of collapse in a very literal sense.

We could have done nothing. We could have done more of the same. Those were certainly two of our options, and there were people on the other side of the aisle who wanted to take that approach, to continue to pursue the policies that led us being in that position in the first place; but we chose not to do that. We chose to take action in a very forceful and a very proactive way. And now, we're nearly a year and a half later and where are we? It's fair for the American people to ask, well, what's been the benefit of this?

This was a huge bill. This was a monumental vote, and it was a vote that many of us took with the knowledge that there were things in the bill that we could support. There were a lot of things that we knew moving forward were going to have a tremendous impact on the Nation and in our districts; and as we've seen from some of the charts that we're holding today, a year and a half later we've seen an incredible difference in our economy, both as a Nation and in our districts.

Six of the last 7 months we've had positive job growth; and, yes, we're at the time of the decade once a decade where you hire census workers to go out, and some folks on the other side are going to say, well, those numbers are inflated by census numbers. Yes, there are census numbers included in that, but private sector job growth has gone up over that same period of time up by the hundreds of thousands in the previous 2 months, and we expect a strong number again for the month of June.

Also, at the end of June we're going to have our fourth straight quarter, a full year of positive GDP growth, and this is to be compared with where we were at the beginning of 2009 when we had a negative six GDP number, and by the end of 2009, the end of that very same calendar year, the end of the year that we passed the Recovery Act, we had plus six GDP growth, almost plus six. And it was the largest calendar year increase in more than 30 years in the gross domestic product from negative six to nearly plus six.

We saw the jobs go from negative 700,000 a month on average every month leading up to the time we passed that stimulus, the Recovery Act bill, to at the end of the year starting to see the numbers turn around. And again, where we are today, six out of the past seven months, positive job growth 5 months in a row. We expect that to continue.

The stock market that bottomed out at 6,500 almost precisely at the time the Recovery Act began to take effect is now up over 10,000.

These things didn't happen by accident. And we talk about manufacturing. In the district that I represent in western Pennsylvania as in the Ohio districts and I presume Mr. MURPHY's district in Connecticut as well, we have a legacy of manufacturing and we have

a lot of folks who, because of the recovery, are doing better today than they were a year ago, much better.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) listed some companies. I have some in my district. I can think of Ellwood Forge and Ellwood Quality Steel. Both are doing a lot better this year than they did last year, not only because their companies are doing better but because as a country we're doing better. That's what it means when manufacturers see an increase in orders. It means that we're stimulating our economy, we're growing, we're moving again, and that's what that symbolizes. That's the first thing that turns around is that manufacturing sector, and in western Pennsylvania we're seeing that impact very directly.

We've seen it in some of the infrastructure projects in all of our districts across the country to have something of lasting significance that's going to be there in the decades after we've recovered.

Now, is everything in the economy where we want it to be? No, of course not. It hasn't fully recovered. We're not out of the woods yet. We're not completely out of the hole that it took us decades to dig, but we're getting better. Again, GDP growth is strong, stock market has recovered to some extent, jobs are much better, and we're moving in the right direction. And that would not have happened were it not for the actions that this Congress took.

□ 2120

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Before I yield to the gentleman from New York, I think it's important again to reiterate, these are two separate philosophies. We did not have one vote in the House of Representatives from the Republican side. They, in many instances, continue to argue for cutting taxes for the top 1 percent—hopefully that will trickle down to the middle class, hopefully that will trickle down to manufacturing. And we saw from the 1980s on, people took that money and they invested it in China, manufacturing in Mexico and China and other places. What we're saying is, reinvest back in the United States—transportation, energy, infrastructure. Rebuild the country. A pro-growth agenda from Democrats—cutting taxes for businesses, cutting taxes for the middle class, and jump-starting the economy, making sure that we have fair regulation, referees on the field, and making sure we don't let corporations run the country, whether it's Wall Street and the financial markets, or whether it's the oil industry saying approve this permit even though I don't have a plan; in case we have a catastrophe, let it all go. We're the corporations, we run the show.

We're reigning that back in, trying to jump-start small businesses with the fund we provided last week, \$30 billion to loan \$300 billion for community banks. Get the local banks loaning money again and stop relying on these globalized banks who are in it to make

a profit and have no connection, no tie to the community.

So I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN.

You know, the talk about the contrasts, the sharp contrasts between the party in control now in the House, with the Democrats advancing dollars that invest in small business, invest in innovation as an economy, clean energy. You think of all those strategies compared to the catering to Big Oil, big banks, Wall Street, making certain the biggest amongst us are taken care of. I contrast that with all of the work being done in my district, in the 21st Congressional District in New York, in the Capital Region, it has always had a spirit of pioneer. It's in our DNA. We have within the confines of that district an energy revolution of sorts, it's the birthplace of electricity. So we're continuing on with a global center for renewable energy at GE, nanoscience in the district, the semiconductor industry, superconductive cable, talking about advanced battery manufacturing.

When we looked at the Recovery Act and how the President wanted to bring us into the new ages, allow for transitioning, a transformation of the energy economy, that's what this is all about. What we have had expressed in this Recovery Act are opportunities to grow new opportunities with advanced battery manufacturing. The battery looked at by GE, as they're soon to establish their plant, not only provides, in its concept of an alternative battery, not only for generation of electricity, not only for powering heavy vehicles, but also it is there for energy storage, so that with the transmittent energy of renewables, that transmittent nature, the opportunities to provide for storage there creates all new opportunities, the battery as a linchpin. The same is true with superconductive cable, where you can transmit far more electrons per inch of cable compared to the traditional cable, where renewables are being developed and new opportunities with nanoscience to create lighter blades, more efficient outcomes, more power per dollar invested. All of this is what holds great promise for our economy, for jobs, for small business innovation, for the emerging technologies. That's what this investment is all about.

And finally, you see a commitment to small business, to the pioneer spirit, to the invention and creative genius that has always been part of the American culture. So I'm really proud of the efforts that we're making to grow back this economy, to grow back the investments in basic research and R&D. That's what this is all about with the Recovery Act.

I think that people are now looking at this contrast, Representative RYAN, they're looking at the slow, steady progress, that climb upward from what was a precipitous drop in that left-

handed side of the V formation. The precipitous drop in jobs, in the growth in unemployment, the lack of investment, the household income loss, now has taken a sharp u-turn, and we see the road to recovery, the progress because of the wisdom of the types of investments made in the Recovery Act promoted by the White House and very much supported by Speaker PELOSI here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I totally agree with the gentleman. Here you have tax cuts for businesses, you have \$30 billion for community banks to loan out up to \$300 billion, you have tax cuts for individuals, you have the extension of unemployment benefits and health care through COBRA, you have infrastructure projects, billions of dollars, you have billions of dollars for Pell Grants so people can go to school. We've taken the banks out of the student loan business so people get a better deal when they take out a loan to go to school. And as you said, we're taking \$1 billion a day that's leaving this country to go to oil-producing countries and driving that back into the United States, the kind of technology that you have, the kind of nuclear technology and production that Mr. ALTMIRE has in western Pennsylvania, fuel cells in Mr. BOCCIERI's district, manufacturing and engineering in my district, and all of the above in Mr. MURPHY's district.

Mr. TONKO. Well, simply said, the policies of the past gave us the catastrophe in the gulf; the policies of the present give us opportunities at home.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. MURPHY, would you like to wrap up? We've got about 1 minute left. Because I know you can, of all of us, you can put it all together in 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. When it comes down to it, of all the things that drive the recovery in this economy, it's people spending again. And the fact is we'll go back to where we started. At the heart of our economic recovery legislation is putting power in the hands of average, everyday working-class families. That's what drives this economic recovery, and that's what the Democrats have invested in.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE). Without objection, the ordering of a 5-minute Special Order in favor of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is vacated.

There was no objection.

THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's always an honor to be here and to be speaking on the floor where so many who have served this country so honorably and well have done the same

thing. I never lose sight of that fact. It gets a little discouraging at times.

It's interesting to hear the stimulus is working because that's what George W. Bush was doing. And as I recall, in 2006, the Republicans lost the majority because Democrats convinced them that it was the wrong thing to do. And you know what? The Democrats were right. They appropriately won the majority because, as they said, we should not be deficit spending, you're killing the country, you're killing the economy by running up this kind of debt, and they won the majority in 2006 because they were right. We should not have been deficit spending like that. But that went on.

□ 2130

So it's interesting to hear, just 4 short years later, that it turns out that what President Bush was doing and was encouraging to be done is actually the good thing. Though, I still tend to go back and think of those of us on the Republican side who agreed that we needed to get out from under the deficit spending and that we needed to get spending under control. Having compassion and spending money to a deficit level is not the same thing. It's the Federal Government, like a parent, who is just throwing money at their kids, thinking that's going to make them happy and that everybody will be loving and caring.

I happen to agree with my friend Jim Dobson, who knows a lot about raising children. He said, You show me a child whose parent never said "no," and I'll show you one messed up kid.

More and more, we keep seeing people run to Washington. "Give us money. Give us money. Yeah, let's don't deficit spend, but give us money." It has got to stop. It has got to stop. When the Democrats promised they would stop the deficit spending if they were given the majority in November of 2006, they diagnosed the problem correctly, but then they didn't use the treatment they promised when they took over the majority.

It's interesting. I went back, and I found an article and speeches from early 2007 when we were talking about how well the economy was going at that point. Yet, at that time, those who promised to stop the deficit spending instead dramatically increased the deficit spending. It is amazing to see how the economy took a nosedive once the Democrats took the majority.

So I didn't plan to talk about the stimulus this evening, but I've heard from enough people who have been begging for us to, please, stop the deficit spending. When the Federal Government runs up such an enormous deficit, they suck up all the capital in the world, and the businesses that would like to hire people can't keep their lines of credit open anymore. You have got this administration's regulators telling banks, Now, you'd better not keep extending that line of credit to that business because, even though it's

still hiring people and seems to be doing well and has never missed a payment, we're concerned that maybe someday it will, and you don't want your bank to be under the heightened scrutiny that we will put on it if you keep extending lines of credit to this company.

So companies lose their lines of credit. They can't borrow money, and they can't grow their businesses. As we have often seen, if you're not growing, then you're usually dying. So it's just interesting. It's interesting.

I've heard my friends on the other side of the aisle yelling and fussing about, you know, a \$100-\$200 billion deficit in 1 year—that it's just outrageous, that it's unconscionable, and how could we do those kinds of things. They're right. We shouldn't have been deficit spending, but I really expected them to stop. This year, it is expected we'll have a \$1.3 to \$1.6 trillion deficit by the Federal Government in 1 year. Who would have ever dreamed that the same people who said just some short years ago that a \$160 billion deficit was reprehensible would today be saying that 10 times that much of a deficit is really a good thing and that the country is doing better?

I don't think there is any better indication of just how well things are going in the private sector than last month, because we got good news. There were 431,000 new jobs created last month. That was great news. 411,000 of the 431,000 jobs were temporary of census workers. I'm not sure that's news that's quite as good as we originally thought.

So we have an administration and a majority who are ecstatic in thinking that the emperor, though naked, has regal clothes on and that the economy is doing great and that the stimulus is working so very well because we created 411,000 jobs last month for temporary census workers. That emperor has no clothes on. It's not a great economy. Now, it should be. It's trying to be. It's trying to come back. Yet, as the private sector tries to do better, boom, we hit them with a health care bill that is going to cost them so much more money than it had cost them before.

It's telling businesses, if you've got over 50 employees, then you're going to get hammered with a \$2,000-per-employee tax. So, you know, we're hearing people say, Well, we had 56. We had to let them go. We had to let people go. We can't be over that cap. We have people being let go because the health care costs are now going to be so much, and the added taxes are hitting. We have people who are selling homes and who are seeing there are going to be added taxes for them.

This was supposed to be a health care bill that helped the working poor. Yet, a few weeks ago, when I was at a jobs fair in Marshall, Texas, I had one gentleman tell me, Look, we're giving, you know, entry-level jobs, but we're giving them really good health insurance.

Well, unfortunately, once the full extent of this health care bill kicks in, under the bill, he won't be able to do that anymore. They'll have to go on Medicaid.

If you make 133 percent of the poverty level or less, under that wonderful bill, you'll get forced into Medicaid, like it or not, even if you've got an employer who is willing to provide you health care. Oh, by the way, if you're above 133 percent of the poverty level and you can't afford the great health insurance policy that is dictated by this Zeus of a Congress and President, then bad news. You're going to pay extra income tax. You can't afford the health care insurance we've mandated? You get an extra income tax. Good news. Good news all the way around.

I did want to address something that has caused me a great deal of concern. All of this actually does, but this hit me as I was seeing more information about the 9/11 conspirators. I use that term because they had filed documents indicating that they were 9/11 conspirators.

This is an article I saw on Sunday. The headline from Politico, which is a newspaper here in Washington, reads, "Chances dim for swift 9/11 decision." This was by Mr. Josh Gerstein on 6/20/2010.

It reads, "Attorney General Eric Holder said the decision over where to hold the trial for alleged 9/11 plotter Khalid Sheikh Mohammad was 'weeks away' 3 months ago.

"Now advocates on both sides of the issue say they expect the Obama administration to punt the decision until after the November midterm elections—when the controversial plan could do less damage to the political fortunes of endangered Democrats and might face less resistance on Capitol Hill.

"Holder, last week, explicitly denied the midterms had anything to do with the timing but would only say discussions are continuing. The White House had no comment."

So the article goes on, and it discusses at quite some length the 9/11 trial and its problems and about figuring out what to do about it.

Then, while I was looking this weekend, I saw some great news. This is from The New York Times. This is exactly quoting from The New York Times' article:

"Five charged in 9/11 attacks seek to plead guilty."

So they are going to plead guilty. "Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: The five Guantanamo detainees charged with coordinating the September 11 attacks told a military judge on Monday that they wanted to confess in full—a move that seemed to challenge the government to put them to death."

Man, that's great news because we had this article on Sunday, saying the Attorney General and this administration can't decide what to do about the trials. It's great news. They're going to plead guilty.

□ 2140

Another quote from the article said that at the start of what had been listed as routine proceedings Monday, Judge Henley said he had received a written statement from the five men charged, saying they had planned to stop filing legal motions and to “announce our confessions to plea in full.” Great news. They’re agreeing to plead guilty to confess everything. Awesome news. Awesome news.

The trouble is, the date of this New York Times story was December 9, 2008. The 9/11 conspirators, as they are self-confessed, agreed to plead guilty to the atrocities regarding 9/11. They were not going to file any more pleadings. They were throwing in the towel. They were ready to be sentenced to death. And if you go back and look at this article, Mr. Speaker, it talks about how they’re ready to accept martyrdom. Isn’t that something? They told a military judge they wanted to confess in full. They were ready to be put to death for their crimes. Isn’t that something? It said they planned to stop filing legal motions and to announce our confessions to plea in full.

But a strange thing happened on the way to the five 9/11 charged conspirators for plotting and carrying out—seeing that it was carried out, at least—the 9/11 atrocities. This administration took office a month after that story and said, You know what? Basically, in essence, You guys, don’t plead guilty. We want to bring this to New York and create a circus out of it. Put the island of Manhattan in great danger. Probably cost them—one estimate was a hundred million dollars they don’t have. They’re trying to figure out where to come up with the money for their own budget right now. Yes, they’re going to bring them to New York and put on a circus.

So the guys withdrew their indication they were going to plead guilty. They were ready for the big show. And now we’re told that there probably won’t be a decision until after the November elections. They were ready to plead guilty, and now we have to wait 2 years because this administration wanted to jump in and make a circus out of justice. You don’t do that. It’s not justice when you attempt to make a circus out of it.

I had a rule in my courtroom. I would allow one camera remain in place, could not be moved, and the moment I saw one juror look over at the camera, the camera was out. Everybody knew the rules. It had to be a pooled camera. So all networks pooled from that one camera. And the first one to file the motion to bring the camera or use the camera were the ones that got to put the stationary camera in there and everybody else pulled footage from those. Because when you’re talking about justice, when you’re talking about court proceedings, you cannot talk about making a big show out of the trial. It’s no longer justice. It’s now a circus.

And, in the meantime, we have over 3,000 people who lost their lives in the

9/11 attacks, who see justice frittering away yet one more time. It’s heartbreaking. Heartbreaking. These guys were ready to plead guilty, as announced in this article December 9, 2008, in *The New York Times*. And now we’re talking 2 years later before we ever even think about, figure out what we’re going to do. They were ready to plead guilty but for this administration’s meddling with the third branch.

And for those that think that the Congress does not have the authority to create military commissions, I understand their ignorance—there’s a lot of it out there, but that’s been going on for years—called the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Because under the Constitution, this body had the authority to create the UCMJ, which we did, long before I was here, of course. But they did. And that’s why.

Now when the Bush administration tried to create a military commission without coming through Congress, that was not constitutional. That’s not the President’s job. It’s the Congress’s job under the Constitution. So when the Congress came back in 2006, created the Military Commissions Act, then it was certainly upheld, because it was appropriate. Of course, in that bill it referred to those who are at war with America as enemy combatants, a term that’s been around for at least 70 years. But that got changed last year. We had an amendment to the Military Commissions Act of 2006. The term “enemy combatant” has now been changed officially in the act that President Obama signed. We wouldn’t want to offend these poor enemy combatants that want to kill us and destroy our way of life. So they’re now referred to under the bill as unprivileged alien enemy belligerents. Four words now.

Anyway, that’s where we are with regard to the 9/11 attackers, the 9/11 plotters; and if you go back and read the pleading filed by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed on behalf of himself and the four others charged that should have pled guilty in January of 2009, but for the intervention by the executive branch through the Department of Justice and the White House, but for their meddling, these guys may well have already been put to death, since that’s what they were willing to accept. And I just know that they have a very rude awakening awaiting them in the next life. But, unfortunately, that will not be experienced by them for some time still to come. Really tragic.

And then we see not only has there been that interference with the 9/11 plotters and the intervention of the White House and the Department of Justice. And, I don’t know, maybe the name should be changed from Department of Justice to Department of Procrastinated Justice, because it should have happened by now, but for this group intervening. Then we see what’s happened down in the Gulf Coast, what continues to go on. We’ve got video every second reminding us of that. And the more you read, the more disconcerting it gets.

Now we’ve heard one of the all-time experts on global warming finally admit early this year that, well, actually, there’s no evidence of the planet warming since 1995. And, yes, in the last few years it’s probably been cooling; and, yes, the Middle Ages were a lot warmer in the Northern Hemisphere than it is here now. Of course, I’m sure it’s easy to remember from history the Middle Ages, the Nords, all those folks. They had some pretty high-powered automobiles which are creating all the global warming back in those days. But, apparently, it was such a wonderful thing to this administration and to our friends across the aisle that British Petroleum was onboard with global warming and they were going to, apparently, make a lot of money in the carbon credit business. They were excited about it. And they were the Big Oil advocate teamed up with the Democrats in the Senate and with this administration.

And so people wondered why this administration didn’t come out much more quickly and condemn British Petroleum. Well, they were still hoping they were going to salvage their crap-and-trade bill. But they also knew if their big ally, British Petroleum, was not onboard, then it might be more difficult to convince others that it was going to be such a good thing for the energy business. So they really didn’t want, apparently, to condemn British Petroleum too roundly too quickly because they were still hoping they could salvage a passage of the crap-and-trade bill.

And they really at the time thought they needed their ally—their very, very close ally—British Petroleum. And there was an article indicating that in fact Senator KERRY on April 22, when the Deepwater Horizon blew, that Senator KERRY was communicating with British Petroleum about trying to get that global warming bill passed.

□ 2150

Things got put on hold, obviously, after that explosion took place. And yet still over 60 days later, the Jones Act has not been suspended, so the Netherlands could come in, as they had offered. They have got some amazing machinery that would help with the separation. They could build island barriers, save so much of the pristine beaches, and still, no Jones Act suspension. Obviously that was a bill to give protectionism to unions, and certainly the unions did not want to see that bill suspended.

But for all the criticism of President Bush, within 3 days of Hurricane Katrina occurring—August 29 was when it occurred, September 1 is when President Bush had signed an order suspending the Jones Act so that foreign vessels could come in and assist us in our time of need after Hurricane Katrina. Over 60 days later, this administration still has not done it.

So I hear all the talk about, We’re doing absolutely everything we can.

How about putting a signature on the suspension of the Jones Act? Just do it 19 days like President Bush did, and you'll be able to have all this outside assistance come in.

One of the things that I've seen—and it's been hard for me over the years, when somebody wants to come help me after I've had some family tragedy or something, is, I just don't like to accept—I don't want anybody to put themselves out. But what you find out is, if you've done something for somebody else, it blesses their heart when they get to do something nice for you.

You know, we have done some very nice things for so many countries, as is reflected in the cemeteries all over Europe, in American soldiers that have been buried around the world, where they gave their lives—not so that we could be an imperialist nation, because if we were, France would be speaking English, the Netherlands would be speaking English, Germany would be speaking English. But that was never our goal. Japan would be speaking English. That was never our goal. It was a goal to bring liberty and freedom, bring the very gift that we have in this country to others. It's such a wonderful inheritance. But the problem is, though we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, like any inheritance, any gift, if you don't fight for it, then mean, evil people will take it away.

So the Jones Act has not been suspended, and we have a fund that was created with—you know, British Petroleum said, We were going to do it anyway. And it sure sounds like, from what we've been hearing, British Petroleum deserves to pay a great deal more than that. But one of the great things the Founders did was create three branches of government so that when a responsible party has done something wrong, you don't have the Congress or the President come in and say, Here's your fine. Here's your fee. This is what you've got to pay. We don't have that. We have hearings and trials in court. And if you want to avoid having a long drawn-out trial process, then you can come in and work out a settlement agreement.

Some companies have found out, after they've done wrong and harmed people, that they actually end up better off creating a fund on their own, something that is acceptable to others so that they can be compensated for the harm that's been done without protracted litigation. That's all a very noble thing. Having a fund supplied by British Petroleum, that's a very good thing. But when you take it out of context, of the three branches of government—and this is more a judiciary issue—and you allow either the legislative or the executive branch to just say, Here's what you owe. Put up the money, and we'll appoint our pet person here to dictate who gets what, then you have broken down the Constitution. That's not supposed to happen.

Because the same President and Attorney General who sit down with somebody at the very time that they are investigating criminal charges—and they've made a big deal in the media about investigating criminal charges. They said, By the way, we're investigating you. I mean, it goes without saying. They've said it all in the media, We're investigating you for criminal charges. We think you need to put this money up. The same executive branch that can dictate creating a fund like that—no matter how willing the perpetrator is to put up the fund—that same executive branch can also say, And by the way, why don't you just take the blame for everything? Why don't you just take the blame for everything? Let's don't even get into what the government might have done wrong, what our administration didn't do, what our Department of Interior didn't do, what our Minerals Management Service didn't do, or the fact that we just made a big splash in June of 2009 about our deputy assistant secretary coming in to this department who worked for British Petroleum ever since she left the Clinton administration in January of 2001, and never mind that she knows more, according to the previous Inspector General, about why that price adjustment language was cut out of the 1998 and 1999 offshore leases that made—I thought originally hundreds of millions, now apparently it's billions of dollars for her employer, Big Oil. But it cost the Federal Treasury billions of dollars that went to big oil. Let's just avoid all of that discussion about the cozy relationship between this administration's regulators and British Petroleum. Let's just avoid all of that, and you just take all the responsibility.

There's a reason that an executive branch is not supposed to do that, because it opens the door to abuse. And, in fact, there are Federal laws—just like I'm familiar with State laws in Texas—that say, basically it's a crime for a prosecutor in Texas to call in a defendant and say, I will not indict you, or I will drop the indictment if you will put x number of dollars into the fund that I dictate. Well, that's a crime. You can't do that. There's a reason that we have three branches of government.

I heard someone ask once of the brilliant Justice Antonin Scalia, Don't you think the reason we've had more liberty in this country than any other country in the world is because of our Bill of Rights? And I just love Justice Scalia. He is so brilliant and yet so forthright. He said, no. And I'm sure my answer will not do justice to his. But my recollection is, basically, no. The Soviets had a much better Bill of Rights than we have. And it hit me. I remembered. I studied the Soviets' Bill of Rights, and they actually did. It was a great Bill of Rights. But he said, No. The reason you've got more liberty in America is because the Founders did not trust government, so they wanted

to make it as hard as they could for government to pass any laws, to force anybody into anything.

□ 2200

You set up three branches as the Founders so that you couldn't just quickly pass a law. And even if you did, you have an executive branch that is elected outside of Congress. So it's not like a prime minister, where we elect one of our own in here to be the leader, similar to a President. We've got an executive branch.

And that's not enough. We set up a judicial branch that's appointed in the Federal system so that all of these things would help create gridlock. Today you hear people say, I'm tired of gridlock. The Founders thought it was the best gift they could ever give is a way to clog up the government so they wouldn't rush in and make laws unless they were absolutely necessary. We've gotten away from that. It's gotten too easy.

As we saw when the Republicans in 2001 had the White House, House, and the Senate, spending started like it hadn't before. Compassion was equated with giving away money. Whereas, if you go back to 1995, when Republicans took Congress as the majority, finally you started having a balanced budget, because this body creates the budget and the Senate eventually, hopefully, agrees. And then you've got a way to control spending.

We had a balanced budget once the Republicans took the majority, and things went great. And it's amazing to me—well, it's humorous, actually, to hear President Clinton taking credit for a balanced budget. He didn't do it. The Congress did. And in some cases, he was brought in kicking and screaming, but the Republican Congress balanced the budget.

It wasn't until they got giddy by having their own party in the White House that the brakes came off and spending increased so that we had \$100 billion, \$200 billion in deficit in 1 year. And that was so outrageous until this last year, when it was over a trillion, and this year maybe as much as \$1.6 trillion in 1 year. It's unbelievable. It's really irresponsible.

And now we read today in the paper that our majority leader is saying they are giving up all hope of passing a budget, too politically difficult. And as we heard one of the Democratic leaders say in 2006 before they won the majority, if you can't provide a budget, you can't govern. There's a lot of truth in that.

So we need to get away from the executive branch being the Congress, being the executive branch and the judicial branch. We saw that with the auto task force. This body created the bankruptcy laws. Bankruptcy is something provided for in the Constitution. But it wasn't created until the early 1800s, where the courts actually set up the system of bankruptcy.

And it was set up because the Founders believed that apparently nobody, no

business or body should ever be too big to fail. Because if you are failing, you can go through bankruptcy. And, in fact, if you are too big to fail, it is absolutely essential that you go through bankruptcy and reorganize and downsize so you will never put this country at that kind of risk again because you are still too big to fail and, in fact, have gotten even bigger. And that's what we've seen with Goldman Sachs. They've gotten even bigger. They should have been allowed to fail previously.

Well, I tell you, there is a brilliant man named Thomas Sowell. And I didn't vote for Barack Obama in 2008, but I sure would have voted for Thomas Sowell. His article says quite a lot. His editorial says here, and it's just been posted this week, but he says, "When Adolf Hitler was building up the Nazi movement in the 1920s," and I am quoting from Thomas Sowell in his editorial, "leading up to his taking power in the 1930s, he deliberately sought to activate people who did not normally pay much attention to politics. Such people were a valuable addition to his political base, since they were particularly susceptible to Hitler's rhetoric and had far less basis for questioning his assumptions or his conclusions. 'Useful idiots' was the term supposedly coined by V.I. Lenin to describe similarly unthinking supporters of his dictatorship in the Soviet Union."

And this isn't in the article, this is my comment, but we do have useful idiots today who are heard to say, Wow, what we really need is for the President to be a dictator for a little while. They know not what they say.

Anyway, back to quoting Thomas Sowell. "Put differently, a democracy needs informed citizens if it is to thrive or, ultimately, even survive. In our times, American democracy is being dismantled, piece by piece, before our very eyes by the current administration in Washington, and few people seem to be concerned about it. The President's poll numbers are going down because increasing numbers of people disagree with particular policies of his, but the damage being done to the fundamental structure of this Nation goes far beyond particular counterproductive policies.

"Just where in the Constitution of the United States does it say that a President has the authority to extract vast sums of money from a private enterprise and distribute it as he sees fit to whomever he deems worthy of compensation? Nowhere. And yet that is precisely what's happening," and he goes on.

And I will tell you, there is a reason we have to rely on the justice system, because if we didn't have that branch of government that could be the final arbiter of disagreements between groups, then there would be people like me who have seen the damage that rushing through, taking the cheaper way to drill in such a difficult area, seen the damage, the loss of lives,

those whose lives are still in jeopardy because of their grave injuries, the damage to the environment—and I just drove from New Orleans to Panama City. And there is anticipation of doom and gloom coming to many places, yet those people, the beaches are beautiful. From Panama City through Alabama through Mississippi, they are beautiful. But people aren't showing up to the beaches. They could at least come and enjoy them.

But BP just did an unconscionable thing. And if we did not have a justice system, if we were back to the days, as Israel once was, of just having a judge and I were the judge, you know, the tendency would be some people would be horsewhipped that cut corners and did all this damage. But there's a reason we don't have a judicial dictatorship so one man can't say you ought to be horsewhipped for what you have done.

What they've done is outrageous. And you can't help but think, because they had such good friends in the administration and in the majority, they thought they were bulletproof. They thought they could do whatever they wanted. And the President, their big buddy, Senator KERRY, the majority, especially in the Senate, they would cover for them. They would take care of them. They didn't know that when they did something this outrageous they would be thrown under the bus. But we should not have one branch that does that kind of dictation. It's not good. It's not good at all.

And then we have the problem with Israel being accosted by its enemies, and we are siding with the wrong people. I had a teacher in elementary school. She always took up for the bullies when they beat up the little guys. I know because I was a little guy in elementary school, and she always sided with the big bullies that had flunked a couple of grades and were bigger than the rest of us.

□ 2210

I will never forget those guys took my brand-new football I got for Christmas, and I went to get it back and my nose was bloodied, my face was pulverized, but then, as now, I don't run from a fight. And when the teacher was told by other students I was trying to get my nose to stop bleeding, she came into the boy's restroom, grabbed me, took me down to the classroom, marched me in front of the class and said, See, now, class, this is what happens when the little boys try to play with the big boys,

Well, that's kind of what's going on here. We've got bullies trying to bully Israel. We're siding with the wrong guys. There will be a price to pay if this continues. Israel's our friend. They have great value for human life, like we do in this country. If they were not in the Middle East, we would spend trillions of dollars trying to protect ourselves in that area from the things that are growing right now. We owe

them more than a thank you, and yet the U.S. voted to force them to disclose their nuclear weaponry, if any. You don't do that to friends. It's what Hezekiah did. He showed Babylonians all his armaments, his treasury and Isaiah told him, as a result, it is all going to be taken away. You don't show your enemies all of your defenses because they will figure out a way to overcome them.

I was just downstairs, in fact, in a little supper with Shaun Alexander, played football for Alabama, and was MVP with Seattle in the Super Bowl, just a great guy. But he mentioned four verses of scripture that really meant so much to him, and one of those was, he said, Deuteronomy 30:19, and I'm quoting from the most quoted book in this history of the Congress. In fact, our first 150 years, oftentimes our legislators were afraid to file a bill without having some scriptural basis to back it up. But Shaun quoted from Deuteronomy 30:19, I call Heaven and Earth to witness against you today that I've set before you life and death, the blessing and the curse. So choose life in order that you may live, you and your descendants.

Verse 20 goes on: By loving the Lord, your God, by obeying His voice and by holding fast to Him, for this is your life and the length of your days, that you may live in the land that your Lord swore to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to give to them.

He also quoted from Matthew 5:24, No one can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other or he will hold to one and despise the other.

You cannot serve God and man. You know, these days, some want to serve a constituent and they get pulled away because they're torn. They'd like to serve a tremendous power in this country, torn between constituent service and power. And then in some cases, as we see here, apparently George Soros has made more money probably than anybody in this country because of British Petroleum and the moratorium and what all has happened there. Of course, this country apparently is standing for \$2 billion to help Brazil do deep exploration, and that will make hundreds of millions for Mr. Soros. I'm happy for anybody who make lots of money, but sometimes people in this body are torn between their constituent service or being a part of a powerful team.

It's why people in here are often gotten to move their vote one way or the other. I was told that before I got here. One of the hardest things is not when people come to you and say, yes, you're going to do this, you're going to vote this way, because most in this body are stubborn enough to say, no, I'm not going to do that. But where they get you is they say, come on, we thought you were a team player, we want you on our team, we want you one of the good guys on our team. And they hit you up on the team player thing.

And so good people in this body, in the Senate, even in the judiciary apparently when they allowed the auto task force, taking without due process in violation of the Constitution, turned bankruptcy upside down. They even convinced the judiciary to even look the other way and let the Constitution and the bankruptcy laws be turned upside down. So there are people who want to be part of the team, you know, and they forget the Constitution; and when that happens we break down what so many have fought and died for to give us this gift.

I heard my colleagues in the prior hour talking about how well the stimulus is going. I keep coming back, and Mark Levin quoted this in his book, "Liberty and Tyranny," and it ought to be a textbook, it's so good. But he quotes from Henry Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury under Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1939 Secretary Morgenthau was testifying—well, actually he wrote this. He said, We have tried spending money. We have spent more money than we have ever spent before, and now after 8 years, we have an unemployment rate that is just as high today as it was when we started, and we have an enormous debt to boot.

Human nature has not changed much since the 1930s. When the government starts spending money, then ultimately you're going to have a choice. You're going to have to keep borrowing or printing, and then ultimately you get in a position the Soviet Union was in. You can't print it fast enough to pay your debts, you can't borrow it fast enough, nobody will loan it to you anymore. So you have to go up and announce you're bankrupt as a nation and out of business.

By the way, one other thing I wanted to mention, and this happens when you refuse to enforce the laws. We had a President who just decided he was going to impose a drilling moratorium; and so the judiciary came in, considered the Constitution, considered the action after it viewed all the excuses and everything for imposing it, said this is arbitrary and capricious, you can't do this, there's no basis for a moratorium of all of these.

If you want to go after BP—he didn't say this, I'm saying it—you want to go after BP, say they're suspended until you make sure they're not cutting corners on other rigs, because we know they cut them—it sure looks like they cut them at least on Deepwater Horizon, that's one thing. But to do it on all the rigs when indications that we saw somewhere there were 750 safety violations for BP and in the same period I think Exxon, maybe Shell, had one? There's a reason maybe you could justify doing that with a BP rig but not all of them.

So the judge struck it down, and here already today the Secretary of the Interior says he's appealing it. Apparently, he likes the idea of having one branch of government run everything. Big mistake.

Then, not only that, a lot of folks may not know, Mr. Speaker, but there is, as I understand it, under Federal law the right of the Border Patrol to come into private landowners' land up to 25 miles from the border, anywhere, any of our borders to enforce our border. Everywhere around the border, they have that right up to 25 miles to come into private property if they need to to enforce our border.

Well, lo and behold, there is one place they can't, and that's on federally owned property like the national park in Arizona. There is apparently about 32 miles of border with Mexico that's a park that has now been announced to be closed to American citizens because there are too many illegals going across that land and tearing it up, and some have gotten violent and killed even law enforcement people in that area.

□ 2220

We can go on private property to protect our border, but we can't go on Federal land? That's outrageous. Rob Bishop has a bill to deal with that, and so do I. Rob has really done great research on this, he has really been the leader in the area of bringing this stuff out. We've got to do something; that is outrageous. We need defense, and we need to give a 25-mile, at least, area to the border patrol to patrol and just say that's not going to be national park wilderness area because our border means too much. We've got people wanting to come in here and destroy our way of life.

But I see my time is running shorter now. There were a lot of things I wanted to cover. But there are just so many people who do not understand, Mr. Speaker, where we came from and why there needs to be a firm foundation under this country. President Harry Truman—some may recall he was a Democrat—he said this: "The fundamental basis of this Nation's laws was given to Moses on the Mount." The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don't think we emphasize that enough these days. If we don't have a proper fundamental moral background, we will finally end up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the State. Boy, was he prophetic.

James Madison, given credit for writing the most in the Constitution, he said this on November 20, 1825: "The belief in a God all powerful, wise and good, is so essential to the moral order of the world and to the happiness of man that arguments which enforce it cannot be drawn from too many sources nor adapted with too much solicitude to the different characters and capacities to be impressed with."

Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "The skeptics and the cynics of Washington's day did not believe that ordinary men and women had the capacity for freedom and self-government. They

said that liberty and equality were idle dreams that could not come true. You know, they are like the people who carp at the Ten Commandments because some people are in the habit of breaking one or more of them." A lot of truth then.

Patrick Henry said this: "Bad men cannot make good citizens. It is impossible that a nation of infidels and idolaters should be a nation of free men. It is when a people forget God that tyrants forge their chains."

So much, so much truth in our heritage. And I just want to conclude with this, Thomas Jefferson's own words: "God who gave us life gave us liberty. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God, that they are not to be violated but with his wrath. Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and his justice cannot sleep forever."

This government is not God, and the only protection from those who think they might begin to be is the enforcement of the three branches of government and their separate powers, and we've got to get back to that to save this Nation.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PLATTS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and June 23 on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHAUER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 23, 24, and 25.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, June 28 and 29.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, June 23 and 24.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today, June 23, and 24.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, June 28 and 29.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today, June 23, and 24.

Mr. CAO, for 5 minutes, June 29.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 17, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3951. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Louisiana Avenue in New Orleans Louisiana, as the "Roy Rondeno, Sr. Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 23, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7997. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid polymer, with 1,3-butadiene and ethenylbenzene; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0033; FRL-8827-4] received June 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7998. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Farmer Mac Investments and Liquidity (RIN: 3052-AC56) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7999. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 2011 Budget Amendments for the Department of Energy; (H. Doc. No. 111—124); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8000. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 2011 Budget Amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, Labor, State and Other International Programs, Transportation, and the Treasury, as well as the Small Business Administration, District of Columbia, Institute of Museum and Library Services, Northern Border Regional Commission, and Southeast Crescent Regional Commission; (H. Doc. No. 111—125); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8001. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Finland-Public Interest Exception to the Buy American Act (DFARS Case 2009-D022) received May 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8002. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Evaluation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8003. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "U.S. Government Foreign Credit Exposure as of December 31, 2008"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8004. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Singapore pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8005. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8006. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA-HQ-OA-2004-0002; FRL-9158-9] (RIN: 2090-AA37) received June 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8007. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act; Interpretation of Unblockable Drain received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8008. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Particulate Matter Standards; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule [R05-OAR-2009-0731; FRL-9157-9] received June 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8009. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit Section 110 State Implementation Plans for Interstate Transport for the 2006 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0409; FRL-9159-5] received June 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8010. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8011. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8012. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-011, certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, and defense services, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8013. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8014. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program Report for Fiscal Year 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7201(e); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8015. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the 35th Annual Report of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8016. A letter from the Sr. VP and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 2009, pursuant to D.C. Code Ann. 34-1113 (2001); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8017. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Areas; Port of Portland Terminal 4, Willamette River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0370] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8018. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Blasting Operations and Movement of Explosives, St. Marys River, Sault Saint Marie, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2010-0290] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8019. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; APBA National Tour, Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1110] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8020. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; BWRC Spring Classic, Parker, AZ [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1111] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8021. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE SYSTEMS (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ70A, 146-RJ85A, and 146-RJ100A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1254; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-040-AD; Amendment 39-16292; AD 2010-10-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8022. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-

200B, 747-300, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1066; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-16284; AD 2010-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8023. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus A318, A319, A320, A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0129; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-245-AD; Amendment 39-16287; AD 2010-10-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8024. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "Public Works and Economic Development Improvements Act of 2010"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4805. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reduce the emissions of formaldehyde from composite wood products, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-509, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4805 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHULER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. OWENS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 5564. A bill to prevent wealthy and middle-income foreign states that do business, issue securities, or borrow money in the United States, and then fail to satisfy United States court judgments totaling \$100,000,000 or more based on such activities, from inflicting further economic injuries in the United States, from undermining the integrity of United States courts, and from discouraging responsible lending to poor and developing nations by undermining the secondary and primary markets for sovereign debt; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on

Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 5565. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5014 Gary Avenue in Lubbock, Texas, as the "Sergeant Chris Davis Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DJOU, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DENT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WOLF, Ms. KILROY, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. McKEON, Mr. CARTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HELLER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FARR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LANCE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. OLSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BONNER, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HARE, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CAO, Mr. YOUNG of Flor-

ida, Ms. FALLIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TAHRIT, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. CHU, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WU, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 5566. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate commerce in animal crush videos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 5567. A bill to invest in urban universities and create innovation and economic prosperity for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Science and Technology, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NYE (for himself, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SHULER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 5568. A bill to create a means to review and abolish Federal programs that are inefficient, duplicative, or in other ways wasteful of taxpayer funds; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5569. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until September 30, 2010; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5570. A bill to provide that no funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Internal Revenue Service to expand its workforce in order to implement, enforce, or otherwise carry out either the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5571. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title I of the United States Code to establish the style for amending laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 5572. A bill to reform the Minerals Management Service and offshore drilling for oil and gas, to repeal the limitation of liability of a responsible party for discharge of oil from an offshore facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5573. A bill to require the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to biennially review and evaluate the grants management and oversight practices of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 5574. A bill to establish the National Commission on Effective Marginal Tax Rates for Low-Income Families; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. PENCE):

H. Res. 1457. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the one-year anniversary of the Government of Iran's fraudulent manipulation of Iranian elections, the Government of Iran's continued denial of human rights and democracy to the people of Iran, and the Government of Iran's continued pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Res. 1458. A resolution expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Marine Awareness Day; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DJOU:

H. Res. 1459. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the 50-star flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PUTNAM, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida):

H. Res. 1460. A resolution recognizing the important role pollinators play in supporting the ecosystem and supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Res. 1461. A resolution supporting Olympic Day on June 23, 2010, and congratulating Team USA and World Fit participants; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MACK (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Res. 1462. A resolution expressing support for the people of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador as they persevere through the aftermath of Tropical Storm Agatha which swept across Central America causing deadly floods and mudslides; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H. Res. 1463. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DJOU, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MANZULLO, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 1464. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the conclusion of the United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and expressing appreciation to the Government of Japan and the Japanese people for enhancing peace, prosperity, and security in the Asia-Pacific region; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SIRENS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H. Res. 1465. A resolution reaffirming the longstanding friendship and alliance between the United States and Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 1466. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Energy to provide certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to the Department of Energy's application to foreclose use of Yucca Mountain as a high level nuclear waste repository; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

314. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 160 memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Federal Communications Commission to refrain from regulating Internet Broadband Services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

315. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 761 urging the Congress to include Oak Ridge in any Draft Special Resource Study/Environmental Assessment on the Manhattan Project Sites and that a new national park unit be considered; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

316. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6 memorializing the Congress to review the GPO and the WEP Social Security benefit reductions and enact the Social Security Fairness Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

317. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 43 memorializing the Congress to approve H.R. 5941; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Ways and Means.

318. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 285 memorializing the President, the Congress, and the Federal Communications Commission to refrain from regulating Internet Broadband Services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 43: Mr. OWENS and Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 197: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 235: Mr. REHBERG and Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 272: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 275: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 422: Mr. WU.

H.R. 503: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 537: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 610: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 645: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 666: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 745: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. HELLER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 848: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 949: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 950: Ms. SHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1074: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1079: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1193: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1203: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1230: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1237: Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 1250: Mr. AUSTRIA.

H.R. 1255: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1362: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1402: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1458: Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 1460: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1547: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1806: Mr. SPACE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1831: Mr. CRITZ.

H.R. 1990: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2030: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2031: Mr. CARTER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2138: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2149: Mr. MELANCON.

H.R. 2159: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2220: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2378: Mr. STARK, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

H.R. 2381: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 2401: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 2408: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 2483: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2575: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2817: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2870: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

- H.R. 2906: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2941: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 3043: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 3048: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3101: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3116: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3149: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3212: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3249: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3267: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 3271: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3302: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3328: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 3408: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 3519: Mr. PITTS and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 3564: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3652: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 3712: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3721: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 3729: Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3753: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3790: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3907: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4051: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4116: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4128: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 4144: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4181: Ms. CLARKE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CHU, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4195: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4197: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4278: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4301: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4306: Ms. NORTON and Mr. BRIGHT.
H.R. 4353: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 4373: Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 4376: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4469: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 4480: Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. HARE.
H.R. 4505: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 4514: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4568: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 4597: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 4601: Ms. TITUS, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 4638: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4662: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4671: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4677: Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 4684: Mr. AKIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. FOX, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUYER, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4690: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4692: Mr. JONES and Mrs. HALVORSON.
H.R. 4693: Mr. HONDA and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4700: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4751: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4752: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4753: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4755: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4756: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4764: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 4788: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4868: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 4886: Mr. HONDA and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4888: Mr. WU.
H.R. 4891: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 4903: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 4914: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 4920: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4933: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4943: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 4959: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4986: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. HARMAN.
H.R. 4993: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 5015: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5034: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 5040: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5044: Ms. KOSMAS and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 5058: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5081: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. FORBES, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5137: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5142: Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5143: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5177: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5211: Mr. HODES.
H.R. 5235: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 5244: Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 5258: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 5285: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5323: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5324: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 5335: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 5350: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 5357: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 5412: Mr. FILNER and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 5418: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5447: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 5460: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 5462: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 5475: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5497: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRIGHT, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. HILL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. NYE.
H.R. 5501: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 5503: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 5513: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5519: Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. FALLIN.
H.R. 5523: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. HELLER.
H.R. 5524: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 5555: Mr. TERRY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. PETERS.
H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H. Con. Res. 259: Ms. NORTON.
H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. BUYER and Mr. HEINRICH.
H. Con. Res. 288: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHN-SON of Texas.
H. Res. 111: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. RAHALL.
H. Res. 546: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 771: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. PAULSEN.
H. Res. 1195: Mr. BOREN, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HILL, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WU, and Mr. CUELLAR.
H. Res. 1196: Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 1207: Mr. FORBES, Mr. DJOU, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Res. 1219: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. FORBES.
H. Res. 1326: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 1355: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 1365: Mr. BUYER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H. Res. 1373: Mr. HOLDEN.
H. Res. 1384: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H. Res. 1388: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H. Res. 1393: Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TANNER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FARR, and Ms. GIFFORDS.
H. Res. 1401: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 1406: Ms. FOX.
H. Res. 1420: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. PAYNE.
H. Res. 1431: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 1452: Mr. FARR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

[Omitted from the Record of June 17, 2010]

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 11, June 16, 2010, by Mr. STEVE KING of Iowa on H.R. 4972, was signed by the following Members: Steve King, Connie Mack, and Michele Bachmann.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 2010

No. 94

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who daily showers us with blessings, open our eyes to the generosity of Your grace. Help us to see in the beauty and bounty that surrounds us the movement of Your loving providence. Remind our lawmakers of their responsibility to use Your blessings to make a better Nation and world, and that to whom much is given, much is expected. Lord, give them the wisdom to relinquish their control and to ask You to take charge, guiding their steps by Your power. Break the bonds of self-sufficiency by showing them what they can accomplish with Your supernatural strength.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2010.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. SHAHEEN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following leader remarks there will be a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m. today, with Senators being allowed during that period of time to speak for up to 10 minutes each. The majority will control the first 30 minutes, the Republicans will control the next hour, and then the majority will control the next 30 minutes, with the remaining time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senate will recess at 12:30 until 2:15 for weekly caucus meetings.

Rollcall votes are still possible this afternoon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed

to executive session to consider en bloc Executive Calendar Nos. 493, 494, 556, 581, 589, 590, 592, 647, 705, 722, 726, 747, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 794, 799, 800, 801, 824 to and including 830, 836 to and including 842, 844 to and including 848, 880, 881, 882, 902, 904 to and including 907, 908, 916, 923 to and including 928, 930, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 952 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in NOAA; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc, that no further motions be in order, and any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Brian Hayes, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2012.

Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2013.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Benjamin B. Tucker, of New York, to be Deputy Director for State, Local, and Tribal Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John H. Laub, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the National Institute of Justice.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Anthony R. Coscia, of New Jersey, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Albert DiClemente, of Delaware, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for the remainder of the term expiring July 26, 2011.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Mark R. Rosekind, of California, to be a Member of the National Transportation

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5217

Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Jim R. Esquea, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Vincent J. Ventimiglia, Jr.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
James P. Lynch, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, vice Jeffrey L. Sedgwick.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Judith Ann Stewart Stock, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Patricia A. Hoffman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability), vice Kevin M. Kolevar.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY
Ari Ne'eman, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2012, vice Robert Davila.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
David T. Matsuda, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION
Michael F. Tillman, of California, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2011, vice John Elliott Reynolds, III.

Daryl J. Boness, of Maine, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2010.

Daryl J. Boness, of Maine, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2013.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD
Earl F. Weener, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2010.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Jeffrey R. Moreland, of Texas, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Arthur Allen Elkins, Jr., of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

PEACE CORPS
Carolyn Hessler Radelet, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION
Elizabeth L. Littlefield, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, vice Robert A. Mosbacher.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA
Lana Pollack, of Michigan, to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD
Dana Katherine Bilyeu, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2011.

Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2010.

Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2014.

SPECIAL PANEL ON APPEALS

Dennis P. Walsh, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Special Panel on Appeals for a term of six years.

THE JUDICIARY

Milton C. Lee, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years, vice Jerry Stewart Byrd.

Todd E. Edelman, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Judith Anne Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Eduardo M. Ochoa, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

James L. Taylor, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Labor, vice Douglas W. Webster.

NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD

Robert Wedgeworth, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013, vice Amy Owen.

Carla D. Hayden, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2014, vice Kevin Owen Starr.

John Coppola, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013, vice Gail Daly.

Winston Tabb, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013, vice Beverly Allen.

Lawrence J. Pijaux, Jr., of Alabama, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Donald L. Cook, of Washington, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Sharon E. Burke, of Maryland, to be Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs.

Katherine Hammack, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Michael J. McCord, of Virginia, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Elizabeth A. McGrath, of Virginia, to be Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Jeffrey A. Lane, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2014, vice Suedeen G. Kelly.

Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2015.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Michael James Warren, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2011.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES

Adam Gamoran, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2011.

Deborah Loewenberg Ball, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2012.

Margaret R. McLeod, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2012, vice Elizabeth Ann Bryan.

Bridget Terry Long, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2012, vice Joseph K. Torgesen.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

David K. Mineta, of California, to be Deputy Director for Demand Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Sherry Glied, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Benjamin Eric Sasse.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Daniel J. Becker, of Utah, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

James R. Hannah, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Gayle A. Nachtigal, of Oregon, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2012.

John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Marsha J. Rabiteau, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Hernán D. Vera, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2012.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Marie Collins Johns, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Thomas Edward Delahanty II, of Maine, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maine for the term of four years.

Wendy J. Olson, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho for the term of four years.

James A. Lewis, of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of Illinois for the term of four years.

Donald J. Cazayoux, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Henry Lee Whitehorn, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Kevin Charles Harrison, of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Charles Gillen Dunne, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York for the term of four years.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Earl F. Weener, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2015.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
DESK

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION

PN1849 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION nominations (16) beginning DAVID A. SCORE, and ending DEMIAN A. BAILEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 8, 2010.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume legislative session.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Let me express my appreciation to our being able to work through some of these. There are quite a few left to go. The Secretary for the majority just indicated to me that there are some other names that will be cleared later today. So I appreciate this very much. This is going to be a step forward. These are all very important. This will allow these people to get their lives in order. There is no need to talk about why we did not have it done sooner. We did not. We have got it done now, and that is a step forward for the Senate and our country.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY
LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I would say to my good friend, the majority leader, as he knows, this is an agreement we have been prepared to make since last month. I am glad we were able to finally work our way through it and get a significant number of these nominations confirmed.

NEW TAXES

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, it is now official. Top Democrats on Capitol Hill are starting to signal their intention to raise taxes on the middle class. The House majority leader in a speech today warned that in order to do anything about the debt crisis Republicans have been speaking about on the Senate floor in recent weeks, President Obama will have no choice, no choice, but to break his campaign pledge of "no new taxes" for millions of American families.

That is the majority leader in the House of Representatives in a speech today, saying that the President will have no choice but to break his promise of no new taxes for millions of American families.

Respectfully, I think this is a tough argument for the Democratic leadership in the House that will not even

take up the Senate's version of the so-called doc fix legislation for no apparent reason other than the fact that it does not increase the debt.

It is hard to imagine anyone taking advice on fiscal discipline from a party that has spent the last 2½ weeks arguing not about how to pay for the extenders bill that is on the floor or how to use this bill to cut the debt but about how much money to add to the debt in the process of passing it.

Here is another idea Democrats should consider, one that Americans have been proposing loudly and clearly: Stop spending money you do not have. Stop spending money you do not have. The American people do not think our problem is that the government taxes too little. Our problem is that the government taxes too much and that it spends too much and borrows too much. Until Democrats demonstrate even the slightest ability to restrain the recklessness with which they spend America's hard-earned tax dollars, the job creators and the workers of this country are not about to take them seriously on how to lower the national debt.

The American people should not be asked to pay the price for Democrats' recklessness through higher taxes. America faces a debt crisis. Democrats have done nothing whatsoever to show they understand that. Breaking a campaign pledge now will not help; cutting spending will.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes, the Republicans controlling the next 60 minutes, and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFICIT SPENDING AND
UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. DURBIN. The minority leader, Senator McCONNELL, is right. Deficits are important. So are facts. Let's mention a few facts on the floor of the Senate. When was the last time the U.S.

Government ran a surplus? A surplus. Collected more money than it spent? Well, it happened to be in the last year of President Bill Clinton's administration. So when President George W. Bush was elected, President Clinton said: Welcome to Washington. Here is a \$230 billion surplus, and if you follow the spending patterns we have laid out over the next 10 years, you will generate a \$5 trillion surplus in the Treasury—\$230 billion now, plan for a \$5 trillion surplus. At that time the debt of America, the accumulated debt of America, from George Washington through Bill Clinton, all of the debt we had amassed, \$5 trillion.

George W. Bush. Welcome to Washington. A surplus. A plan to increase the surplus. A plan to spend down the national debt. But what happened in 8 years of Republican rule, fiscally conservative Republican rule? I will tell you what happened. The national debt went from \$5 trillion to \$12 trillion.

How do you do that in 8 years? Well, you wage two wars that you do not pay for, and you give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, and you have a prescription drug plan that is not paid for as well under Republican Presidents.

The national debt from Bill Clinton, \$5 trillion; to the end of President George W. Bush, \$12 trillion, and a little gift that President George W. Bush left to President Barack Obama as he left office. No, he did not leave him the \$230 billion that he was given as he came into the presidency. No, he handed off to President Obama a \$1.3 trillion deficit. Welcome to Washington, President Obama. And when you take your hand off the Bible at the swearing in, let's mention too that the Bush economic policies have now cost us, that month, January, that month in 2009, 750,000 American jobs. Now we hear from the Republican side of the aisle these pious incantations about our budget deficit.

Well, it is a problem. But let's put the blame where it belongs. When the Republicans had their chance, they took a surplus and turned it into the biggest deficit in the history of the United States. When President Bush had his economic policies in place, we doubled the national debt. When President Bush left office, he left the economy in the worst recession we have had since the Great Depression.

Now come the Republicans and say: We need to cut spending. Well, let's go back and look at another lesson in history. This goes even further back—80 years, the worst economic situation in modern times in America, the Great Depression. I heard about it as a kid. But it was not as if my parents were giving me a history lesson, they were giving me a story about our family, how my mom and dad got married in 1928, had their first baby in 1929, and their second baby in 1931, and tried to raise a family in the Great Depression. Their lives were changed forever. Their view of the world changed forever. My

mom, an immigrant to this country, and my dad, from a farm family, never borrowed money, scared to death of debt, because they saw the Great Depression and they saw it destroy people. Franklin Roosevelt came in as President in those days. He came in in March of 1933. He said, we are going to change this. We are going to get America back on its feet. You have nothing to fear but fear itself. We are going to put people back to work. We are going to give them government jobs if we cannot find them jobs in the private sector. We are going to tell our farmers, you are going to survive because we are going to basically stand behind you through the tough years. Whether it is a drought or a flood, we are going to be around to help you get through to the next year. We are going to make sure that banks do not fail. We are going to inject government into this economy and get America back on its feet.

At that time the unemployment rate in America was 25 percent. When the New Deal got started, they brought it down 13 percent, cut it in half because of government investment in this economy. People went back to work. They left the long lines waiting for soup and bread and started earning some money. They built highways. They built bridges. They built stadiums. They built parts of America we still use today. It was an investment by the government in our economy to bring us out of the worst depression we had ever faced.

Then, after a few years what happened? Republican critics came forward and said, wait a minute. This is deficit spending. We are spending money we do not have. We have got to stop. And they prevailed, just as Senator MCCONNELL wants to prevail today. Hit the brakes. Stop spending. You know what happened? They prevailed with that argument. You know what happened with the unemployment rate? It went from 13 percent back to 19 percent, and the sick economy continued for years until the war came along, World War II, and we had a massive investment in our Nation to protect our Nation, to give our troops what they needed, and we put people back to work.

Now we are about to repeat history. The Republicans come to us now and say, we have got to stop putting money back into the economy. It creates deficit. Yes, it does. But if you do not get the 14 million unemployed Americans back to work, the deficit will get worse. They will not be paying taxes, they will be drawing on government services.

We want them back to work. And it means making sure we make investments in America that count—helping small businesses; tax credits and tax deductions for small businesses; credit for small businesses; government actively moving forward to give small businesses a chance to keep their employees and hire more.

That is what we believe in on the Democratic side of the aisle. The Republicans say: Oh, deficit spending. Stop. We cannot do that. Then what happens? The business fails. The jobs are lost. The people draw unemployment and, in desperation, wait for something to happen.

You know what the Republicans are up to now? Last week we asked them: Would you please extend unemployment benefits for these millions of Americans who are out of work. In my State the unemployment rate is 10.8 percent. It has been around that for several months now. Boone County, 16.6 percent; Pulaski County, way down south, 12 percent; western edge of our State, Hancock County, 11.8 percent; and in Clark County, in the southeastern end of our State, 13.7 percent. There are 717,000 people in Illinois officially unemployed.

The Republicans say: Cut off their unemployment benefits. That is what they voted for last Thursday. And 80,000 of those 717,000 unemployed will lose their unemployment benefits.

What happens to the unemployment check? It is the most quickly spent government check ever sent out. Desperate people out of work take that check and turn it into groceries and clothes and shoes and gas in the car and utility bills and rent and mortgage payments as quickly as they receive it. It is money right back into the economy. They want to cut it off because we have a deficit.

I understand this deficit. I am on the Deficit Commission, and I understand taking it seriously. But let's take seriously putting America back to work. This Republican approach of cutting the unemployment compensation for people who lost their jobs through no fault of their own is a strategy that failed in the 1930s and is going to fail us now.

We have to believe in America and a better day when people are back to work and this economy is moving forward. We will deal with this deficit with a strong economy, with Americans working, not by quaking and quivering and saying we cannot put money back into the hands of those who are out of work. That is one of the fundamentals in this government. It is the way we take this great free market system of ours, when it falls on hard times, and move it forward again.

All of the speeches we will hear from the other side of the aisle about deficits are going to overlook the obvious. Were it not for the failed economic policies of the Bush administration, we would not be where we are today. Were it not for the doubling of the national debt under the last Republican President, we would not be where we are today.

It seems that those on the other side of the aisle have, I guess, an extreme sensitivity to deficits when there is a Democratic President, and are oblivious to them when there is a Republican President. The American people

know what the facts say. They know the history. I hope they do not embrace the Republican approach which will drive us further into unemployment and recession.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland.

KAGAN NOMINATION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, this Monday the Senate Judiciary Committee will begin the confirmation hearings for Elena Kagan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. These confirmation hearings will provide an opportunity to the public to see firsthand how important Supreme Court decisions are in their ordinary lives. There are many examples we could give, from schools to consumer issues to personal lives, privacy, religious protections, helping the environment, the workplace.

In recent years, by a sharply divided Court, they have reversed precedent and congressional intent and ruled on the side of big business over individual rights. This is judicial activism, not judicial restraint. I hope all my colleagues will agree that the next Supreme Court Justice should be on the side of individual Americans, following legal precedent and congressional intent.

I wish to give an example—I know my colleagues will give others—about workplace fairness in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire*. Let me provide a little background. Lilly Ledbetter worked for 19 years at Goodyear Tire. During that period, she was paid \$15,000 a year less than her male counterparts doing the same work. This type of discrimination is prohibited by congressional statute under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Within that legislation, title VII was specifically enacted to protect American workers from undue discrimination, including gender discrimination. When Mrs. Ledbetter found out she was being discriminated against, she did the right thing: she brought a claim against her employer.

The only reason Mrs. Ledbetter knew she was being paid less than her male counterparts was because a colleague finally told her. This is not unusual. In fact, in most employment discrimination cases, employees are unaware of discrimination until an unexpected event occurs or undisclosed information finally comes to light.

Mrs. Ledbetter went to court, stated her claim, and won. After multiple appeals, the case reached the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, by a 5-to-4 decision, denied her claim. The Court said Mrs. Ledbetter had to file her case within 180 days after the beginning of the discrimination, and since she did not do that, her claim was barred by the statute of limitations. This defies logic. How can a person bring a claim when they don't know they are being discriminated against? It makes no sense.

This decision appalled me and many of our colleagues. Whose side is the Supreme Court on? What happened to protecting American workers and not big business? What happened to following legal precedent? What happened to following congressional intent? What happened to judicial restraint from a majority of the Court that professes that is what they believe is right? If an employee is being discriminated against, there should be effective remedy. If they don't know they were discriminated against, it doesn't make the error any less wrong when they find out about it. The Court is clearly out of touch with the impact they have on everyday Americans.

This case is a perfect example of hurting female workers. As of 2009, women comprised 46.8 percent of the U.S. labor force. As of 2009, 66 million women were employed in the United States; 74 percent were employed full time; 26 percent, part time. Equal pay has been U.S. law for more than four decades. But on average, women today still make just 78 cents for every dollar made by a man in an equivalent position. Women of color are in an even worse position. The average earnings for African-American women were 68 percent of a male's earnings, while Latinos earn just 58 percent of a male's earnings. The Supreme Court ruled precedent and actually made it more difficult for women to bridge this gap. That is not what we want from the Supreme Court of the United States. That is not what we want as far as the activism of the Supreme Court is concerned.

When the Court turned the law completely on its head and circumvented congressional intent, Congress stepped in. I am proud to say that my senior Senator, Ms. MIKULSKI, introduced the Lilly Ledbetter Equal Pay Act, which I cosponsored. This legislation had 54 Senate cosponsors and passed the Senate by a vote of 61 to 36. The House of Representatives passed the bill by a vote of 255 to 177. On January 29, 2009, President Obama signed his first bill into law, the Lilly Ledbetter Equal Pay Act.

Under our system of checks and balances, each branch of government has a responsibility to keep the other in check. But we all should be on the side of the American people and workers. As the Judiciary Committee and the Senate convene next week to consider the nomination of Elena Kagan, we need to remember whose side we are on. We need to remember that big business can and will fend for itself, but it is individuals who look to the Court and to Congress to uphold the law and the protections it delivers.

Elena Kagan will be the fourth woman to serve on the Nation's highest Court, and this will be the first time in history we will have three women serving on the Court at the same time. Elena Kagan's record as Solicitor General and her broad legal background give me confidence that she under-

stands the appropriate role of the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, let me thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments about the Ledbetter decision.

What we are gathering on the floor today to discuss is whether American corporations are getting something more than a fair shake from Republican appointees on the Supreme Court, whether there is a bit of a systemic lean in favor of corporate interests on the part of those judges to the point where we really now need to call that out because it is beyond what statistics could possibly justify.

Certainly, the Ledbetter decision helps prove that point. We have at a company a woman who does not know she is being discriminated against; that for the same work as her male colleagues, she is being paid less. She has no way to know that. She does not know that is held against her rather than against the company which discriminated against her. The company was able to get off scot-free for all those months and years of discrimination before she found out what they were doing to her. The law did not require that particular answer. As the dissenting Justices pointed out, it was, in fact, the wrong answer. But it certainly served the interests of corporations across America to limit their liability when they discriminate against their employees.

The case I wish to talk about is the Exxon decision where the Supreme Court threw out a jury verdict after the Exxon Valdez oilspill, a jury verdict for punitive damages in the amount of \$5 billion. Sounds like a lot of money. It is a lot of money, but at the time, it was just 1 year of profits for Exxon.

Remember what they did in this case. They took this gigantic tanker, the Exxon Valdez, and they allowed the captain, a known alcoholic, to get on board drunk, to continue drinking heavily while on board, and to steer the Valdez aground in Prince William Sound, creating what was then, in 1989, the biggest oilspill in American history.

Prince William Sound is still recovering from that. Our colleagues from Alaska will tell us that one can still pick up rocks on the seashore and see the oil on the underside of the rocks. We all remember the images we first saw there—and are now seeing tragically echoed in the gulf—of birds, marine mammals covered in oil, poisoned by oil, dying on the shores and beaches or, if they can be found, being recovered by human volunteers who try to clean them up and save their lives. It was a very significant error by Exxon.

Everybody knows corporations are all about their bottom line. That is not me saying that; that is the law of cor-

porations. They actually have a duty, a legal duty to their shareholders to maximize their economic self-interest. It is what they do. It is why they were set up. It makes them a very important economic engine for society. But it does mean we have to control that motivation through the law. One of the ways we control that motivation through the law is with punitive damages—punitive damages assessed through the jury.

Let me say a quick word about the jury. The jury is an American institution of government. It is mentioned three times in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It is there for a reason. It is there for a very important reason. When de Tocqueville wrote "Democracy in America," he wrote about the jury that it is "an institution of the sovereignty of the people." He wrote that in a chapter whose heading was about protecting against the tyranny of the majority.

The Founding Fathers saw it that way because they saw corrupt colonial Governors. They saw legislatures that had panicked in that period between independence and the Constitution. Remember Thomas Jefferson talking about the Virginia Legislature, saying: We have turned out 1 tyrant, and now we have 270 tyrants—or whatever the number was—of the Virginia Assembly. They had to go back, and Madison had to rethink the balance of powers. They adopted what is now the American system of government. They had an experience that there needed to be a place where one could go to get a clean decision from a jury of one's peers. And it didn't matter who the Governor was, who the general assembly was, what the power structure was; there was some place in American Government where power did not count, where the powerful and the powerless had the same shot. That is why it is in the Constitution. That is why it is described as a mode of the sovereignty of the people.

When the Supreme Court takes away from the jury what seems to me to be a reasonable punitive damage assessment—if they had really been whacked for \$5 billion, who knows what message that might have sent through the oil industry. Conceivably, it might have prevented the oilspill in the gulf if it really rattled their cages enough. But, no, it interfered with the predictability corporations want. So the Supreme Court threw out the \$5 billion punitive damage assessment—just 1 year's profit for that company—and knocked it down 90 percent. They adopted a rule that it couldn't be more than one-to-one with damages. It is not in the Constitution. It is not statutory. They just decided that the interests of corporations in predictability were so important that paying back Alaskans for the damage done and putting a punitive assessment on top of it that would prevent this from happening again was less important. Predictability was more important; deterring misconduct

was less important. That is a value judgment. It is a value judgment these Justices bring to this Court.

Jeffrey Toobin is an authoritative writer about the Supreme Court. He studies it carefully. He tracks it carefully. Here is what he wrote last year about our Chief Justice:

In every major case since he became the nation's seventeenth Chief Justice, Roberts has sided with the prosecution over the defendant, the state over the condemned, the executive branch over the legislative, and the corporate defendant over the individual plaintiff. Even more than Scalia, who has embodied judicial conservatism during a generation of service on the Supreme Court, Roberts has served the interests and reflected the values of the contemporary Republican Party.

Remember, this is the one who, when being confirmed, said he was only going to call balls and strikes, as if that was even an apt metaphor. Well, it seems that the strike zone for individual plaintiffs is a lot smaller in this Court than the strike zone for the big corporations. I will pick out a part of the sentence:

In every major case since he became the Nation's seventeenth Chief Justice, Roberts has sided with the corporate defendant over the individual plaintiff.

That is as of May 25, 2009.

If you take a look at the decision that came down today in *Rent-A-Center v. Jackson*, an employee challenges a contract saying, Wait a minute. I should not have to be a party to that contract because the circumstances that caused me to enter into that contract were unconscionable. I should be protected from that contract because it was unconscionable to force me to sign it. The contract requires that you go and arbitrate instead of having access to—guess what—the jury.

The Supreme Court said the decision over whether it is unconscionable should go to the arbitrator. You wouldn't even be at the arbitrator if the contract weren't valid. It is topsyturvy logic. But, once again, it reflects the fact that the strike zone for corporations is a lot bigger with the Republican appointees of this Court than the strike zone for regular people.

I see Senator FRANKEN from Minnesota here waiting to speak, and I will yield the floor so he may do so.

As we face this question of Elena Kagan's nomination to the Supreme Court, we need to be clear that when the opponents talk about rule of law, when they talk about not having activist judges, when they talk about making sure corporations get a fair shake, there is actually a little bit more going on here. There is a little bit more going on here, and what is going on here is that over and over and over again the Republican appointees to the U.S. Supreme Court, when they have the chance, will rule in favor of the corporation and against the individual defendant. It is not surprising, since the Republicans are the party of the corporations, that the judges they appoint want to help the corporations. We

should not forget that fact as we look at a nominee who will hold the strike zone the same; who won't give that benefit any longer to the corporations that now, apparently, are beginning to feel they are entitled to at the U.S. Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I couldn't agree more with my colleague from Rhode Island and his eloquent statement, as well as my colleague from Maryland. I think we are going to be hearing a lot about this Roberts Court as we head into and during the Kagan hearings.

I rise today to talk about Americans' basic right to have their day in court. The Supreme Court has always been a towering institution, both physically and metaphorically. Until recently, as visitors walked up the steep steps of the Supreme Court's front doors, they entered underneath a mantle inscribed "Equal Justice Under Law." Now those bronze doors are closed to the public.

That may have been because of security concerns, but it is hard to imagine a better metaphor for what has been happening to our Court. The Roberts Court has consistently denied hard-working people their day in court, blocking them from their entrance to the courtroom.

Many of my colleagues remember me speaking on the Senate floor about Jamie Leigh Jones. As a 20-year-old, she went to Iraq as a contractor for KBR, then a Halliburton subsidiary. She complained about sexual harassment almost immediately. She was put in a barracks with 400 men and a handful of women. When she complained to KBR, they not only ignored her, they mocked her. They told her, Oh, go spend the day in the spa. Four days later, she was drugged and brutally gang raped by her coworkers and then locked in a shipping container with no contact with the outside world.

What happened to Jamie Leigh in Iraq was bad enough, but because of the Supreme Court's decision in *Circuit City Stores v. Adams*, KBR had been able to force Jamie to sign an employment contract that required her to arbitrate all job disputes rather than bringing them to a court of law. So Jamie, now a teacher in a Christian school in Texas, was forced to spend the next 4 years fighting to get her day in court after being gang raped on the job. She has had two reconstructive surgeries since this happened. Let me say this again. She was brutally gang raped on the job and still had to fight to get her day in court.

I am proud the Senate passed my amendment to give victims such as Jamie Leigh Jones a chance for justice and I was proud to see it signed into law. But, sadly, we are about to see a lot more Jamie Leighs denied their day in court. Just yesterday, as Senator WHITEHOUSE noted, the Court erected yet another hurdle for people seeking

justice in another 5-4 decision, this one called *Rent-A-Center v. Jackson*.

On one side of the courtroom in this case was *Rent-A-Center*, a corporation that runs over 3,000 furniture and electronics rent-to-own stores across North America, with 21,000 employees and hundreds of millions of dollars in annual profits. On the other side stood Antonio Jackson, an African-American account manager in Nevada who sought to bring a civil rights claim against his employer. Jackson claims that *Rent-A-Center* repeatedly passed him over for promotions and promoted non-African-American employees with less experience.

Although Jackson signed an employment contract agreeing to arbitrate all employment claims, he also knew the contract was unfair, so he challenged it in court. But yesterday the Supreme Court sided with *Rent-A-Center*, ruling that an arbitrator, not a court, should decide whether an arbitration clause is valid. Let me say that again. The arbitrator gets to decide whether an arbitration clause is valid. Let me repeat that. The arbitrator gets to decide whether the arbitration clause is valid. That is just one step away from letting the corporation itself decide whether a contract is fair.

In doing so, the Supreme Court made it even harder for ordinary people to protect their rights at work. Justice Stevens, not surprisingly, wrote the dissent. As he did in *Gross*, Stevens notes that the Supreme Court, yet again, decided this case along lines "neither briefed by the parties nor relied upon by the Court of Appeals." In other words, the Supreme Court went out of its way to close those bronze doors—and keep them closed. Clearly, this is a ruling that Congress needs to fix, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to do so.

Sometimes it is easy to forget that the Supreme Court matters to average people—to our neighbors and our kids. Some have tried to convince us that Supreme Court rulings only matter if you want to burn a flag or sell pornography or commit some horrendous crime. But as Jamie Leigh Jones and Antonio Jackson show us, the Supreme Court is about much more than that. It is about whether you have a right to a workplace where you won't get raped and whether you can defend those rights in court before a jury afterwards. It is about whether corporations will continue to have inordinate power to control your life with their armies of lawyers and their contracts filled with fine print. It is about whether they can force you to sign away your rights in an unfair employment contract so you never see the inside of a courtroom. It is, quite frankly, about the kind of society we want to live in.

Next week, the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the nomination of Elena Kagan to the U.S. Supreme Court. Those hearings provide a good opportunity for us to examine the legacy of the Roberts Court and talk

about what it would mean to have a Court that instead cares about hard-working Americans.

Solicitor General Kagan is nominated to fill the seat currently occupied by Justice Stevens who wrote the impassioned dissent in yesterday's *Rent-A-Center* ruling. I hope General Kagan has learned from Justice Stevens and takes his words to heart. I look forward to questioning her during these hearings. I want to make sure she understands that Supreme Court cases impact all of our lives—and that she will be the kind of Justice who believes in equal justice under the law.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, how much time do I have?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republicans have 60 minutes, and individual Senators are limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Would the Chair please let me know when 9 minutes have expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam President.

ENERGY DEBATE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, last week the *New York Times* ran a story, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

[From the *New York Times*, June 18, 2010]

NET BENEFITS OF BIOMASS POWER UNDER SCRUTINY

(By Tom Zeller, Jr.)

GREENFIELD, MA.—Matthew Wolfe, an energy developer with plans to turn tree branches and other woody debris into electric power, sees himself as a positive force in the effort to wean his state off of planet-warming fossil fuels.

"It's way better than coal," Mr. Wolfe said, "if you look at it over its life cycle."

Not everyone agrees, as evidenced by lawn signs in this northwestern Massachusetts town reading "Biomass? No Thanks."

In fact, power generated by burning wood, plants and other organic material, which makes up 50 percent of all renewable energy produced in the United States, according to federal statistics, is facing increased scrutiny and opposition.

That, critics say, is because it is not as climate-friendly as once thought, and the pollution it causes in the short run may outweigh its long-term benefits.

The opposition to biomass power threatens its viability as a renewable energy source when the country is looking to diversify its energy portfolio, urged on by President Obama in an address to the nation Tuesday. It also underscores the difficult and complex choices state and local governments face in pursuing clean-energy goals.

Biomass proponents say it is a simple and proved renewable technology based on natural cycles. They acknowledge that burning wood and other organic matter releases car-

bon dioxide into the atmosphere just as coal does, but point out that trees and plants also absorb the gas. If done carefully, and without overharvesting, they say, the damage to the climate can be offset.

But opponents say achieving that sort of balance is almost impossible, and carbon-absorbing forests will ultimately be destroyed to feed a voracious biomass industry fueled inappropriately by clean-energy subsidies. They also argue that, like any incinerating operation, biomass plants generate all sorts of other pollution, including particulate matter. State and federal regulators are now puzzling over these arguments.

Last month, in outlining its plans to regulate greenhouse gases, the Environmental Protection Agency declined to exempt emissions from "biogenic" sources like biomass power plants. That dismayed the biomass and forest products industries, which typically describe biomass as "carbon neutral."

The agency said more deliberation was needed.

Meanwhile, plans for several biomass plants around the country have been dropped because of stiff community opposition.

In March, a \$250 million biomass power project planned for Gretna, Fla., was abandoned after residents complained that it threatened air quality. Two planned plants in Indiana have faced similar grass-roots opposition.

In April, an association of family physicians in North Carolina told state regulators that biomass power plants there, like other plants and factories that pollute the air, could "increase the risk of premature death, asthma, chronic bronchitis and heart disease."

In Massachusetts, fierce opposition to a handful of projects in the western part of the state, including Mr. Wolfe's, prompted officials to order a moratorium on new permits last December, and to commission a scientific review of the environmental credentials of biomass power.

That study, released last week, concluded that, at least in Massachusetts, power plants using woody material as fuel would probably prove worse for the climate than existing coal plants over the next several decades. Plants that generate both heat and power, displacing not just coal but also oil and gas, could yield dividends faster, the report said. But in every case, the study found, much depends on what is burned, how it is burned, how forests are managed and how the industry is regulated.

Ian A. Bowles, the secretary of the Massachusetts Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, said that biomass power and sustainable forest management were not mutually exclusive. But he also said that the logical conclusion from the study was that biomass plants that generated electricity alone probably should not be eligible for incentives for renewable energy.

"That would represent a significant change in policy," Mr. Bowles said.

The biomass industry argues that studies like the one in Massachusetts do not make a clear distinction between wood harvested specifically for energy production and the more common, and desirable, practice of burning wood and plant scraps left from agriculture and logging operations.

The Biomass Power Association, a trade group based in Maine, said in a statement last week that it was "not aware of any facilities that use whole trees for energy."

During a recent visit to an old gravel pit outside of town where he hopes to build his 47-megawatt Pioneer Renewable Energy project, Mr. Wolfe said the plant would be capable of generating heat and power, and would use only woody residues as a feedstock. "It's really frustrating," he said.

"There's a tremendous deficit of trust that is really inhibiting things."

In the United States, biomass power plants burn a variety of feedstocks, including rice hulls in Louisiana and sugar cane residues, called bagasse, in parts of Florida and Hawaii. A vast majority, though, some 90 percent, use woody residue as a feedstock, according to the Biomass Power Association. About 75 percent of biomass electricity comes from the paper and pulp companies, which collect their residues and burn them to generate power for themselves.

But more than 80 operations in 20 states are grid-connected and generate power for sale to local utilities and distribution to residential and commercial customers, a \$1 billion industry, according to the association. The increasing availability of subsidies and tax incentives has put dozens of new projects in the development pipeline.

The problem with all this biomass, critics argue, is that wood can actually churn out more greenhouse gases than coal. New trees might well cancel that out, but they do not grow overnight. That means the low-carbon attributes of biomass are often realized too slowly to be particularly useful for combating climate change.

Supporters of the technology say those limitations can be overcome with tight regulation of what materials are burned and how they are harvested. "The key question is the rate of use," said Ben Larson of the Union of Concerned Scientists, an environmental group based in Cambridge, Mass., that supports the sensible use of biomass power. "We need to consider which sources are used, and how the land is taken care of over the long haul."

But critics maintain that "sustainable" biomass power is an oxymoron, and that nowhere near enough residual material exists to feed a large-scale industry. Plant owners, they say, will inevitably be forced to seek out less beneficial fuels, including whole trees harvested from tracts of land that never would have been logged otherwise. Those trees, critics say, would do far more to absorb planet-warming gases if they were simply let alone.

"The fact is, you might get six or seven megawatts of power from residues in Massachusetts," said Chris Matera, the founder of Massachusetts Forest Watch. "They're planning on building about 200 megawatts. So it's a red herring. It's not about burning waste wood. This is about burning trees."

Whether or not that is true, biomass power is also coming under attack simply for the ordinary air pollution it produces. Web sites like No Biomass Burn, based in the Pacific Northwest, liken biomass emissions to cigarette smoke. Duff Badgley, the coordinator of the site, says a proposed plant in Mason County, Washington, would "rain toxic pollutants" on residents there. And the American Lung Association has asked Congress to exclude subsidies for biomass from any new energy bill, citing potentially "severe impacts" on health.

Nathaniel Greene, the director of renewable energy policy for the Natural Resources Defense Council, said that while such concerns were not unfounded, air pollution could be controlled. "It involves technology that we're really good at," Mr. Greene said. For opponents like Mr. Matera, the tradeoffs are not worth it.

"We've got huge problems," Mr. Matera said. "And there's no easy answer. But biomass doesn't do it. It's a false solution that has enormous impacts."

Mr. Wolfe says that is shortsighted. Wind power and solar power are not ready to scale up technologically and economically, he said, particularly in this corner of Massachusetts. Biomass, by contrast, is proven and

available, and while it is far from perfect, he argued, it can play a small part in reducing reliance on fossil fuels.

"Is it carbon-neutral? Is it low-carbon? There's some variety of opinion," Mr. Wolfe said. "But that's missing the forest for the trees. The question I ask is, What's the alternative?"

Mr. ALEXANDER. The above-referenced article is entitled "Net Benefits of Biomass Power Under Scrutiny." It is about how the people of Massachusetts are starting to debate the idea that they are accomplishing anything by displacing coal with biomass to produce clean electricity. I am talking here about producing electricity, not biofuels which we use in our cars.

Biomass is essentially burning wood and other organic products in a sort of controlled bonfire to produce electricity. The argument for biomass goes like this: Wood is natural. Trees regrow. Burn them up today and more trees will grow tomorrow. Therefore, we won't run out of resources. Moreover, trees are carbon neutral. Burning wood may release carbon dioxide, but trees reabsorb carbon so we can benefit from this natural cycle by generating electricity. Therefore, we are not making climate problems any worse with biomass.

Indeed, biomass produces about 50 percent of our Nation's renewable electricity today, according to the New York Times, and by most of the definitions of renewable electricity that we use in proposals in the Senate. But we can't rely upon biomass to replace significant amounts of the fossil-based electricity we get today from coal. Biomass electricity has its place, and can be used to burn forest and other wood waste. In Tennessee we have a lot of pine trees. They need to be removed from the forest, and this is a good way to do that and make a little electricity. However, we cannot and we should not start cutting down and burning our forests to produce electricity. The loss of forest land is still one of the major ecological catastrophes in Africa, Asia, and South America. So are we, the most advanced country in the world, going to talk about going back to burning up our forests for energy? Many environmental advocates are now arguing that biomass should not even be considered to be "renewable" or "carbon neutral" because of the fact that burning wood releases greenhouse gases. While that is true, so does the natural process of decay, but the carbon is reabsorbed by the growth of new trees. Biomass can be, and should be, an important—albeit a small part—of our electricity portfolio by using excess forest material and industrial wood waste.

Unfortunately, the New York Times piece misses out on one of the most important concerns about biomass. Just like other renewable electricity sources, it cannot be the solution for our clean energy needs because of the problem of scale. We would have to continually forest an area 1½ times the

size of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park to replace the electricity created by two standard coal plants or one standard nuclear reactor. Wood has only half the energy density of coal. That means, if nothing else, we have to do twice as much work in hauling it around. There is a utility in Georgia that is using wood to replace coal in a 100-megawatt powerplant. This utility has trucks running in there day and night hauling wood to keep the plant running, and that is only 100 megawatts—about one-tenth the size of one nuclear reactor. For the southeastern United States to meet a 12-percent renewable electricity standard, as called for in the Waxman-Markey energy climate bill, by using biomass alone, we would have to cut down more trees than the entire U.S. paper industry uses each year.

I think it is worth taking note of all this as we move toward the idea that renewable resources are the answer to our energy problems.

Tomorrow, there will be a group of my colleagues going to the White House to discuss with the President the issue of how to proceed on clean energy. My fear is that we may all be asked to put our differences aside and settle this issue by pushing through a "renewable electricity standard" that says all we have to do is choose a number—17 percent by 2020 or 25 percent by 2030—and before you know it, we will have all the energy we need from wind, the Sun, and from the Earth running our highly advanced technological country.

In fact, more than half of the States already have adopted some version of these renewable electricity standards, but they haven't accomplished much. New Jersey wants to close down a nuclear reactor and replace it with an offshore wind farm. It will have to build 50-story wind turbines along its entire 125-mile coast, and it will still need to have the nuclear plant or a natural gas plant or coal plant or some other plant to provide electricity when the wind doesn't blow, which is most of the time.

To meet its requirement of 33 percent renewable electricity by 2020, California has put up wind farms, developed its abundant geothermal resources, and siphoned methane from almost every landfill in the State, and it still only gets 12 percent of its electricity from renewables.

Last year, a Wall Street Journal article cited the California State Energy Commission's warning that the renewable requirement could begin causing reliability problems—that means that when you turn your light switch on, the light might not go on—and increase electricity rates by 2011, which is next year. California State agencies were warning that simply increasing the renewable requirement from 20 percent to 33 percent could cost \$114 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the

Wall Street Journal article from July 3, 2009.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 3, 2009]

STATE'S RENEWABLE-ENERGY FOCUS RISKS
POWER SHORTAGES

(By Rebecca Smith)

California officials are beginning to worry that the state's focus on transitioning to renewable-energy sources could lead to power shortages in the near term.

The state has been so keen to develop renewables that relatively few conventional power generators, such as gas-fired plants, have been built lately. That risks a possible energy shortfall in certain places if the economy rebounds any time soon.

California's utilities are barreling ahead to try to meet a state mandate to garner 33% of their power from renewable sources by 2020, and some officials are concerned the effort might push up electricity prices and crimp supplies.

The state auditor warned this week that the electricity sector poses a "high risk" to the state economy. A staff report from the state energy commission also warns that California could find itself uncomfortably tight on power by 2011 if problems continue to pile up.

Utilities complain that the ambitious renewable-energy mandates, combined with tougher environmental regulations on conventional plants, are compromising their ability to deliver adequate power. "Conflicting state policies are a problem," said Stuart Hemphill, senior vice president of procurement at Southern California Edison, a unit of Edison International of Rosemead, Calif.

The stresses being felt in California could be a harbinger of problems to come in other states. The federal Waxman-Markey climate-change bill, passed by the House of Representatives on June 26, would require states to obtain about 15% of their electricity from renewable sources by 2020. Currently, about 4% of U.S. electricity comes from renewables, excluding hydropower.

California's 33% renewable-energy target is so ambitious that it is likely to miss the goal by five years or more, energy officials now concur.

State energy agencies recently concluded it could cost \$114 billion or more to meet the 33% mandate, more than double what it might have cost to achieve an earlier 20% requirement. Consumers will bear those costs, one way or another.

Agencies also identified problems with constructing sufficient transmission capacity to move renewable-based energy to cities.

Southern California Edison, which buys more renewable electricity than any other U.S. utility, has conducted seven solicitations for renewable-energy supplies since 2002 and inked 48 renewable energy contracts. Yet it is still only halfway toward its procurement goal. In 2008, 16% of its electricity was renewable in origin, but more than 60% of that came from geothermal plants—most of them built long before the current push for green power.

At the same time, new regulations are putting existing power plants under pressure. Last week, the state Water Resources Control Board issued a proposed policy that would clamp down on power plants that use something called "once-through cooling," which sucks water out of the ocean and rivers and discharges massive amounts of warmed water, harming some aquatic life.

The policy would end the practice at 19 plants that produce as much as 15% of the

state's electricity. That has the California Energy Commission worried electricity shortages might arise if older, marginal plants are shut down before there is replacement power available.

Building conventional power units is notoriously tough in Southern California because of air-quality problems and difficulty getting air-emissions credits, which are essentially rights to spew specified amounts of pollutants.

Early this year, the local air agency, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, imposed a moratorium on issuing air credits from its "bank" that affected 10 power plants that were under development.

"It's too early to tell how the pieces will fit together, but all the agencies and utilities are talking," said Edison's Mr. Hemphill. "Something has to be worked out."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, countries such as Denmark and Germany have done the same thing. Denmark, which is often cited for its wind power, has pushed its windmills up to 20 percent of its electrical capacity. That sounds good. Many people regard 20 percent as about the theoretical limit that wind power can supply to a total electric grid, even for a small country such as Denmark. Yet Denmark hasn't closed even one single coal plant as a result of all these new windmills. So it is still dependent on fossil fuels, and it has the most expensive electricity in Europe because of all of its renewable electricity. Meanwhile, France, which has gone to 80 percent nuclear power, has per capita carbon emissions 30 percent lower than those of Denmark, and it has so much cheap electricity that France is making \$3 billion a year exporting its electricity—mostly from nuclear power—to other countries.

So what are we getting into when we say we are going to solve our energy problems by passing a law telling ourselves we have to get 15, 17, or 20 percent of our electricity from renewable sources, very narrowly defined, by 2020?

First, it is important to point out that 80 percent of the facilities built to satisfy State renewable standards have been windmills. So a renewable electricity standard is really a national windmill policy instead of a national energy policy. Wind turbines are easy to put up, especially in remote areas. We have built 35,000 megawatts in total wind energy capacity, which represents an increase of more than 100 percent in the past 3 years. But most wind turbines only generate electricity about 33 percent of the time. That is how often the wind blows. The best wind farms—the ones on the eastern and west coast mountaintops or on the windy plains of the Dakotas—operate a little more than 40 percent of the time. That means our 35,000 megawatts in windmill capacity only generates about 10,000 megawatts at best—the equivalent of ten standard nuclear reactors.

Moreover, the wind doesn't always blow when it is needed and often blows when it is not needed. The strongest winds are at night or during the fall and spring, which are periods of low demand, while the periods with the least

wind are hot summer afternoons, when the electricity demand peaks. Wind and other renewables are not dependable in the terms that utilities need dependable electricity. The Tennessee Valley Authority, in the region where I live, says it can only count on the wind power it produces in Tennessee and even the wind power it buys from the Dakotas about 10 to 15 percent of the time when it is actually needed. That is also what has happened in Denmark. They have to give away almost half of their wind-generated electricity to Germany and Sweden at bargain prices because it comes at a time when it is not needed. The result has been that the Danes pay the highest electrical prices in Europe and still haven't achieved much reduction in carbon emissions.

Then there is the matter of subsidies. We hear a lot about oil subsidies in the Senate. I suggest that when we talk about big oil, we also talk about big wind. The U.S. taxpayers are already committed to spending \$29 billion over the next 10 years to subsidize the investors, corporations, and the banks that have financed the big wind turbines, and they only produce 1.8 percent of our electricity. If we went to 20 percent of our electricity from wind in the United States, that would be \$170 billion from American taxpayers.

Windmills are and can be said to be a big success compared to solar electricity at today's prices. California now has more solar electricity than any other State, and in March, the California Public Utilities Commission announced the opening of one of the largest photovoltaic stations in California—21 megawatts. Solar power makes more sense as a supplement to our power by offsetting some of our demand by placing solar panels on rooftops, not large-scale electricity plants. We all hope we can reduce the cost of solar power, which today costs four times as much as electricity produced from coal.

These are technologies we are counting on to solve our energy problems. I think we have to exercise some caution here. The assumption is that all we have to do is subsidize these technologies and get them up and running, and they will find their place in the market. That doesn't seem to be true. All of these technologies still have much to prove before they can shoulder a significant portion of our electricity. Biomass facilities need to be placed where they are most efficient and can be used as a supplement to low-cost reliable sources of electricity that already provide the large amounts of clean and reliable energy we need. We already have a proven technology in nuclear power that provides us with 20 percent of our electricity and 70 percent of our carbon-free electricity. We should focus on that.

As the President and our colleagues consider our clean energy future tomorrow and the things we agree on, we can agree to electrify half our cars and

trucks, and we can agree to build nuclear plants for carbon-free electricity. We can certainly agree on doubling energy research and development to bring down the cost of solar power by a factor of 4 and to create a 500-mile battery for electric cars.

But we need to remember, as we think about the next 10, 20, or 30 years, the United States is not a desert island. We use 25 percent of all the energy in the world to produce about 25 percent of all the money, which we distribute among ourselves, 5 percent of the people in the world. We ought to keep that high standard of living. We need to remember we are not a desert island. Someday, solar, wind, and the Earth may be an important supplement to our energy needs, but for today, we are not going to power the United States on electricity produced by a windmill, a controlled bonfire, and a few solar panels.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague commenting about energy. There is a bipartisan energy bill that I hope the President discusses tomorrow. It came out of the Energy Committee on a bipartisan vote. It doesn't increase cap and trade.

I certainly agree with my colleague on nuclear power, although we have some disagreement about wind. We have some nice places in Kansas for wind energy generation. I talked with the operators of the Smoky Hills Wind Farm last week. It operates between 40 and 45 percent of the time—the highest operating unit in the world. This company is a global wind-producing company. It is a very nice operation. I am not saying you can power it all off of wind. I am a nuclear supporter myself.

I also believe we have nice places to do wind power and a nice generation capacity that is complementary to the rest of the energy grid in the United States. Kansas is the second windiest State in the country. There are many times I have been in Kansas and have wondered, who else could be windier? We have a lot of consistent wind. There are places we can produce wind power on a very advantageous basis for the rest of the country. It is my hope that we can have those on a complementary basis but that we don't do a cap-and-trade system; rather, that we go with the bipartisan bill that passed the Energy Committee.

TRIBUTE TO MANUTE BOL

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the untimely passing of a giant—a giant in the hearts of the Sudanese people but also a literal giant. At 7 foot 7 inches, Manute Bol was a hero in his native home of Sudan, not for the fact alone that he was a pro basketball player in the United States or that he killed a lion with a spear while working as a cow

herder—no, Manute was a hero because of his advocacy for his fellow countrymen, a true humanitarian.

Manute began his NBA career in Washington in 1985, when he was drafted in the second round by the Washington Bullets. That year, Manute set the NBA rookie record with a total of 397 blocks. He continued to break shot-blocking records throughout his career and is the only player in NBA history to block more shots than points scored.

Manute coined the idiom or the phrase “my bad,” which quickly became the standard for those players owning up to their own errors on the court. “My bad.” To own up to one’s own mistakes is a true measure of one’s character, and it is no surprise that Manute leaves this legacy to the NBA.

Manute had a gentle nature and unmistakable humor. He was also a Christian, and his faith guided his advocacy for his fellow Sudanese brothers and sisters.

Manute was the son of a Dinka tribal chief and was given the name “Manute,” which means “special blessing.” He was, indeed, special, and what made him special was not his height but his heart. Manute often returned to Sudan to visit refugee camps, and he subsequently created the Ring True Foundation to assist those less fortunate than himself.

Manute moved to Olathe, KS, in 2007 to be closer to his family and continue his advocacy for Sudan as a spokesman for a Kansas-based nonprofit, Sudan Sunrise, which raises money to build schools and churches in Sudan. In 2006, Manute participated in the Sudan Freedom Work, a 3-week march from the U.N. building in New York to the U.S. Capitol in Washington, DC. He was admitted to the United States as a religious refugee, and in his final years in Kansas, Manute was working on a project to have Christians and Muslims work together to build a school in his hometown of Turlie, Sudan.

The world needs more Manute Bols—individuals who dedicate their lives to others. Our thoughts and prayers go out to Manute’s family, friends, and the people of Sudan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Dr. BARRASSO.

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

HEALTHCARE

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, as I understand it, it is about 90 days since the President signed the legislation known to some as ObamaCare and to others as the Medicare reform bill. But there have been some interesting developments in the intervening 90 days.

To quote the Speaker of the House, she said at the time, “We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what’s

in it.” We are finding out what is in it. Remarkable events have taken place, ranging from the implementation that means that more than half—51 percent—of all employees in 2013 will be in plans that aren’t grandfathered, despite the President’s comment that if you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. Nearly 7 in 10—69 percent employees, 80 percent of workers, and small businesses—would lose their current plan within 3 short years.

Mr. President, I would like for my friend, Dr. BARRASSO, to explain exactly how that happens. First, I would like to mention the issue du jour which, of course, is headlined on Politico this morning: “Medicare Tussle Stymies Hill. Rift between Pelosi and Reid stands in the way of funding compromise.”

I think it is important to recognize the reason we did not do the so-called doc fix is because the majority did not want to do the doc fix, which means not implementing the 21-percent cut in reimbursement for doctors who treat Medicare patients. The reason we did not was because they had cooked the books on the cost of ObamaCare.

The fact is, they kept counting into the cost—in order to keep their commitment that it would cost less than \$1 trillion—they kept counting in that there would be the 21-percent cut, a \$281 billion difference over 10 years.

The AMA and all of those people who signed up with this bill are now saying: Why are you not doing the doc fix? We did the doc fix on Friday, I believe. It is now in the House, and we will probably do the doc fix. But why the delay? The delay is simply because they did not want to. On the floor of this Senate, they did not want to do the doc fix because of the budgetary impact on how they were selling this proposal to the American people.

I ask my colleague, Dr. BARRASSO, to comment on that point and also what we are finding out as to how many Americans are actually going to lose the insurance policy they have. By the way, there is also an article this morning in USA TODAY entitled “Doctors limit new Medicare patients,” which was also predicted by some of us.

One thing my friends on the other side of the aisle might have forgotten is we cannot force doctors—they have not enacted a law yet that forces doctors to see Medicare patients. Therefore, a number of doctors are voting with their fee in the respect that they are not enrolling new Medicare patients they would treat.

I ask my colleague, Dr. BARRASSO, if he would comment on the doc fix and also maybe a better explanation than I have been able to give as to why so many people face the loss of their health insurance policy between now and 2013.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, my colleague from Arizona is absolutely right. There is a front-page story in USA TODAY. I was reading it as I was coming back from Wyoming yesterday.

In Wyoming over the weekend, I visited with a number of seniors on Medicare. I visited with some family physicians who take care of families in Wyoming. I practiced medicine for 25 years in Wyoming taking care of families and have lived under the Medicare rules and regulations.

Here it is: “Doctors limit new Medicare patients. Surveys point to payment concerns.” Doctors will tell you the biggest deadbeat when it comes to paying for health care is the Federal Government. It is Washington. More and more of my colleagues are opting out, as the Senator from Arizona said, from taking care of Medicare patients because what they get reimbursed is so limited that it does not keep up with the growing cost of liability insurance, the mandates on them in terms of the expenses of running a business, and they try to provide health care for all their employees.

Item after item, those costs go up. But what the government continues to pay for taking care of patients on Medicare, which is an expanding group of people, is shrinking.

Think about how Washington works and does not get it. Patients around the country on Medicare understand they are having a hard time finding a doctor. The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services was quoted in yesterday’s USA TODAY saying 97 percent of doctors accept Medicare. What is the reality? In North Carolina, since January 1, this article says 117 doctors have opted out of Medicare. In New York, since the beginning of the year, about 1,100 doctors have left Medicare. The president of the State of New York Medical Society is not taking new Medicare patients.

Mr. McCAIN. As well as the Mayo Clinic.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mayo Clinic said: We cannot afford to keep our doors open if we are taking Medicare patients. Specifically in Arizona, where they have a wonderful clinic, the best care in the world in many ways in the sense that early on in the health care debate, President Obama said we should use the Mayo Clinic as a model of what works, they do not want to take Medicare patients. They do not want to take Medicaid patients. But this health care law is cramming 16 million more Americans on to Medicaid. What the President is proposing for the American people is something less than what he has previously said is the best in care.

One of the other promises the President made is, if you like the health care you have, you can keep it. As a matter of fact, he gave a speech about a year ago at the American Medical Association meeting:

If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan. Period.

He went on to say:

No one will take it away. Period. No matter what. Period.

Now the White House has come out with new rules and regulations about

who really will be able to keep their health care plans. In the analysis that has come out from the administration, over 100 pages—I had it on the Senate floor last week—what they have shown is, over the next few years more and more Americans who have health care right now through their jobs that they like, they understand, they know how to use—and as a doctor I have worked with these patients. I know what it means to them to have a health care plan they are comfortable with, that they understand, that they use, that all of the work has been done with the doctor's office, hospital, and the patient, they understand the whole thing. To have that change is very distressing for people. It is unsettling. But yet this government report out from the administration says within the next couple of years, for people who have their insurance through small business plans, almost four out of five of them may lose the coverage they have.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask, is that because of a minor change in the insurance policy they now have that then forces them out of the policy, even though there is a minor change? Maybe Dr. BARRASSO can give us some of those examples of how minor they are, how they basically force them out of the policy they have into the "exchanges." Is that what happens?

Mr. BARRASSO. I agree with my colleague completely. What is happening is any sort of a change to a policy, whether they change the deductible, change the copay or any of those things, then that policy is disallowed as something you can keep.

Mr. MCCAIN. Some of those changes would simply be driven by pure economics and the escalating cost of health care on which clearly this legislation has no effect.

Mr. BARRASSO. Let's say you change your job. Let's say you move from one employment situation to another. You may change your insurance. Most people do because most people get their insurance through their work. We will have a situation where over the next couple of years, a promise that the President made to the American people—another promise that the President made to the American people will be broken.

We have not just seen it with regular insurance. My colleague from Arizona is in a State with many people who are seniors, a number of them on Medicare Advantage, a special program that speaks specifically to preventive care, coordinated care. People signed up for Medicare Advantage because there are advantages to being on Medicare Advantage. Yet this health care law that was crammed through this Senate is going to cut massively from Medicare Advantage.

One out of four people on Medicare is on Medicare Advantage, and they know why they have signed up for it. It is because of the advantages to them.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask one more question of my friend? This is kind of a

hometown issue, but 330,000 Arizona citizens who are enrolled in Medicare, who paid into Medicare all their working lives and have enrolled in this Medicare Advantage program which gives them choices are now going to have that severely impaired or eliminated. How does that happen? How is it when a program is offered to people who have paid into the system all their lives and they have chosen that Medicare Advantage program, and now it is going to be taken away from them. How does that work?

Mr. BARRASSO. It works when a Senate and a House of Representatives and a President think they know more than the American people. They say: We know what is best for you. We don't care what you think. That is what has happened.

Mr. MCCAIN. They have pledged basically to dismantle the Medicare Advantage program?

Mr. BARRASSO. Cut the funding so people on Medicare Advantage—who like it, who like the preventive medicine activities of it—are going to lose those opportunities.

Just since 2003, the number of seniors on Medicare Advantage grew from a little over 4 million to 11 million. That is because the seniors talk to one another, and they know what the best deal is for them, for their money, and for their health.

The seniors I know in Wyoming who signed up for this program said they want to make sure they have a number of these preventive services. Once they lose this, they are going to lose preventive services. They will have to pay more. The cost for people will go up, in spite of the promise made by the President that he was going to get down the cost of care.

Experts who have looked at this said: No, I am sorry, it is not going to work that way.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask the Senator one more question. Did he have a chance to examine the \$14 million—I believe it was \$14 million, \$18 million—

Mr. BARRASSO. The mailer.

Mr. MCCAIN. The mailer. I was trying to find a polite word—the mailer that was sent out to all Medicare enrollees and what conclusions he drew from that infomercial?

Mr. BARRASSO. To my colleague from Arizona, I did. I had a chance to look at that mailer sent out by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. I found it very misleading. Some have described it even as being a piece of propaganda.

The sad part is, it was paid for by the American taxpayers. The estimates for the cost have been \$16 to \$20 million of taxpayers' money to send out this piece of mail that essentially misleads, or tries to mislead—as my colleague from Arizona knows, the American people are too smart to be misled by this—it tries to mislead them into saying that this whole health care law is actually going to strengthen Medicare.

The seniors of this country clearly understand, as I know they do in Wyoming and Arizona, if you cut \$500 billion—a $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion—out of Medicare, not to save Medicare, not to save the program that is there for our seniors but to start a whole new government program, that is not going to improve Medicare. That is money seniors planned for, know it is in their system, and it is being taken from Medicare to start a whole new government program. It is not for them. It is not going to improve Medicare. It is not going to strengthen Medicare.

That is why from the beginning, to my colleague from Arizona, I said this bill, now the law for 90 days, is bad for patients, bad for payers—the American taxpayers who are going to end up stuck with the bill—and bad for the providers—the nurses and doctors who are trying to take care of these people.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Dr. BARRASSO for his leadership on this issue. Those who are interested in his Web site, which is titled "Second Opinion," might be interested in gaining more information from that Web site. My colleagues might be interested in that.

I thank Dr. BARRASSO for his leadership on this issue, for his in depth knowledge of it. I noted the luncheon we had with the President of the United States. I applaud Dr. BARRASSO's attempts to inform the President on this issue. I am not sure how receptive the audience was to it, but what he had to say made a lot of sense to me.

I know Dr. BARRASSO shares my view that we are not going to quit on this issue. We are not going to quit on this issue. It is going to be repealed and replaced because we are not going to do this to the American people.

Still the overwhelming majority of the American people disapprove of this proposal. As the Speaker of the House said, we have to pass the bill so we can find out what is in it. As they are finding out what is in it, more and more Americans dislike it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Arizona.

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

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, there has been a lot of conversation about the issue of illegal immigration and the results of different meetings. I

know my colleague from Arizona wishes to discuss that aspect of the issue, but I take to the floor with my friend and leader from Arizona to discuss the overall issue of immigration in light of a meeting and a trip he and I had to the border on Saturday, where we visited with ranchers, with citizens, with Border Patrol, and where we had a thorough trip throughout the area. So we come to the floor to share our conclusions and concerns with our colleagues.

Let me begin by saying that unfortunately—or fortunately—the head of the Customs and Border Protection recently said that parts of Arizona were like a “third country.” You know, in some respects—in some respects—he may have been correct. Let me quote him. This is David Aguilar, the Acting Deputy Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. He was quoted in the Arizona Republic as saying: the border is not a fence or a line in the dirt but a broadly complex corridor. It is . . . a third country that joins Mexico and the United States.

A third country that joins Mexico and the United States is obviously not as secure as the United States of America. If my colleagues will look at this map here and see this area here, this is the sign that is posted as far away as 50 miles from the Arizona-Mexico border.

Danger. Public Warning. Travel Not Recommended. Active Drug and Human Smuggling Area. Visitors May Encounter Armed Criminals and Smuggling Vehicles Traveling at High Rates of Speed. Stay Away From Trash, Clothing, Backpacks and Abandoned Vehicles. If You See Suspicious Activity, Do Not Confront. Move Away and Call 911. BLM Encourages Visitors to Use Public Lands North of Interstate 8.

North of Interstate 8 is the area north of this shaded area. In other words, visitors are encouraged not to go south of the interstate, which is a huge part of the State of Arizona. That is the posted sign put up by the Federal Government.

Then the Secretary of Homeland Security says, “The border is secure as ever.” If the border is as secure as ever, then you have to draw the conclusion that it isn’t secure, because otherwise you wouldn’t have to be posting signs such as this 50 miles north of the border, if the border was secure. Our whole point is that we need to get the border secure. We don’t see the necessity in the United States of America placing a sign such as that.

If we are doing fine on border security, why would it be necessary to put up a sign such as that all the way up to the interstate?

Here is another sign from our Park Service in the Coronado National Forest. This is in our national forest, from the Park Service.

Smuggling and/or Illegal Entry Is Common in This Area Due to the Proximity of the International Border.

If we had a secure border, why would we have to put up signs such as that? If we had made such great progress at that time the Secretary of Homeland

Security was trumpeting this, why in the world would we have to put up signs such as that? That is the question.

I will let my colleague discuss the results of our visit, but I can tell you that the citizens residing in the southern part of our State do not feel secure. When you have 241,000 illegal immigrants apprehended last year, that means that, depending on who you talk to, it is nearly a million people apprehended in just that part of the border. When you have 1.2 million pounds of marijuana intercepted in the Tucson sector, it is not a secure border. When you have the violence—the incredible violence—that continues to rise on the other side of the border, you know it is just a matter of time before it spills onto our side of the border.

Unfortunately, just south of the Arizona-Sonora border resides the most vicious of all the drug cartels—the Sinaloa cartel—headed by Juan “El Chapo” Guzman, who walked out of a Mexican prison a few years ago and, unfortunately, this cartel has corrupted officials at very high levels.

I report to my colleagues that the people living in the southern part of the State of Arizona do not feel secure. They see signs such as this one, which I mentioned; and they see the destruction of our wildlife preserves; they see the in-home invasions. And, yes, our Border Patrol and the men and women who are serving in it are doing a magnificent job. We are proud of the job they are doing. But they do not have the assets in order to complete the job of securing our border.

Senator KYL and I have a 10-point plan that, if implemented, will do the job.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the stories we heard were human tragedies, and statistics don’t tell the story adequately. Let me cite a few of the statistics and then ask my colleague to recount some of the heartrending stories that we heard from families in the area. When we talk about that, he can point to the extreme southeast corner of the State of Arizona, where we were, primarily, on Saturday, and where most of these folks live on ranches—places that used to be very safe. Today, these folks do not feel they can sleep at night or move around without carrying weapons. They need to travel in pairs. This is the area in which an extraordinarily difficult tragedy occurred when a long-time resident of the area was slain, it is believed by one of the drug cartels or other smugglers who frequent the area.

The human tragedy is the real heart of this, but let me cite some statistics, because when the Secretary of Homeland Security says we are secure as we have ever been, I think these statistics would at least belie part of that claim.

About 50 percent of all illegal immigrants enter through Arizona. In fact, they enter through essentially the eastern one-third of that particular map. The number of illegal immigrants

living in Arizona increased over the last decade about twice, up to over 600,000 people. It is estimated that about 12 percent of Arizona’s workers are illegal immigrants. According to the Maricopa County Attorney’s office, about 12 percent of the county’s population and about 22 percent of felony crimes committed are committed by illegal immigrants.

My colleague has talked frequently about the fact that Phoenix, AZ, our hometown, is the second largest kidnapping capital of the world, and the largest in the United States—second in the world only to Mexico City.

We can go on and on about the statistics. We have the highest rate of property crime among the 50 States in the last year for which the FBI reported the statistics in 2008. Our sheriffs and other law enforcement tell us that between 15 and 20 percent of the individuals apprehended at the border have criminal records or are wanted for crimes in the United States.

Phoenix is a primary originating city, where drugs are brought from the border and held in Phoenix and then transported to other cities. We lead the Nation in marijuana seizures—50 percent. Heroin is increasingly found in Arizona, and on and on and on.

The statistics don’t lie, of course. But the real tragedy is the human tragedy—the fear that people have; people who are fourth or fifth generation ranch families in the area; people in town, who are increasingly the subject of break-ins and property crimes and the like.

But none of this even begins to talk about what happens when the people who are smuggled into the country, are held in drop houses—generally in the Phoenix area—for transport either west to Los Angeles or anywhere east in the country. They are essentially victimized by the very people who smuggle them in and who demand ransom from their families in Mexico, El Salvador, or Guatemala, or wherever they might have come from. And until they pay that ransom, they are brutalized and assaulted and become victims of crime themselves. And, of course, they rarely report that crime.

So the human tragedy here is the real story. But it is important for us to at least cite the statistics and show our colleagues the signs that the U.S. Government itself feels constrained to post in order to warn people to stay out of an area which encompasses probably about 20 percent of the State of Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. And may I also make the comment that my colleague from Arizona points to about the terrible and unspeakable treatment that is inflicted upon these individuals who are brought in by human smugglers. Almost all are brought up by human smugglers. Where are the human rights advocates and activists? Shouldn’t they be standing up and saying: You have to have a secure border so that these unspeakable indignities—the

rape and ransom and all these things—will be stopped?

Secondly, I want to point out very quickly to my colleagues that in recent years, 80 percent of the wildfires in our Coronado National Forest have been human caused—75 percent of those are attributed to undocumented aliens who fail to properly extinguish fires started to signal for rides, cook food, or dry clothing. The Coronado National Forest now has to send armed officers to clear wildland fire areas and to provide security for firefighters. The Forest Service has reported accounts of armed smugglers walking through the middle of active firefighting operations. And now, in its fourth week today, as we speak, the human-caused Horseshoe fire is burning in the Chiricahua Mountains in the Coronado National Forest, 5 miles from the town of Portal, AZ. It is the site of very heavy drug trafficking and border-crossing activity.

With the few minutes we have remaining, I want to engage Senator KYL in a conversation about what we need to do and why we need to secure the border first. There has been a lot of publicity in the last 24 hours about a conversation that Senator KYL had with the President of the United States. I was not there, but I was there a few weeks ago when the President of the United States came and had lunch with Republican Senators and gave a list of the issues that he was concerned about, with immigration being one of the items he mentioned. So Senator KYL and I responded to the President of the United States.

It was made very clear to me in the conversation we had—and I am sure our 39 other colleagues who were there will recall—that the President basically conditioned his support for border security to overall comprehensive immigration reform. We went back and forth. I tried to explain to the President that we gave amnesty back in the 1980s. Somewhere around 3 million illegal immigrants were given amnesty, but the promise was that we would secure the border. Obviously, we didn't secure the border and we now have 12 million people in the country. As Senator KYL mentioned, there are some hundreds of thousands in the State of Arizona illegally.

So our point is that even if we went through comprehensive immigration reform, if we don't have a secure border, then some time from now we will have another group of illegal immigrants we will have to address, and so the issue argues for getting the border secured first. It can be done in 1 or 2 years. It isn't that expensive, when you look at the costs of a wildfire and all of the things, drugs and everything else associated with it, not to mention a violation of human rights.

There is a big stir about the conversation the President and Senator KYL had. It was clear to me in the conversation, in front of 39 Republican Senators, that the President of the United States said yes, he would secure

the border, but we had to have "comprehensive immigration reform." This is the difference between our position and that of the President. We say secure the border, have the Governors of the border States certify it is secure, and then we can certainly move on. But the American people have to have the assurance that we are not going to revisit this issue time after time. Every nation has the obligation to secure its borders.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, when Senator MCCAIN and I asked the acting head of the Border Patrol in the area where we were on Saturday, what do you need, he basically said, "More of everything." He talked about the need for 800 more Border Patrol agents. He talked about the need for more surveillance—something Senator MCCAIN has talked about a lot, surveillance to cover a very big area where you are probably never going to have enough personnel even if we bring in National Guard troops. He welcomed the National Guard troops to the area. He said we are going to have to have consequences for people crossing. I talked to him about Operation Streamline. In the Yuma sector of the border, which is on the western part of the Arizona border, the Yuma sector is very close to being operationally clear of illegal immigration issues because they have enough agents, they have enough fencing. By the way, he talked about the need to repair and replace a lot of the fencing in his sector. But they also have a policy that, instead of catch and release, where the people are simply put on a bus and sent back to Mexico, they actually are prosecuted and have to spend at least 2 weeks in jail.

That is a huge deterrent. Because if you are a criminal, obviously you don't want to be caught and go to jail, and if you are here to work and send money back to your family, you are obviously not doing that if you spend time in jail. He said there have to be consequences. We believe the expenditure of somewhere between \$1 billion and \$3 billion over the next couple of years could provide adequate resources—this is our 10-point plan—adequate personnel, the fencing that is required, the surveillance, the technology, and also the extra prosecutors, courtroom, and detention spaces that would be necessary to provide the deterrent or the consequences, as he put it. There is no doubt the border can be secured. What we need is the will to do it.

Mr. MCCAIN. What Senator KYL and I are trying to report to our colleagues is, No. 1, the border is not secure. The border is not secure. No. 2, it can be secure. How could someone claim our border is more secure than ever if the Federal Government has to put up that kind of warning to American citizens on American soil? If nothing would convince my colleagues that we need to do a lot more, it is the actions of the Federal Government. That is not a private landowner who put up that sign. That is the Bureau of Land Manage-

ment. So have the Department of Interior and other agencies.

The point is, we are trying to tell our colleagues it is not secure. We can secure it. Our citizens deserve that.

But the second point we want to make as forcefully as possible is: Let's get this border secure, which we can do, and then we can move forward with comprehensive immigration reform and work together with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But for us to go back to our constituents and to the American people, and say: Hey, we moved forward with this legislation, yet we still are having to put up signs such as this, that people should avoid being in an active drug and human smuggling area, in the United States of America, is not a convincing argument that they are "as secure" as ever.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I inquire how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 6 minutes 18 seconds.

Mr. KYL. That is the time remaining on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, what I wish to do is take about 3 more minutes and then my colleague can close.

As he said, if you need a different kind of reason to want to secure the border, then look at what is happening to our environment. I know the Presiding Officer—and his father before him—is keen on protecting the great national treasures of our country, our environment. Coming from adjoining States, we share a lot of the same kind of country. The area in the extreme southwestern part of his State and the extreme southeastern part of our State is known for some of the best birding in the world. The part of northern Mexico that borders our States provides a sanctuary for birds that are not found anywhere else in the world. This fire my colleague mentioned is burning right up to the creek which is one of the watersheds that represents the prime area for these birds to exist. Their habitat will be destroyed if we continue to have fires set by illegal immigrants in the area that destroy the habitat.

If you look at the environment of the area from the air, you see that there are thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of paths that are worn in parts of the desert that are basically off limits to American citizens and even to our law enforcement officials, but the smugglers use these trails and they deposit their trash. Everybody knows that once you have cut the desert, it takes hundreds—hundreds—of years for that desert to respond. That is just one reason.

Obviously the human tragedy is the one that is of most concern. If my colleagues would hear this one plaintive cry, we were told on numerous occasions on Saturday: Please, go back to Washington and tell your colleagues what it is like. Tell them how we are

suffering. Tell them what we have to go through just to live here. Can't our Government at least provide basic protection from crime? These are members of the family of Robert Krantz, who was brutally gunned down, and fellow ranchers in the area and other citizens who live in the small communities there. They believe their government has abandoned them. They look right into our eyes and say: What are you going to do about it?

The best we can do is to tell you the fear they have, the suffering they have gone through, the difficulty they have continuing to live in an area, as I said, in which some of their families have lived for four and five generations, to pass that message on to my colleagues and say: OK, if it is the environment you care about, there is a reason to be there; if it is crime, there is a huge reason to be there; if it is the cost to the Federal and State government, we need to get hold of this problem. But if you just care about the people who are there, we have an obligation as their representatives to assure their protection, and that is the message we are coming to the floor today to convey to our colleagues. Please listen, if not to us, to our constituents, and remember we all work for all of the people of the United States of America. We are all Senators. So every one of us here has an obligation to the folks—yes, in your State but also to the folks in our State—to at least provide them the basic protection and give them a sense that they do not live in a Third World country between the United States and Mexico; that they are American citizens deserving of the protection of the U.S. Government.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, there is no way I can elaborate on that very strong statement, so I yield the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

HOMELESS WOMEN VETERANS AND HOMELESS VETERANS WITH CHILDREN ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. 1237, the Homeless Veterans and Other Veterans Health Care Authorities Act of 2010.

I just had the opportunity to meet with an amazing woman named Natalie and her two children who are actually here in Washington right now.

Natalie is currently living in Issaquah in my home State of Washington—but she has been through some tough times over the past few years.

She is a Navy veteran and a single mom. But she became homeless in 2007 when she couldn't find work and had to move out of the house she was staying in.

Like most moms, Natalie wanted nothing more than to provide her two children with the stable and loving home every family deserves—so she fought to secure transitional housing, and she was very fortunate to find a

program called Hopelink in Washington State that gave her the support she needed to get back on her feet.

Natalie is now back in stable housing, taking care of her children, and advancing in her nursing career—and she is here in Washington, DC, today to help make sure no other family has to face the challenges she overcame so bravely.

Unfortunately, not every family gets the support that Natalie's did.

Homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children are two terribly vulnerable groups that are growing by the day.

Back in my home State of Washington, veterans service organizations and homeless providers have told me they are seeing more homeless veterans coming for help than ever before.

And, unfortunately, more and more of these veterans are women, have young children, or both.

In fact, female veterans are between two and four times as likely to be homeless than their civilian counterpart and they have unique needs and often require specialized services.

That is why I introduced the Homeless Women Veterans and Homeless Veterans with Children Act with Senator JACK REED and Senator TIM JOHNSON.

This legislation would take three big steps forward toward tackling the serious problems facing this vulnerable group.

First of all, it would make more front-line homeless service providers eligible to receive special needs grants.

This would help organizations in Washington State and across the country help support families like Natalie's.

It would also expand special needs grants to cover homeless male veterans with children, as well as the dependents of homeless veterans themselves.

And it would extend the Department of Labor's Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program to provide workforce training, job counseling, child care services and placement services to homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children.

It is so important that we not just provide immediate support—but that we also make sure our veterans have the resources and support they need to get back on their feet.

In addition to helping homeless veterans, S. 1237 also includes a number of other provisions aimed at supporting our nation's heroes.

It extends eligibility to health care for certain veterans with disabilities who served in the Persian Gulf war.

It would establish a medical center report card to allow veterans and their families access to transparent performance comparisons between VA facilities and between VA and non-VA sites.

And it would direct the VA to enable State veterans' homes to admit parents who had a child die while serving in the Armed Forces.

This is a very personal issue for me. Growing up, I saw firsthand the many ways military service can affect both veterans and their families.

My dad served in World War II and was among the first soldiers to land on Okinawa. He came home as a disabled veteran and was awarded the Purple Heart.

Like many soldiers of his generation, my father didn't talk about his experiences during the war. In fact, we only really learned about them by reading his journals after he passed away.

And I think that experience offers a larger lesson about veterans in general. They are reluctant to call attention to their service, and they are reluctant to ask for help.

That is why we have to publicly recognize their sacrifices and contributions.

It is up to us to make sure that they get the recognition they have earned.

And it is up to us to guarantee that they get the services and support they deserve.

This bill passed through the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee with strong bipartisan support, and that is how it should be, because supporting our veterans shouldn't be about politics—it should be about what kind of country we want the United States to be and about what our priorities are as a nation.

In his second inaugural address in 1865, President Lincoln said our Nation had an obligation to "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

Now, in 2010, I believe we not only need to care for him—we need to care for her and for his and her families and for every man and woman coming home after serving our country so bravely.

That is why I am proud to stand here today for Natalie, her children, and families just like hers across the country—to urge my colleagues to support S. 1237, the Homeless Veterans and Other Veterans Health Care Authorities Act of 2010.

I hope we can pass this expeditiously off the floor and get these services out to the men and women who have served us all so well.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

METRO SAFETY

Ms. MIKULSKI. What morning business this is. For those of us in the National Capital region, this is indeed a very solemn day. One year ago today, nine people died on Washington's

Metro. We were shocked and horrified when a red line Metro train struck another train. Eight passengers were killed, including one Marylander from Hyattsville. A train operator also died, and over 50 passengers were injured.

Those men and women died not as a result of a terrorist attack or of sabotage, these deaths happened because of Metro. It was a failure of management, it was a failure of technology, and it was a failure of the culture of safety at Metro.

Today our hearts go out to those families, those who lost loved ones and those who bear the permanent injuries of that fateful day. Since that day there have been 4 more deaths at Metro. This brings the total to 13 deaths in the last year. Let me repeat that—13 people died by Metro in the last 12 months.

After that June 22 crash 1 year ago, four Metro employees died on the job. One last August was a track repairman from Silver Spring who was hit by maintenance equipment. In September, another employee died. A communications technician was hit by a train. In January, two more Metro employees died. They were automatic train control technicians when they, too, were struck by a maintenance truck.

Well, in December, I said enough is enough. We always say a grateful nation will never forget after a terrible accident and we go to a memorial service. Well, for me what happened at Metro was not a memorial service, it was a call to service and for action by us. The best way we can honor the memory of those who died and those who were injured is to reform Metro.

I have called for that reform. In December during my testimony on rail safety legislation I introduced, I spoke out and said it was time for change at Metro. They needed new leadership. They needed a fresh approach. They needed to adopt a culture of safety that was unrelenting in terms of their focus on the details to protect the people who work on the Metro and the people who ride the Metro.

I was shocked to learn there are no Federal safety standards for any Metro. So whether we are talking about the National Capital region Metro or New York's subway system or California's subway system, there are no Federal safety standards.

That is why I worked with NTSB and the Federal Transit Administration to develop legislation that would do two things: give our own U.S. Department of Transportation the authority to establish and enforce Federal safety standards so we would have uniformity, conformity, and metrics for measuring safety on the Metro that we help fund. It also would require the U.S. Department of Transportation to implement the National Transportation Safety Board's recommendation list which includes requiring that railcars have crashworthy standards, emergency entry and evacuation standards, and regulations for train operator shifts.

We have safety standards for commercial airplanes. We have safety standards for buses that carry passengers. But we do not have safety standards for railcars that are used in subways. I think that is wrong.

What we also found was that safety inspectors that are part of a unique governing system were denied access to the Metro tracks. That is when we said we needed to find out what was going on. I called for a Federal audit of Metro, a Federal investigation of just what was going on there.

Thanks to Secretary LaHood and FTA leader Peter Rogoff, well known to those of us in the Senate, they did an outstanding audit which was indeed an outstanding service for us all. Their findings were shocking, hair-raising, and chilling. What did we find out?

Supervisors and train operators did not exactly know where Metro workers might be doing maintenance on the tracks until they actually saw them. Can you imagine? People driving the train had to see with their own eyes their workers to make sure they did not hit them.

There was no technological warning system. Operators weren't given the exact location of workers on the tracks. Information was generalized and workers were often in different locations than what operators were told. So the Metro itself was a lethal tool. Metro did not have the manpower to implement its own safety programs. It did not have a list of the top ten safety hazards and concerns. The list goes on and on about the audit.

I held a very vigorous oversight hearing, both Senator CARDIN and myself. We pushed Metro to come up with a checklist for change. We insisted that they come up with this checklist. I demanded that they give it to us right then and there.

They told me they were going to be working on it, and I said: Look, tell me what you are going to do. Well, listen to how ground shaking it was: Replace the oldest railcars on the fleet, develop a realtime automatic train control redundancy system, strengthen the expertise of the safety department, complete the roadway worker protection program, develop a training and certification program for bus and rail personnel, strengthen employee knowledge of rules and rules compliance, develop an accident and investigation database, create a strong internal training tracking database, fill vacancies in the safety department, and improve the agency's safety culture.

Imagine, it took a Senator holding a public hearing to get a must-do list on the safety list for change. This is unacceptable. We have to make sure we have Federal legislation. We need to do two things: We need to have Federal legislation, and we need to have Federal funding.

I want to make sure we save lives on the Metro. This is why I introduced safety reform legislation. I understand the Banking Committee is considering

it. Well, the Banking Committee needs to pass it, and the Banking Committee needs to pass it before the July 4 work break.

I know the Banking Committee has a lot on their plate. I know they are trying to regulate Wall Street. Good for them. Three cheers for them. We want that. But while we are making sure people do not lose their money on Wall Street, we have to make sure they do not lose their lives on Metro. So I ask our friends on the Banking Committee, could we kind of get this done this week, next week, before the July 4 break?

The bill does three things: It gives the Secretary of Transportation the authority to establish and enforce safety standards, including those standards for railcars and making sure there is an employee safety certification training program; it also requires oversight of the agencies monitoring safety to be independent; it funds federally approved State oversight agencies to make sure they have the rules of the road and the resources to do it because we regulate so much of this at the State level.

I am pretty worked up about this. I hope we move the bill. I hope we move it before the break.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEMIEUX. I ask unanimous consent to speak until the Senate goes into recess at 12:30.

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

OILSPILL RESPONSE

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. President, I come to the floor, as I did yesterday and last week, to talk about the economic and environmental disaster in the Gulf of Mexico and the lack of response by this government in dealing with the disaster. Everything that can be done should be done to stop this oil from coming on our beaches, from going into our coastal waterways, and from damaging our way of life on the gulf coast.

I specifically come to talk about what is happening to Florida. For the last week, I have been making statements and questioning why there are not more skimmers off the coast of Florida. I have been asking for more skimmers to be sent to the Gulf of Mexico for many weeks.

A week ago today, I met with the President, ADM Thad Allen, and other State and local officials in Pensacola to address many issues concerning the response to the oilspill. At that time, we were told there were 32 skimmers off the coast of Florida. Today, we are told there are 20. It makes no sense

that there are not more skimmers. Admiral Allen has told us there are 2,000 skimmers in the United States. We have heard reports of offers of foreign assistance of skimmers that are still under consideration or have been declined. Why are there not more skimmers in the Gulf of Mexico skimming

up the oil before it comes onshore? We can't even get a straight number as to how many skimmers are off the coast of Florida.

I have two documents, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. One is the Deepwater Horizon response of Monday, June 21, from

the State of Florida. The second is the National Incident Command response for June 21 from the Coast Guard.

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



Charlie Crist
Governor

David Halstead
State Coordinating Officer

Snapshot Report # 32
Monday, June 21, 2010 at 0900 hrs EDT

Mobile Unified Command Boom Operations:

Tier	Proposed/Need	Deployed	Staged	Shortage	Percent Under
1	303,600	194,700	57,350	51,550	16.98%
2	280,100	132,800	0	147,300	52.59%
Total	583,700	327,500	57,350	198,850	34.07%

County Contracted Boom Tier 3 Totals:

County	Deployed	Proposed	Staged
Escambia	20,000	N/A	0
Santa Rosa	12,100	N/A	0
Okaloosa	36,500	N/A	0
Walton	0	N/A	0
Bay	85,500	N/A	9,961
Gulf	0	N/A	11,700
Franklin	0	139,800	98,600
Wakulla	N/A	71,500	0
Jefferson	N/A	18,835	0
Taylor	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	154,100	230,135	120,261

Vessel Assets Deployed:

Type	Working	Staged	Ordered	Location Deployed
Off-Shore Skimmer	111 (9 are skimmers)		2	TF 701- Chandler Islands, Ala to 3NM off FLA TF 702- 20NM off FLA shore TF 703- Chandler Islands, Ala to 3NM off FLA TF 704- Chandler Islands, Ala to 3NM off FLA TF 705- 2-10NM off Panama City
Near Shore Skimmer	57 (11 are skimmers)	0		TF1- Destin - Panama City TF3- Pensacola-Destin TF4- Perdido Pass TF5- Petit Bois Island
Total	148	0	2	

Vessels of Opportunity (VOO):

VOO LSA	Off Shore Assets	Near Shore Assets	FLA Assets	Total VOO Assets	Deployed VOO Assets
Pensacola	75	40	80	195	381 74 using Sorbent, Snare & Containment
Destin	200	100	112	412	
Panama City	153	60	84	297	
Port St Joe	100	50	42	192	
Apalachicola	100	50	37	187	
Carabelle			12	12	
Total	628	300	367	1295	

Product Collection at Source:

06-20-10	Enterprise	Q4000	Total
Oil	14,574	8,716	23,290
Gas	32.5	15.8	48.3

BP Reported FLA Product and Trash Recovered:

Staging area	Daily Product	Cumulative Total
Pensacola	13.81	141.97 tons
Panama City	0	1.46 tons
Total	13.81	143.43 tons

Small Business Administration Loan Applications:

Issued	Accepted	Declined	Approved
382	95	17	5
Loan amount approved: \$255,000.00			

Clean-up Teams:

Team	Personnel	Staging Location
Emergency Response Team (USCG)	18	Pensacola
Emergency Response Team (USCG)	9	Panama City
Emergency Response Team (USCG)	9	Port St. Joe
Total	36	

(BP) Contractor Personnel	Personnel	Staging Location
Beach cleanups	1621	Pensacola, Panama City
Qualified Community Responders	313	Pensacola, Panama City
Gross Vessel Decon	27	Pensacola
	27	Panama City
Boom Operations	541	Pensacola, Panama City
Total	1955	

SCAT Teams:

Team ID	County
SCAT 4	Escambia
SCAT 6	Escambia
SCAT 7	Okaloosa
SCAT 9	Bay
SCAT 10	Walton

County EOC Activations:

County	Activation Level
Escambia	2
Santa Rosa	2
Okaloosa	2
Walton	2
Bay	2
Gulf	2
Franklin	2
Wakulla	2

Recon Teams:

County	ATVs Staged	ATVs Deployed
Escambia	0	7
Santa Rosa	0	1
Okaloosa	0	5
Walton	0	4
Bay (FWC)	0	5
Gulf (FWC)	0	2
Franklin	0	1
On Stand-By	7	0
Total	7	25

County or Agency	Resources Staged	Resources Deployed
Walton	0 - Command Bus	1 - Command Bus
FWC	0 - Boats	42 - Boats
FWC & CAP & USCG	1 - Planes	3 - Planes
FWC	0 - Helicopters	3 - Helicopter
FLNG	0 - Planes	2 - Planes
FLNG	0 - Helicopter	2 - Helicopter

State Personnel:

Area Of Operation	DEM	DEP	FWC	DOT	DMS	AWI	DOH	DOF	FLNG	CAP	SMT	IMT
SEOC	30	2	6	1	2		27	2	47	9		5
Mobile	7	4	3	1	1	1	1		2		7	6
Panhandle	3	40	85									
Peninsula	1											
Total	41	46	94	2	3	1	28	2	49	9	7	11

BP Claims:

BP Claims in Florida	Claims	Approx. Paid
Grand Total	*17,083*	\$15,221,896.03

One claimant has one claim which may have multiple events

Recovered Oiled Wildlife:

	Recovered alive*	Released	Died or euthanized	Still in Rehab	Recovered dead
6/20/10	1		0	28	0
Total #	58	2	27	28	38

*Does not include marine mammals or turtles. (2 live visibly oiled sea turtles have been rescued)
*Primarily northern gannets and brown pelicans, pied-billed grebes.
See the consolidated wildlife report updated by noon each day:
<http://www.deepwaterhorizonresponse.com/go/doctypr/2931/55963>



SHORE OPERATIONS - FLORIDA (Panhandle)

National Incident Command Daily Situation Update

Prepared By: CDR Becker / CDR Hein

0600 EDT 21 June - 0600 EDT 22 June 10

WX: Heat index 90.
SHORELINE: No new oiling in Pensacola. Beach cleaning conducted from Escambia to Okaloosa counties. Response personnel deployed to Walton County.
NEARSHORE: Task Force #1 relocated to respond to new reports of oil at Panama City. Task Force #3 continued day and night operations in Pensacola Bay. Task Force #4 is located south of Perdido Key conducting skimming operations. Night operations conducted for the protection of Destin Pass.
OFFSHORE: Task Force #702 operated 10 miles south of Perdido Pass. Task Force #703 continued skimming operations 12 miles south of Santa Rosa Island. Task Force #704 conducted skimming operations 25 miles south of Pensacola Pass. MIGHTY SERVANT III positioned 22 miles off Pensacola Pass for continued skimming operations.
BOOM: Continued deployment of phase 2 boom in Choctawhatchee Bay. 7,900' deployed last 24 hours.

State and Local Concerns

- Unified Incident Command and Liaison Officers working to address Local and State Officials' concerns about the plans for creating additional staging areas throughout the state as operations increase.
- Waste management is a growing problem.
- CNN attending Town Hall Meeting in Port St. Joe on June 22.
- FL Responders: 87%. (Out-of-State workers include those brought in possessing pollution response expertise and include adjacent state residents.)

WX: 60% chance of storms with highs around 90 degrees. Strong storms possible; producing heavy rain, frequent lightning, and strong gusty winds. Heat index 100-104.
OIL EXPECTED ASHORE: Coastal regions of Escambia, Bay, Wakulla, and Walton Counties.
OIL RESPONSE PRIORITIES: Continue ramping up beach cleanup operations in impacted areas across Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay counties. Continue night operations in Pensacola area. Shift boom priorities to protect marsh areas. Establishing deployment sites in eastern part of Area of Operations.

Shoreline Impacts (Verified by SCAT Assessments)

County	Current Shoreline Impacts (Miles)	Type of Impact	People Assigned	Estimated Clean Date (Range for County)	SCAT Assessed to Date
Escambia	35.7	Light	1,738	28-Jun	46.3
Santa Rosa	0.0		0		0.0
Okaloosa	2.7	Light	293	22-Jun	25.7
Walton	7.5	Light	349	22-Jun	24.6
Bay	7.9	Tarballs	400	22-Jun	42.5
Gulf	0.0		60		29.7
Franklin	0.0		39		0.0
Wakulla	0.0		3		0.0
Jefferson	0.0		0		0.0
Taylor	0.0		0		0.0
TOTAL	53.8		2,882		168.8

Claims Summary¹

# of Claims	\$ Disbursed	Denied	> 30 days	Centers	People
20,024	\$15,998,477	0	4,764	0	12
					141

Wildlife

Type	Collected Alive	Collected Dead	Total	Released
Birds	56	297	353	2
Sea Turtles	10	39	49	0
Mammals	3	1	4	1

Resources

Boom Stats ²	Personnel Totals ("Other" Category Includes Volunteers)	
Boom Required by Plan	Component	Number
Required (w/ wear & tear)	USCG	101
Boom Deployed	Nat'l Guard	83
Boom Staged	Contractors	7,231
Percent Complete	BP	7
Surplus/Shortfall	Other	66
Requested above Plan	Grand Total	7,488
Deployed above Plan	SCAT/RAT	9
Boom rcvd in last 24hrs		
Boom Ordered ³		

Equipment Assigned⁴

Platform	Number	Platform	Based (acft)	Spot/Recon (sorties)	Spray (sorties)	Logistics (sorties)
Vessels of Opportunity ⁵	387	Fixed Wing	2	8	0	1
Barges	21	Helo	3	16	0	0
Other Vessels	209					
Skimmers	108 ¹					

¹ Deepwater Integrated Services Team meeting with state officials to clarify processes and data access.
² Boom requirement reflects agreed upon changes to the Florida ACP.
³ 1M ft of boom on order for entire response and will be allocated as needed.
⁴ Flight sorties conducted throughout the entire gulf region. Near/Offshore skimmers are UAC assigned assets.
⁵ VOO is contracted and activated. It does not include 1,380 VOOs contracted and not activated.
 Qualified Community Responders: To date, 3,390 volunteers have been trained to assist in land-based clean-up efforts.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The first of these, the Deepwater Horizon response from Monday, June 21, says there are 20 skimmers off the coast of Florida. The second, from the National Incident Command, says there are 108 off the coast of Florida. Last week, we had this same discrepancy between these two reports. We questioned the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard told us the information contained in the national incident report was not, in fact, correct. We can't get a straight answer as to how many skimmers are currently off the coast of Florida, but it appears from the most reliable information—and I am still waiting for a straight answer—that there are only 20. One percent of the skimmers of the United States are off the coast of Florida, with the worst economic and environmental catastrophe looming off our shores. Huge swathes of water are washing up tar balls all the way from Pensacola Beach, now to Panama City, FL.

We received a briefing this morning from the Navy and the Coast Guard. I thank Secretary Mabus of the Navy, who provided RADM John Haley as well as a captain from the Coast Guard and other folks from the Navy to brief me on the status of what skimmers the Navy has and what they are doing in the gulf. We found out there are 23 naval skimmers, relatively small skimmers that can fit on the back of a truck or be put on a train or in an air-

plane. That is how they were transported to the gulf. They are welcome. We are happy they are there. There are 6 on the way and 29 skimmers total.

There are another 35 skimmers they would like to bring down, but they are under a category called legally constrained. What does that mean? That means that for some reason, the law is prohibiting the Navy and the Coast Guard from getting these skimmers here. Why hasn't this been waived? Why hasn't the President signed an Executive order? Where is the sense of urgency 62 days into this to get these skimmers to the gulf coast? We are going to look into what Federal law may be prohibiting and legally constraining the Navy and the Coast Guard from getting the skimmers. I will offer legislation, if need be, to waive that. I have already offered legislation to waive the Jones Act, which has been cited as a prohibition or perhaps an obstacle to bringing in skimmers from foreign countries.

Let's talk about that issue. We know there are 2,000 skimmers in the United States. Yet only 20 are off the coast of Florida, if that is the correct information. We know the Navy wants to bring an additional 35 skimmers, but they are legally constrained and we have not yet undone that or secured those skimmers, some 62 days after the oil started flowing.

Let's talk about foreign offers of assistance. There was a State Department report last week: 17 countries have made 21 offers of assistance. The Associated Press reported that they had not been responded to or had been declined. We have more current information than that. The State Department reports about 56 offers of assistance from 28 countries and international groups. Of the 56 offers of assistance, 5 have been accepted. That includes booms—people could use the Internet to send a message about navigation in the gulf—and skimmers or skimmer equipment. BP has accepted three offers of assistance, including booms and skimmers. Two offers are categorized as “unknown” or “declined.” Forty-six offers are currently under consideration, 62 days into this incident. Where is the urgency? Where is the alacrity of the response to get this done and get these skimmers in the gulf?

I have a document, “U.S. Department of State Chart on Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Response: International Offers of Assistance from Governments and International Bodies,” dated June 18, 2010. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

**U.S. Department of State Chart on Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Response:
International Offers of Assistance from Governments and International Bodies
June 18, 2010**

Country/Entity	Date of Offer	Resources Offered	Status of Offer	Reimbursement Required?
Belgium	15 June 2010	Skimmers	Under consideration	Yes
	14 June 2010	Fire Boom	Under consideration	
		Dispersant	Under consideration	
Canada		Containment and Fire Boom	Accepted 9,843 ft containment boom accepted June 4. Arrived on scene and now in the field for staging. *More boom offered 14 June, under consideration.	Yes
	30 April 2010	People/technical	Unknown. This offer was made directly from British Columbia to the Gulf Coast States.	
China via IMO	14 June 2010	Containment Boom	Under consideration.	Yes
	5 May 2010	People/technical – proposed solution	Proposed solution has been shown to engineers and technical experts, will be incorporated into response as needed.	Yes
European Maritime Safety Agency	13 May 2010	Containment Boom	Under consideration	Yes
		Skimmers	Under consideration. Only the USCG can accept this vessel offer.	
		Vessels		
		Sweeping arms	Under consideration	
France		Dispersant	Declined. These chemicals are not approved for use in the U.S.	Yes
	19 May 2010	Containment and Fire Boom	Under consideration. *More boom offered 14 June,	

**U.S. Department of State Chart on Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Response:
International Offers of Assistance from Governments and International Bodies
June 18, 2010**

					Under consideration.	
	18 May 2010	People/technical			Under consideration	
		Bird rehabilitation equipment			Under consideration	
Germany	12 May 2010	Containment and Fire Boom			Under consideration *More boom offered 15 June, under consideration.	Yes
		People/technical			Under consideration	
International Maritime Organization (IMO)	05 May 2010	People/technical			Accepted. Requested IMO to send communication to all 169 Member States and the maritime community generally regarding use of websites provided by the U.S. to assist in safe navigation in the Gulf of Mexico	n/a
Ireland	30 April 2010	General offer of assistance			Under consideration	Yes
Israel (via IMO)	14 June 2010	Containment Boom			Under consideration.	Yes
Italy	17 June 2010	Facilitation - private companies offering vessels, people/technical			Under consideration	
Japan	12 May 2010	Containment Boom			Under consideration	
Joint UNEP OCHA Environment Unit	29 April 2010	People/technical – technical and resource facilitation			Under consideration	Yes
Kenya (via IMO)	14 June 2010	Fire Boom			Under consideration.	Yes
Mexico	03 May 2010	Dispersant			Under consideration	Boom was offered gratis, other materials and equipment were purchased
		Containment Boom			BP purchased 13,780 feet of boom and two skimmers in early May. Arrived in field and now on scene.	
		Skimmers				
Monitoring and Information Center (EU)	30 Apr 2010	People/technical – coordination of offers among member states			Accepted	n/a

**U.S. Department of State Chart on Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Response:
International Offers of Assistance from Governments and International Bodies
June 18, 2010**

MIC							
Netherlands	30 April 2010	Vessel w/ storage capacity Skimmers	Under consideration	Yes			
			Accepted on May 23. BP purchased three rigid Koseq sweeping arms accepted May 23.				
			Under consideration				
Norway	30 April 2010	People/technical Dispersant Containment and Fire Boom Skimmers People/technical	Under consideration	Yes			
			Purchased by BP directly				
			Eight skimming systems accepted in early May				
			Under consideration				
Romania	30 April 2010	General offer of support	Under Consideration	Yes			
Russia	7 May 2010	Containment Boom Vessels Oil storage containers People/technical	Under consideration	Yes			
Republic of Korea	2 May 2010	Dispersant Containment Boom Skimmers People/technical	Under consideration	Yes			
			Under consideration				
			Under consideration				
			Under consideration				
			Under consideration				
Spain	30 April 2010	Containment and Fire Boom Sweeping arms Containment Boom Skimmers	Under consideration	Yes			
			*More boom offered 14 June, under consideration.				
			Under consideration				
			Under consideration				
Sweden	30 April 2010	Containment Boom Skimmers Vessels – 3 barges, 3 recovery boats	Under consideration	Yes			
			*More skimmers offered 15 June, under consideration.				
			Under consideration				

**U.S. Department of State Chart on Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Response:
International Offers of Assistance from Governments and International Bodies
June 18, 2010**

			People/technical		under consideration	
Tunisia (via IMO)	14 June 2010		Fire Boom		Under consideration	Yes
Qatar	14 June 2010		Boom		Under consideration	Yes
UAE	10 May 2010		Dispersant		Under consideration	Yes
			Containment Boom		Under consideration	
			Skimmers		Under consideration	
			People/technical		Under consideration	
United Kingdom	30 April 2010		Dispersant		Under consideration. Only 11 tons of chemicals offered are licensed for use in the U.S.	Yes
			Containment Boom		Under consideration	
Vietnam	05 May 2010		Vessel w/ sweeping arms		Under consideration	Yes

Mr. LEMIEUX. This document goes through the various offers of assistance and what is the current status of the response. So if we go to the European Maritime Safety Agency, skimmers, under consideration. May 13 is the date of the offer. As of last Friday, no response. Republic of Korea, skimmers, under consideration. May 2, the offer is made. As of last Friday, no response. Sweden, April 30, skimmers; more skimmers offered on June 15. Under consideration. No response. United Arab Emirates, skimmers, under consideration, offer made May 10. No response. Why are we not welcoming all of these offers of assistance to bring these skimmers and put them in the Gulf of Mexico to suck up the oil?

I wish to show an example of an offer of assistance made to the United States. The ship here is from a Dutch company called Dockwise. The name of this vessel is the *Swan*. Unlike some of the skimmers being used and deployed by the Navy, which can be put on a train car or flown on an airplane to the location—and although very welcome are relatively small—this is a massive ship that could take in 20,000 tons of oil or an oil-water mixture off of the water. They rig the ship with skimming equipment that hangs off the sides.

So on May 7, Dockwise offered the *Swan* to the United States. The offer went under consideration. After 48 days, the offer for this massive ship with 20,000 tons of skimming capacity is still under consideration. But the ship is not available anymore because Dockwise now has employed the ship for other purposes because the U.S. Government, from all the information we have, never got back to them. Here is a Dutch company offering us a massive ship to skim 20,000 tons of oil and water off the top of the Gulf of Mexico, and the U.S. Government doesn't return the phone call. They never hear whether we want the ship. People involved with the situation believe the *Swan* was rejected due to Jones Act considerations and that a similar vessel, the SEACorp vessel named the *Washington*, was chosen instead. The *Washington* is an American flag vessel. Its capacity is 1,000 tons, one-twentieth the capacity of the *Swan*. I am for America first, but why aren't we using both of them? There is plenty of oil to skim up. Use the American vessel, but don't fail to respond to the Dutch company that has this massive ship that has a 20,000-ton skimming capacity. Why would we not employ both?

I could not be more frustrated with the lack of response. I could not be more frustrated with the lack of a sense of urgency from this administration in getting this job done.

The people of the State of Florida are scared to death about the oilspill. When I was in Pensacola last week, I met a woman who works at the pier on Pensacola Beach. I asked her how things were going. She serves food at the pier.

She said: It has been very harrowing for us.

I asked her: Are people coming out?

She said: People from north Florida are coming to the beach. These are people who haven't been to the beach in a long time.

I said: Why are they coming?

She said: They are coming to see the beach one last time, as if they were going to visit a friend who was on his or her deathbed. They don't believe the beach will ever look the way they remember it looking.

Why we are not deploying every available national asset, military asset, and accepting every offer of assistance from foreign countries is beyond belief, and it is not acceptable. I will continue to meet with the Coast Guard and the Navy. When I see the President tomorrow at the White House, I will raise this issue with him. I will do everything I can to keep clamoring for this. It is not acceptable that in this, the greatest country in the world, our response would be this anemic.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:28 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5 p.m. with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAX

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the Reid-Baucus tax extenders bill before the Senate includes several provisions that, to my knowledge, have never been vetted by congressional tax writers either in the Senate Finance Committee or in the House Ways and Means Committee. As an accountant with practical expertise in tax matters, this disturbs me greatly. It should also disturb the small business owners because there is a provision in this bill that would slap them in the face with a 15-percent tax increase. I am talking about the provision that would apply a

15.3-percent self-employment tax to the distributions of certain subchapter S corporations. Those are the small business corporations. This self-employment tax would apply when 80 percent of the gross income of the small business is attributable to three or fewer professionals in a professional services corporation. We are talking about the smallest of the small businesses.

This is a \$9.1 billion hit on a small subset of small businesses engaged in a service trade. I wonder, the next time an offset is needed, will the Senate go after all the small businesses, changing the Tax Code this same way?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle call this a "loophole closer" or an "anti-fraud provision." I assure my colleagues this is neither. These words are convenient labels my colleagues use to defend tax-and-spend policies. The small business corporation provision is, however, a massive tax increase on small business.

This new payroll tax on nonwage income would hurt the ability of small businesses to reinvest and to create jobs. At nearly 10 percent unemployment, I don't think the Federal Government is in any position to pursue job-killing tax increases. Small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. It is imperative that we nurture their growth, not hinder it, so they can create jobs and get our economy back on track.

None of us is in favor of fraud, but that is not really what we are talking about.

If the IRS wants to improve compliance with the self-employment tax, they have the right tools. They just need to use them. For example, the IRS Revenue Ruling 74-44 that specifically addresses the tax treatment of dividends in lieu of compensation gives them all they need.

I ask unanimous consent to have the IRS revenue ruling printed in the RECORD following my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ENZI. I also have pages and pages of case law of which the IRS has successfully litigated the issue of dividends in lieu of compensation and the applicability of employment taxes.

Plus, Congress has codified the economic substance doctrine which says a transaction must have an economic purpose aside from the reduction of tax liability in order to be considered valid. In my opinion, this is the IRS's ace-in-the-hole card. The IRS can close any loophole—real or imagined—with the power of the new law.

Why can't the IRS do its job with the volumes of legislative regulatory and judicial tools it already has? For example, the IRS revenue ruling could be codified somehow, but then it wouldn't provide an offset for new programs, would it? Nor would it permit my colleagues across the aisle to reduce the tax on venture capitalists for their carried interest. I don't like the carried

interest provision, but to soften the impact of that policy on the backs of small businesses is just plain wrong.

Even the Government Accountability Office agrees the IRS should be doing more with what it has to crack down on fraud. In a 2009 report, the GAO stated: "IRS efforts to enforce the rules on paying adequate wage compensation to small business shareholders have been limited," and the IRS provides only "limited guidance in determining adequate compensation" guidelines for taxpayers.

A 2002 report by the Treasury's inspector general found that "IRS agents did not always address officer compensation, even when little or no compensation was paid."

Clearly, the IRS isn't doing its job. That is the loophole. The IRS can and should do more with what they already have.

As a former accountant, I find this small business corporation payroll tax totally unworkable. For example, the tax would apply when 80 percent or more of gross income of the S corporation is attributable to three or fewer shareholders in the S corporation. How are taxpayers supposed to track the attribution of gross income? Let me give an example.

My friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, has introduced S. 144 that would exempt cell phones from the recordkeeping requirements under the listed property rules. Why? Because the paperwork burden is too costly and time consuming for business. I think it is a good bill, and I am proud to be a cosponsor. In fact, the bill has 72 cosponsors. That is a supermajority of the Senate who agree it is a good bill. But if a supermajority of the Senate agrees the bookkeeping burden of parcelling out an itemized cell phone bill between business and personal use is too onerous, why would we think that itemizing the source of gross income across shareholders and employees in an S corporation would be any easier?

This new payroll tax on small business was written without any input from the tax-writing committees, and it shows. Although I am sure it was unintended, this new law has the potential to reduce Social Security benefits. Since the new payroll tax would reclassify income from certain small businesses as wage income, it could trigger the earnings test for folks receiving early retirement benefits from Social Security.

Even Senator BAUCUS admitted the payroll tax provision needs "modifications." I remember it well because he made this statement during a Treasury hearing a few weeks ago when I raised this issue as an onerous tax increase.

Not only is this a job-killing tax, but the manner in which it was concocted is appalling. The original tax extenders bill raised the taxes on Wall Street bankers, but when their lobbyists howled, lawmakers went looking someplace else—small businesses—for the revenue they needed. Small businesses

aren't as able to defend themselves when the tax man cometh, and in the end it results in a new tax that robs David to pay Goliath.

The outrageousness of this new tax led me and my colleague, Senator SNOWE from Maine, to file an amendment that would strike the S corporation payroll tax from the underlying tax extenders bill.

If my colleagues across the aisle seriously believe that noncompliance with the self-employment tax among S corporations is a problem, then the best, most workable solution is to codify the "reasonable compensation" standard into law. This S corporation "attribution of gross income" basis isn't workable. If you don't believe me, again, I refer you to the experts.

I have a letter I wish to submit for the RECORD. It is a letter from the AICPA, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. In the letter they say:

We are concerned that there may be unintended consequences that have not been fully aired and discussed. Accordingly, we strongly support the amendment being offered by Senators Snowe and Enzi which would strike Section 413.

I ask unanimous consent this letter be printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. ENZI. Again, this seemingly small provision in the tax extenders bill would have a \$9 billion impact, and that is just on a subset of S corporations, these small businesses.

This payroll tax provision ought to be stripped and sent back to the tax-writing committees where it can be addressed in the proper fashion. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Snowe-Enzi amendment in our efforts to remove this misguided, outrageous new tax. I think there is support on both sides of the aisle for doing that.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From taxanalysts]

FEDERAL RESEARCH LIBRARY: IRS REVENUE RULINGS

(Rev. Rul. 74-44; 1974-1 C.B. 287)

REV. RUL. 74-44

Advice has been requested whether, under the circumstances described below, an electing small business corporation incurred liability for the taxes imposed by the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and the Collection of Income Tax at Source on Wages (chapters 21, 23, and 24, respectively, subtitle C, Internal Revenue Code of 1954).

The corporation is a small business corporation with two shareholders, that has elected, pursuant to section 1371(a) of the Code, not to be subject to corporate income tax, but to have all its income taxed directly to its shareholders.

In 1972, the shareholders performed services for the corporation. However, to avoid the payment of Federal employment taxes, they drew no salary from the corporation but arranged for the corporation to pay them

"dividends" of 100x dollars, which is the amount they would have otherwise received as reasonable compensation for services performed.

Sections 3121(a) and 3306(b) of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, respectively, define the term "wages," with certain specific exceptions not material here, as "all remuneration for employment." Section 3401(a) of the Code, relating to the withholding of income tax, contains a similar definition.

In the instant case, the "dividends" paid to the shareholders in 1972 were in lieu of reasonable compensation for their services. Accordingly, the 100x dollars paid to each of the shareholders was reasonable compensation for services performed by him, rather than a distribution of the corporation's earnings and profits. Such compensation was "wages" and liability was incurred for the taxes imposed by the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and the Collection of Income Tax at Source on Wages.

EXHIBIT 2

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2010.

Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Finance,
Washington, DC.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4213, SECTION 413—EMPLOYMENT TAX TREATMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE BUSINESSES—S. AMENDMENT 4342

DEAR CHAIRMAN BAUCUS AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) opposes Section 413 of the American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act of 2010 which we believe threatens to result in a significant increase in taxes and complexity for S corporations and their shareholders, and for certain limited partners. Section 413 represents a major change in longstanding tax policy that has never been the subject of public hearings, thus, we are concerned that there may be unintended consequences that have not been fully aired and discussed. Accordingly, we strongly support the amendment being offered by Senators SNOWE and ENZI, S. Amendment 4342, which would strike Section 413. The proposed Section 413: Fails to take into account a fair and reasonable return on the human and investment capital of the owners; may reduce Social Security benefits for early retirees; may create unintended consequences to qualified and non-qualified retirement plans of owners that would now have both wages and self-employment income; and ignores the fact that the IRS currently has the appropriate enforcement tools it needs to re-characterize the distributions of S corporations as salary subject to employment taxes under FICA.

The AICPA would like to work with Congress and the IRS to address the best way to collect S corporation shareholders' and partners' fair share of employment/self-employment taxes. Such a provision should not be rushed through the legislative process without due process and deliberation. Thank you very much for taking time to consider our serious concerns and suggestions regarding Section 413 of this Act, and the much needed Snowe-Enzi amendment. If we can be of assistance, please contact Peter Kravitz, AICPA Director of Congressional & Political Affairs or Edward S. Karl, AICPA Vice President—Taxation.

Sincerely,

ALAN R. EINHORN,
Chair, Tax Executive Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

MONTANA WEATHER EMERGENCIES

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to share an incredible story about a community working together in the aftermath of a powerful storm in Billings, MT.

The storm that occurred on Father's Day spawned at least one tornado that touched down in Billings Heights, blowing apart several businesses and one of the city's most familiar buildings.

If my colleagues will take a look, this is a picture of what the inside of Rimrock Auto Arena looks like today. You can see the tornado ripped off the roof. Thousands and thousands of folks have memories from inside this building, from concerts to sporting events to graduations.

This picture was taken by Larry Mayer, a photographer for the Billings Gazette. Minutes after the tornado tore through, emergency responders, as my colleagues can see, arrived on the scene to keep folks away from the debris in the streets.

The wind twisted guardrails around light poles. The rain turned streets into rivers. Golf ball-sized hail came crashing down.

In our part of the country, we are used to extreme weather—subzero cold, drought, snow, and severe thunderstorms—but a tornado tearing through the middle of Montana's largest city is pretty darn rare. Through it all, only one minor injury was reported, and that was due to hail.

While we stand together in support of the folks who lost their businesses and their property last Sunday, we are grateful no one died. Nobody lost their home. I attribute that to a lot of luck and to quick action and smart decisions by emergency responders in Billings and in Yellowstone County.

Immediately after the clouds lifted, officers kept onlookers out of harm's way. More than a dozen National Guardsmen immediately secured the area, answering a late night call on Father's Day. News reporters went to work sharing the story. Unelected leaders, from councilmen to commissioners, buckled down to hammer out the next steps.

This week, people across the country opened their newspapers and turned on their TVs to see the incredible pictures from Billings, MT. They saw what happens when a community works together in the aftermath of a storm such as this. Everyone lived to share their story, and the community grew stronger because of it.

It is not just Billings that felt the force of wild weather this last week. Further north, the community of Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation is still trying to tally up the damage after a powerful rain storm last Thursday night. In the nearby Bear Paw Moun-

tains, there is word that water wiped out entire roads. Dozens of families in the area were forced out of their homes, and roads were destroyed.

Last week, a microburst destroyed a home near Froid, MT. Ramona Ryder, the woman who lived in a residence there, died in that storm.

Of course, Montana is a State where agriculture is not just the top industry, it is the livelihood of thousands of families. Weather takes its toll on crops and soil and irrigation. But over the past week, we have seen unusual weather across the Big Sky State, and we can expect more of it. From farmers to tribal communities to folks who live in Montana's biggest cities, it impacts everyone.

Now we begin the process of rebuilding the businesses and the familiar buildings destroyed by these storms.

I ask the Presiding Officer and all of my colleagues to stand with me to offer any support we can to the Billings and Rocky Boy's communities and to those folks up in the Bear Paw Mountains and especially to the folks who have to start from scratch because, as we know all too well in Montana, it takes working together to rebuild, and we will become stronger.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be divided equally between the Democrats and Republicans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAMAS IN GAZA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the current situation in the Gaza Strip.

In 2007, Hamas, a State Department-designated foreign terrorist organization, forcibly seized control of Gaza. Hamas continues to refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist and, in fact, has perpetrated terrorist attacks against Israel, launching countless rockets from Gaza into Israel.

Hamas calls for the elimination of Israel and Jews from Islamic holy lands. No Hamas leader has publicly expressed a willingness to disarm or to stop attacks on Israel and Israelis.

Israel, like every other country in the world, has a right to defend itself. With a sworn enemy on its border, Israel must protect her citizens against potential attacks every single day. Under the blockade, Israel directs ships to the port of Ashdod, where they are inspected for arms and other dangerous items before Israel allows off-loading

and assists in the delivery of legitimate goods to Gaza.

We know that Israel's concerns about arms transfers to Gaza are legitimate because both weapons and raw materials are smuggled into Gaza through tunnels from the Sinai in Egypt. Thousands of rockets and mortars have been fired from Gaza into Israel over the last decade.

Just last week, Israel has shown signs of compromise, announcing its intention to ease the blockade and allow more civilian goods and humanitarian aid to enter the Palestinian territory by land, including construction materials for civilian projects.

It is important to note that Hamas has made no such compromises and continues to maintain its vehement and violent stance against Israel's existence. Hamas also continues to endanger Gaza's civilian population by using hospitals, schools, mosques, and residential neighborhoods as command and operations centers or as weapons storage facilities.

While Hamas claims to be the popular representatives of the Palestinians in Gaza, their actions show that they hardly care for the plight of the average Gazan, as their rule deprives their own people of a transparent democracy, civil rights and freedom.

The best way to ameliorate that and to fix the broader current crisis and prevent future ones, of course, is Israeli-Palestinian peace and the creation of an independent Palestinian state that lives side-by-side with Israel, providing security and economic stability for the Palestinian and the Israeli people.

Today, it is Israel that continues to acknowledge the necessary framework for any peace agreement.

Israel has shown willingness for direct negotiations, but the Palestinians continue to insist on proximity talks. Israel is seeking to make peace with a partner whose parliament is controlled by Hamas, an organization still sworn to the destruction of Israel.

The only way to achieve peace is for Hamas to give up its militancy, forego terrorism and violence against innocent civilians, recognize Israel's right to exist and become a legitimate partner in Palestinian institutions. The more than 1 million Palestinians living in Gaza deserve that, the millions of Israelis who are subject to Hamas rockets and terror deserve that and frankly, the world deserves a stable, secure Middle East.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, before coming to Washington, I ran a shoestore in Gillette, WY. I stocked the shelves. I worked with customers to fit them with shoes. I ran the cash register. I placed the orders with suppliers. I swept the floors. I cleaned the toilets. I did the bookkeeping. In short, I was a one-man show. That is not quite accurate. My wife was there, and we had a couple of clerks. We all had the same responsibilities. My wife helped and actually grew the business while I was mayor of Gillette. We were a one-family show. I know firsthand the struggles and challenges America's small businesses face. We faced them on a daily basis. That is why I am so concerned about the recent action by the Obama administration.

Earlier this week, the administration published a 121-page interim final rule that will have a major negative impact on millions of small businesses across the country. This new rule, which implements just two pages of the health care law pertaining to grandfathered health plans, will increase the costs these businesses will pay for health insurance. This new rule violates the President's repeated promises from last year and the year before that under the new health care law, if you like what you have, you can keep it.

A chart on page 54 of the rule states that the Departments of Treasury, Labor, and Health and Human Services estimate that between 39 and 69 percent of the businesses will lose their grandfathered health plan status. This means these businesses' health plans will not be able to keep their current plans but, rather, will be required to comply with one of the expensive mandates included in the new law. This will, in turn, drive up the costs for these plans, making them even more unaffordable for small businesses. As a former small business owner, I understand how small businesses are struggling every day to find the resources to provide health insurance to their employees. Rather than making it easier for these businesses to continue to provide this coverage, the new regulation will actually make it more likely that employers will simply drop their health insurance coverage altogether.

I have a copy of the chart to show the folks back home. This chart shows the administration's own estimates, which indicate that only about half of Americans will be able to keep what they have. The picture, of course, is even worse for small businesses. Health and Human Services estimates that by 2013, up to 80 percent of small businesses could lose their grandfather status. The plans that do lose their grandfather status will have to abide by a whole slew of new Federal mandates, many of which have not even been written yet.

These are the low estimates of how many people are going to take it again. This is a midrange estimate by the administration and then a high estimate

for small employer plans, large employer plans, and all employer plans. The low-end estimate is 49 percent of them will have to go to something different if they cannot be grandfathered, the midrange estimate is 66 percent, while the high-end estimate is 80 percent of small employer plans will have to give up what they have right now because there are more federally mandated requirements they have not been meeting. In my home State, more than 50 percent of the people will have to change to a different insurance. I have to tell you, almost all of them who have insurance are happy with the insurance they have and really thought they could keep what they have if they like what they have. This chart shows that is not going to be the case.

During my days as a shoestore owner, I would not have had the luxury to read a 121-page interim final rule and try to determine what I needed to do to keep my health insurance plan. And if my small business was one of the 80 percent of small businesses that the administration thinks will lose their current status, then I would be forced to pay for a lot more coverage.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this new rule is it will actually make it harder for employers to make changes that could hold down the cost of their health care. Once this interim final rule becomes effective, which will be July 12 of this year—less than a month from now—large and small businesses will have few options for both keeping costs in check and maintaining their grandfather status. If an employer does any one of the following things to manage their costs, they lose the health care they have: If they eliminate any benefits, they lose their grandfather status. If they increase coinsurance rates, they lose their grandfather status. If they increase deductibles or out-of-pocket limits beyond minimum levels, they lose their grandfather status. If they increase copayments beyond minimum levels, they lose their grandfather status. If they decrease the employer share of the premium by more than 5 percent, they lose grandfather status. If they add an annual limit or decrease the lifetime or annual limit, they lose grandfather status. If they change their health insurance carrier, they lose their grandfather status.

Which is the most important one of those? The very last one. If they change their health insurance carrier, they lose their grandfather status. The only way you have a chance of holding those costs down is to bid out the insurance. It made a huge difference in our business. The first time we bid it out—and we were several years staying with the same company and having very huge increases—the first time we bid it out, we found out we could save very substantially, and so we bought the lower bid insurance.

Then the company we had been dealing with for several years came to us and said: Why did you change?

I said: We got a much lower price.

They said: Why didn't you come back to us and ask for a lower price?

I said: That is not the way we sell shoes; that is not the way you should sell insurance.

If they change their health insurance carrier, they will lose their grandfather status even if they provide the same things the other one was providing, which is what you do in a bid. In an attempt to keep health care costs down and avoid having to do the other things we mentioned, you would lose your grandfather status. In short, if employers do anything to help slow the growth of their health insurance costs, they will lose the limited protections against the expensive new mandates in the bill.

It is worth noting that 2 pages in the law—just 2 pages; it was 2,700 pages, but 2 pages are causing all this—that create the grandfathered plans are a blank slate. The law does not say anything about cost-sharing requirements or coinsurance rates.

The administration made up all these provisions and requirements. They did not have to write these rules that preclude half of Americans from keeping what they have. The reality is that the administration does not want you to keep what you have. They certainly like that talking point—it keeps people from getting very nervous—but they do not actually want you to keep what you have. They do not want grandfathered plans to exist. They want to force all Americans to buy only insurance plans that are defined and approved in Washington. It is just one more Washington takeover.

Throughout the rule, the administration makes the assumption that a large number of plans will place a high value on the remaining grandfathered plans. Why do they make this assumption? Because the administration recognizes that employers realize the mandates and burdens included in the health care bill will drive up premiums and drive up costs for large businesses, small businesses, and individuals. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that costs will increase 10 to 13 percent for Americans purchasing coverage on their own. That represents a \$2,100 increase for families purchasing coverage.

Page 112 of the rule lists the 13 new mandates included in the health care law that do not apply to grandfathered plans. However, based on the administration's own calculations, it looks as if 39 to 69 percent of employers will now be forced to comply with these new 13 mandates when they lose their grandfather status.

Even for the small number of plans that manage to keep their grandfather status, the reality is that the new law will still impose expensive new mandates that will increase their costs. The new health care law requires all plans, including grandfathered health plans, to comply with certain provisions in the new health care law. Page 112 of the interim final rule has five

sections detailing the new mandates that apply to grandfathered health plans for plan years beginning on or after September 23 this year. Another section becomes effective in 2014.

This bill was sold as letting people keep what they have, but the devil is always in the details. Do a little digging and it is clear that Americans will not be able to keep what they have.

I would like to read a paragraph from page 112 of the regulation. It says:

Provisions applicable to all grandfathered health plans. The provisions of Public Health Service Act section 2711 insofar as it relates to lifetime limits, and the provisions of Public Health Service Act—

And it lists several of them—

apply to grandfathered health plans for plan years on or after September 23, 2010. The provisions of Public Health Service Act section 2708 apply to grandfathered health plans for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2014.

This means health plans are now prohibited from having lifetime limits on the dollar value of benefits for any participant or beneficiary. Even though this section becomes effective after September 23 of this year, the Department has not issued any regulations or guidance telling plans how to implement this new requirement.

Section 2712 says that health plans shall not rescind such plan or coverage, except that this section shall not apply to a covered individual who has performed an act or practice that constitutes fraud or makes an intentional misrepresentation of material fact. We have not seen any guidance or regulations on that section either.

Section 2714 says that all kids under the age of 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance policy. This popular provision got a lot of attention from the media and the administration. Because of the popularity, this is one area where the administration has actually written an interim final rule which becomes effective July 12 this year even though the comments are not due until August 11 of this year. The final rule goes into effect July 12, but the comments are not due until August 11. In other words, they are not going to read any of the comments before that goes into effect.

In the rule, the administration includes an analysis saying that this provision is expected to increase premiums by 1 percent. That might not sound like a lot on its own, but remember that this is only one of the six provisions with which all health plans, even grandfathered plans, will be forced to comply. If each of the other five provisions also drives up premiums by similar amounts, that would equal a 6-percent increase on top of whatever increase results from normal medical inflation.

Section 2715 says all plans must give enrollees a government-approved summary of benefits and coverage explanation describing the benefits included in the plan.

The interesting thing about this section is that Secretary Sebelius has until next March to publish the standards the plans have to use when they draft these documents, but the plans have to give their enrollees the documents this September. How is that possible? If plans do not have these documents ready, they can be fined up to \$1,000 per enrollee. The standards will not be ready until next year, but the plans have to comply this year or face a \$1,000-per-enrollee fine. Common sense rode a horse right out of Washington. Maybe it was never here to begin with.

Section 2718 says all plans for big businesses have to spend at least 85 cents out of every premium dollar they get paying claims, and plans for small businesses and individuals have to spend at least 80 cents out of every premium dollar they get paying claims. This may sound like a good idea, but, again, the devil is in the details.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners is responsible for defining the terms used in these calculations and coming up with some recommendations about how to implement this section. The Secretary asked them to make these recommendations earlier than when the law says, but they have been having some difficulty. The difficulty is that States know that implementing these provisions will put health plans out of business—out of business. When the plans go out of business, the Americans enrolled in these plans will lose their coverage. This is a real problem with which the insurance commissioners are grappling. Unfortunately, Republicans warned our colleagues on the other side about this problem last December but we were ignored.

Section 2708 becomes effective in 2014 and says that plans cannot apply waiting periods that exceed 90 days. Again, this provision sounds like a great idea, and some States are already doing this, but this is one more thing that will drive up costs.

No single raindrop thinks it is responsible for the flood. These provisions may sound like good ideas when looked at by themselves but, when taken together, they drive up premiums to the point health care is unaffordable.

All these sections I have been talking about are mandates that apply to all plans, even grandfathered plans. There is a whole list of mandates that do not apply to grandfathered plans but apply to the new plans. Page 112 of the rule. I would refer you to that. I won't read it here. It has a lot of references again, and even though these sections aren't supposed to apply to grandfathered plans, as this rule points out, about half of all Americans will lose their grandfathered plan and they will be forced to buy a plan that includes the additional mandates.

But if you are enrolled in a union health plan, have no fear. Different rules apply to you. The administra-

tion's favorite special interest group gets special treatment under this rule. This is exactly the kind of political cynicism this administration campaigned against 2 years ago. Page 48 of the rule says:

This estimate does not take into account collectively bargained plans, which can change issuers during the period of collective bargaining agreement without loss of grandfather status.

Keep reading, because page 50 says:

For fully insured group health plans, another change that would require a plan to relinquish grandfather status is a change in issuer.

The bottom line: Big labor can change issuers, but small businesses cannot change issuers. The ability to change issuers is something that keeps insurance companies competing against each other to see who can offer the best product at the lowest price.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. ENZI. I thank my colleagues.

The ability to change issuers is something that keeps insurance companies competing against each other to see who can offer the best product at the lowest price. Take that competition away, and prices will go up—for everyone but union plans.

The simple truth is, because this new rule will drastically tie the hands of employers, few employers are expected to pursue grandfather status. That means more than half of Americans who like what they have won't be able to keep it. As I said earlier, this is not a mistake. This is exactly what the President and the majority controlling Congress want. They want all Americans to be forced to buy the kind of health insurance they think you should have. Never mind that you can't afford it. Never mind that employers faced with the choice of either paying for health insurance or paying a new penalty will be less likely to hire new workers and will probably even lay off workers. Simply put, this rule States: Washington knows best. Never mind the President promised Americans who like what they have can keep it. This new rule is pretty clear: If you like what you have, you can't keep it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we continue in morning business and that Senator BROWN of Ohio and myself be allowed to engage in a colloquy for the next 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTATE TAX

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Senator BROWN and I have come to the

floor today to talk about the estate tax. Today's discussion was prompted by a recent New York Times report that an estate of a Texas natural gas tycoon—Mr. Duncan of Houston—is worth \$9 billion. That is a nine with nine zeros after it. It is a big number, and it is going to go without tax to his heirs. Without any tax at all. It is hard to know what his tax planning is, but if the ordinary rates applied, the tax that would be paid by this estate might be as much as \$4 billion.

I think it is important to put that in counterpoint with the discussion we have been having on the floor today, where our friends on the other side of the aisle are blocking unemployment insurance for Americans who, through no fault of their own, lost their jobs. Because of what Wall Street did to wipe out the economy, they are out there on their own. They can't find work. In Rhode Island, we have 70,000 people unemployed in our small State. Our unemployment rate is 12.3 percent. And if you don't have unemployment insurance to protect you at a time such as that, you are stuck. Unemployment insurance goes to pay for food. It goes to pay for gas in the tank, to look for the next job. It goes to pay for shoes for your children. It goes to pay for clothing and rent and heat or electricity—all the basics. They are blocking it. They are blocking it because it is not paid for, as if this were not an emergency.

But they are perfectly happy—in fact, we haven't heard a peep out of them—with the Duncan estate going tax free to his heirs. I don't know how many of them there are, but if there are any less than nine, they all just became billionaires, tax free. That is the kind of contrast that is so remarkable about this building. We have an entire party that is dedicated to preventing working people, who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own as a result of this economic meltdown, from getting unemployment insurance, and that has actually already expired and we are trying to backfill it for that period, but they are completely satisfied with an oil tycoon worth \$9 billion having his estate go completely tax free to his heirs. That situation is happening because of a glitch in the Tax Code that we could not fix. It is part of the Bush tax cuts having run to their conclusion.

The estate tax goes back to 1789 in its first incarnation. It has been permanent since 1916. John D. Rockefeller paid estate taxes in 1937 when he died. He was taxed at a 70-percent rate. Today, we are having a debate about whether we should continue at a rate of only 45 percent. The Duncan estate went through at zero percent.

This cut, which took \$4 billion out of the economy to pay this one family with a tax-free estate, was pushed through by the Republicans using reconciliation. If you have been listening on the floor, you have heard a lot of critique about what a terrible proce-

sure reconciliation is when it is used to do anything to help regular Americans. But when it comes to cutting the estate tax so that the Duncan family can have a \$9 billion estate pass tax free, well, that is a perfectly fine use of reconciliation, according to our Republican friends.

At this point, at exemption levels of \$3.5 million per individual, \$7 million per couple, only a few thousand estates each year pay any estate tax at all. It is a tax that only hits not the rich but the superrich—the billionaires, such as the Duncan family. And while we are in this period of economic turmoil, while we are in this period where one party is trying to keep regular workers from getting access to unemployment insurance in the middle of this economic disaster, they are all for an unpaid-for zeroing out of the estate tax so that a \$9 billion estate passes completely tax free.

I think that is wrong. I think it shows priorities that are completely topsy-turvy—completely upside-down. I know that Senator BROWN wanted to join me, and I have gone on for a bit, so I will quiet down for a second so he can be heard. But it is immensely frustrating that that is the priority around here—let the working family lose the basic paycheck that holds the family together but have the billionaires get \$9 billion tax free.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his comments. As Senator WHITEHOUSE said, I have been in this body only since January of 2007. Most of the damage from the estate tax was done prior to our being here. But I spent some years before being elected to the Senate in the House of Representatives, and anytime we talked about the estate tax in the House, my Republican colleagues would use two terms. They would talk about the “politics of envy” and they would talk about “class warfare;” that Democrats were envious of success and that we were engaging in class warfare, wanting to turn one social class against another.

But the issue here isn't any strong desire for us to engage in retribution against anybody or any class envy. The situation is this, and let's start with this chart. This is a percentage of estates subject to tax. The estate tax, which the Republicans called the “death tax,” does not impact 99.3 percent of people who die in this country. Their families pay zero estate tax. It is only, as Senator WHITEHOUSE said, the absolute mega superrich. It is not people worth just a few million but only seven-tenths of 1 percent. That means it is 7 out of 1,000 who will pay any estate tax at all. And so this issue—not aimed at any one person—raises the question of: What do we do instead?

The Duncan family—this is Mr. DUNCAN, whom Senator WHITEHOUSE talked about—died with \$9 billion, and his family pays no estate tax whatsoever. Senator WHITEHOUSE pointed out that if there are fewer than nine members of

that family, they all woke up the next morning certainly very sad about their father or their uncle or their brother, but they also woke up as billionaires the next day, and our condolences go out to that family, but something has to replace this. If the estate tax was where it should have been, he would have—his family would have—paid the Federal Government \$3 billion or \$4 billion.

What does that mean? It means that during this previous Congress—the 2002 and 2003 Congresses—when the Bush administration ran up this huge debt, with tax cuts for the rich, not paid for but passed on to our children and grandchildren; the Iraq war, not paid for and passed on to our children and grandchildren; the giveaway to the drug and insurance companies in the name of Medicare privatization, passed on to our children and grandchildren; and the billions of dollars of cost that was added to the bill, this would have helped pay for some of that.

The \$3 billion or \$4 billion that would have been generated by the Duncan estate, where does that money come from? What do we replace that with? We either continue to tax middle-class people in this country too heavily or we cut programs for that \$3 billion or \$4 billion or we charge it to our grandchildren. And that is what has happened. As Senator WHITEHOUSE said, it is a contrast.

What do we do? We can do as Republicans do: We can deny unemployment compensation; deny COBRA insurance coverage, so people can keep their health insurance; deny Pell grants for people, which could be paid for by this \$3 billion or \$4 billion, or should we tax more people to pay for it? The Republicans didn't care about the budget deficit when it was the Iraq war. They didn't pay for the Iraq war. They didn't care about the budget deficit when it was the giveaway to the drug companies. Now all of a sudden they do.

This is the face of people we deal with. This is a General Motors auto worker in Lorain, OH, somewhere near Dayton, where this GM plant closed in the last 2 years. These workers waiting here are losing their unemployment insurance because people on the other side of the aisle—our Republican colleagues—simply would rather protect the super wealthiest people in our society—they would rather protect these seven-tenths or 7 out of every 1,000 people—and helping them pay no taxes, rather than taking care of this unemployed worker. That is the tragedy of the choices they have made.

Those contrasts, as Senator WHITEHOUSE said, are very clear, between Republicans wanting to protect the superrich and Democrats wanting to make sure that unemployment compensation is extended. These are human beings, each with a story. You can bet in this crowd some of these people not only lost their job but they lost their insurance, and some of them have lost their home as well. Because I

know what has happened in the Dayton area, in Miami Valley. Far too many people have lost their homes.

So while the Republicans are trying to protect the Duncan estate, with billions and billions of dollars in that estate, people such as Senator WHITEHOUSE, Majority Leader REID, who is on the floor, and Senator KAUFMAN want to see us take care of the unemployed workers, take care of those who have lost their insurance, take care of those who are faced with foreclosure because of the economic situation. As Senator WHITEHOUSE said, these people didn't choose to be in this situation.

As Warren Buffett said in 2007:

The average American went exactly nowhere on the economic scale in the last 20 years. They have been on a treadmill while the super rich have been on a space ship.

That is exactly what happened in this country. The wealthiest people have done better and better as their tax rate went down and down. Those middle-class kids who need Pell grants, the middle-class families who lost their jobs who are now on the unemployment line, those workers who have lost their insurance through no fault of their own—they lost their jobs—they are on this downward spiral which simply is not what our country stands for.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Two points I would like to make. One is echoing what Senator BROWN just said. We always hear about the debt and the pay-for from the other side when it is convenient, when they are trying to stop something the administration wants to do. When it helps regular people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, then it becomes an international incident if it is not paid for. But when an estate of \$9 billion is allowed to pass tax free because of a loophole, that is OK. That is a \$4 billion unpaid-for loss to the government, through its revenues. That is just fine.

There is a disconnect there. If you are serious about the deficit, you have to be serious about it when it is billionaires and not just serious about it when it is regular working families. There is a one-sidedness and a convenience for their concern about the deficit. When it is their President in the White House, Katey, bar the door. By my calculation they blew \$9 trillion during the Bush administration. Now they suddenly have had an epiphany about debt, but it does not quite extend to billionaires who are allowed to pass their estates through tax free. So much for the debt and the pay-for concern.

The other group they are very concerned about all the time is corporations. In this year, corporations have paid less tax compared to humans than ever before, since 1983, where there was a glitch and corporations paid less taxes relative to what humans pay than now. But other than that, 1 year, 1983, more than a quarter of a century ago, corporations are paying an all-time low in taxes compared to what humans pay.

If you go back, it is 70 years—1983 was just a 1-year exemption. So all this battle has driven down tax rates for corporations, tax rates for billionaires, and here we are with a deficit and they do not care about the billionaires.

I will close. I see the majority leader on the Senate floor, and I do not want to take time. I will close. America is a place of which we are very proud. It is the greatest country ever. It is a place where people can get fabulously rich. Not only is it a place where you can get fabulously rich, when you get fabulously rich you can still live a relatively normal life. You don't have to live like some Third World thug behind armed guards driving around in convoys with armed SUVs. You can live a normal life as a very rich person.

Everybody has a chance to get rich. Everybody has a chance to become a millionaire, a multimillionaire, a billionaire. But when they do, they have to pay their share.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Chair.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, the time for morning business has expired; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the understanding of my friends who have been here waiting to talk for several hours. I also announce that one of the reasons we are waiting is to determine if we need to have votes tonight. Everyone has been notified that we might have to have votes tonight, but it appears at this stage we will not. I have been in contact with the Republican leader and his staff. I think we will continue working through the night on some issues we are trying to deal with and worry about votes tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business for 2½ hours, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senator STABENOW and the Republican leader or his designee, with Senator STABENOW controlling the first 60 minutes and the Republican leader or designee controlling the next 60 minutes,

with Senator STABENOW controlling the final 15 minutes; further, that during the controlled period of time, Senators be permitted to enter into colloquies and at the end of the controlled time, the majority leader be recognized.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of nearly 1 million people who have lost their jobs, who have now also lost their unemployment insurance benefits because of the extensive obstacles and objections that have been put forward in the Senate to extending this important program. I wish I could say this was the first time that had happened. It seems that every time we come to the floor in the middle of these very difficult economic times, even though things are getting better, every time we come to the floor on behalf of people who are out of work, who want to work, who have worked their entire lives but at this point can't find a job, all we get are objections and delays and weeks and weeks and weeks of people sitting on pins and needles, holding their breath, trying to figure out what is going on: Will they have the ability to pay the rent, the mortgage, put food on the table, be able to care for their kids while they are looking for work. Here we are, right back in that very same position.

Right now we have over 15 million people who are on unemployment benefits. That doesn't count those who are working part-time jobs or have fallen off of the system completely because they haven't been able to find a job and have been out of work longer than the insurance benefits will allow. We have 15 million people looking for work, and we are told there are about 3.1 million jobs available. That means there are five people looking for every one job opening. This is not a situation of people not wanting to work. In the State of Michigan, we know how to work. We work hard. We make things. We grow things. We work hard. Yet through no fault of their own, people find themselves in a situation where we have seen an economic tsunami go through our country, lasting in Michigan longer than any other place across the country. And even as we climb our way out—and it is getting better; we have turned the corner; the economic recovery provisions we have put in place we

know are beginning to make a difference—we still are in a situation, even as we are moving and turning the corner, where there are five people out of work for every one job opening. That is real life for too many people I represent.

We have had legislation in front of us. We have been spending weeks now on a jobs bill, a bill to create jobs, to invest in innovation, to help small businesses, to help manufacturers get the capital they need, but to also, in that bill, help people who don't have a job while they are waiting for all this to take effect, for all of this to work, people who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, who find themselves in a situation where they are desperate and depending on us to understand what is happening to too many working families, middle-class families, people who never in their wildest dreams thought they would find themselves in this situation but here they are. They want to know that we get it, that we understand what is happening in their lives and that we are not going to play politics or use people who are out of work somehow as pawns in a political chess game that is going on here in the Senate.

The normal unemployment insurance benefits only last for 26 weeks, but thanks to the recovery act, we have been able to bridge the gap for millions of Americans by extending it. That is very important. But we are at a point now where the recovery has not fully been actualized. People are still in a situation where they need to have help on a temporary basis while they are looking for work.

Since this recession started in 2007, there are now 8 million fewer jobs in America, too many of those in manufacturing. I could spend hours talking about fair trade and what we need to do to make sure markets are open abroad for our products to be sold so we are exporting our products, not our jobs, and how we can have a fair trade policy. I am pleased that in the recovery act we have focused on making things again in America, battery manufacturing facilities and the advanced manufacturing tax credit, both of which I was pleased to be a part of leading to create jobs.

We are creating jobs. But it takes time to turn this around. We find ourselves in a situation where nearly 1 million people who have lost their jobs are going to lose their unemployment benefits because of what has been going on here. They don't have time to wait and hold their breath as we continue to work to turn this economy around. These are families trying to make ends meet. They are applying for jobs every day. They are putting in applications. I get e-mail after e-mail—and I will share some this evening—from people who are trying to find work, putting in applications, going back to school. We have all said to them: Maybe you need to go back to school. They have gone back to school to get retraining, but

they have to keep a roof over their heads while they are doing that. They have to keep food on the table, keep the electricity on for their families while they are doing that. That is what unemployment benefits allow them to do.

The last time Congress cut off emergency unemployment insurance benefits was after the terrible recession in 1985, when the employment rate was 7.3 percent. Today, 33 States and the District of Columbia now have unemployment that is higher than 7.3 percent. These are red States, blue States, Republicans who are out of work, Democrats who are out of work. It doesn't matter what party one is; if they lose their job, it is an emergency for the family. They expect the Senate to understand that and to act. In 16 of those States, unemployment is still higher than 10 percent. Many States haven't seen this many people out of work since the Great Depression.

When we look at the States where there are more than 1 in 10 people who have lost jobs through no fault of their own, we see a picture that is, in fact, America. I know one of those great States is the State of my colleague who is from Rhode Island. He has come to the floor on numerous occasions to speak about the people of Rhode Island, just as I have come on numerous occasions to speak about the people in the great State of Michigan. I am pleased the Senator from Rhode Island is here.

I yield the Senator up to 10 minutes to speak at this time.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to be here with Senator STABENOW. I know from the experience of Rhode Island how difficult things are in Michigan. I have seen over and over the passion and energy with which she comes to the floor to argue on behalf of the people of Michigan. I join her this evening on behalf of the people of Rhode Island.

The unemployment insurance obstruction we are getting is simply cruel under the circumstances in Rhode Island. I know my friends on the Republican side like to argue that if we cut off people's unemployment insurance, that will motivate them to get back out there in the workforce where they should be, as if they were just idling around, as if they were not out looking for work.

In Rhode Island, we are at 12.3 percent unemployment. We have been the third or fourth highest unemployment State in the country for months and months now. This is not some sudden glitch in the accounting. This is a persistent economic nightmare in Rhode Island. We have been 15 straight months—more than a year—with double-digit unemployment. If we go back to 8 percent unemployment, we go back 22 months, nearly 2 years. This is a persistent problem. The notion that we will cut off somebody's unemployment insurance and have them go out and find a job is plain nuts in a State such as Rhode Island or a State such as

Michigan, because the job just isn't there to be found.

As Senator STABENOW said about Michigan, her folks are hard workers. Rhode Islanders are hard workers. We have a tradition of working hard in a whole variety of industries. There aren't a lot of people lying around enjoying the luxury of unemployment insurance payments. They want to be out getting work. Unemployment insurance payments let them search for work and feed their family, pay the rent, put gas in the car, buy shoes for the kids, put food on the table, all in the meantime. Our colleagues want to take that away.

Let's scroll back for a minute to why we are here in the first place. We are here in the first place because the people who were supposed to be regulating Wall Street were asleep at the switch. The people who were supposed to be regulating Wall Street were asleep at the switch because they were told to be asleep at the switch. It is the Republican theory of governance that regulation should have a light hand and that corporations know better and should really run the show. So the folks who were supposed to be regulating Wall Street were the captives of the big Wall Street financiers. They took all the breaks off. They let them run with crazy leverage ratios, new instruments such as derivatives and collateralized debt obligations, and they went right to sleep, the way they were supposed to. The result was a catastrophic Wall Street meltdown that could have been prevented if there had been a different theory of governance and not the theory of governance that we let the corporations run the show and that is the best thing for Americans.

But that is what happened. They let the corporations run the show. That theory of governance prevailed. There was a massive meltdown. That massive meltdown sent a tsunami of misery across this country into places miles from Wall Street, completely different from Wall Street, including States such as Rhode Island and Michigan. We have 71,000 people unemployed in my little State of Rhode Island. Those people need to get unemployment insurance while the economy recovers. We are not a 4-percent unemployment State or a 6-percent unemployment State. We are not even an 8-percent unemployment State. We are over 12 percent unemployment. There is not a job for these people. To take away the bread and butter, to take basic sustenance off the table is, frankly, unfair. We have even tried to get an extra 25 bucks added to the benefit. Republicans have objected to that.

Mr. President, 25 bucks does not seem like much, and indeed it is not much, but if you are just getting by with unemployment insurance because your State has been in recession for so long, as ours has, that extra 25 bucks is a meal the family does not have to skip; that is a trip to the doctor they do not have to duck because they cannot afford the copay; it is an important

little thing; and it is just symbolic of the attitude on the other side of the aisle that: Sorry, not interested. Tough bounce. We don't care.

We were on the floor earlier talking about how when it is a \$9 billion family and there is no estate tax on that because of the way the Republicans have driven this and \$4 billion in revenue is lost to the government as a result of this colossal estate being exempted from the estate tax, that is OK. But when it is 25 bucks for a working family to buy a pair of shoes for their daughter, no, that is too much. Now we have to get serious about the recession. Now we have to get serious about the debt. But when it is a \$9 billion family with a huge estate, no, different rules apply when it is very rich people.

Well, I am here for people like Dan of East Greenwich. He worked in sales. He has been unemployed since April 2009. His wife is disabled. He is out looking for work, but the jobs are not there, and he has not been able to find one. If he loses his unemployment insurance, Dan has let us know he will be evicted from their apartment. He and his disabled wife will be evicted from their apartment. That should not be happening. That is just bluntly wrong.

Bill of North Kingstown contacted me. He is 56 years old. He has been unemployed since January of 2009. He used to work in engineering. He has now been faced twice with eviction when the unemployment insurance has lapsed, and he is looking at eviction again. It is staring him in the face if we do not act. He has received only \$200 over the last 3-week period as his benefits have expired, and he has lost his COBRA benefits, but he needs medication. So he is stuck because we have not acted.

Nancy, from Portsmouth, is 59 years old. She has been unemployed for 21 months. She has a bachelor's degree. She has a whole variety of industry certifications. She has a background in sales and marketing. She is a talented woman who has worked all her life. Until she got swamped by the tsunami of misery that originated on Wall Street and has washed through all of our States, she was fine. But now, after 15 years of working in insurance, she cannot find a job, and she will soon lose her unemployment insurance benefits as the Republicans continue to block the extension.

So I would urge them to reconsider. I understand the point about the debt and the deficit and the spending. But, to me, that does not have an enormous amount of credibility because when President Clinton left office, he left an annual surplus and he left a budget trajectory that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said was going to have us be a debt-free nation by 2008, I believe it was—a debt-free nation.

On the day George Bush was sworn into office, we were on a trajectory to be a debt-free nation during his term. There was even discussion in economic texts about whether that was really a

good idea. He solved that; at the end of his term, we were \$9 trillion in debt. We were not debt free. He was \$9 trillion in debt, and we had this economic meltdown that required government intervention to protect people, and that made it even bigger. But we would have none of this if it had not been for the Republican debt orgy they went through—fair-weather debt, I would add, an orgy of fair-weather debt—and then a huge hole because of their theory of governance and their theory of economics that has had to be filled in because of that tsunami of misery. That is why we are here. So it is a little late in the game and a little disingenuous to hear lectures from that side of the aisle about economic sobriety after that wild spending through those Bush years and the cleanup we have had to do since then. And these guys who are out of work and who need the help—folks such as Ron, Bill, Dan, and Nancy—should not be paying the price. We should take care of the people who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I thank Senator STABENOW.

I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE very much for his passion, his leadership.

Just to emphasize what the Senator was talking about on the floor in terms of where we have come from, I remember being in the House of Representatives in 1997, I believe, when we voted to balance the budget for the first time in 30 years under President Clinton. It was tough. We had to make tough decisions, but we did that, and we were on a trajectory so that by the year 2000—when I was elected to the Senate in 2001 and came into the Budget Committee—the big debate was what to do with the biggest surplus in the history of the country. We saw that big surplus, during the 8 years of President Bush, go red with red ink, down, down, down, down, so much so that when President Obama came in, the job loss was at about 750,000 jobs a month. We were losing 750,000 jobs a month. So we went to work and we focused on people in the middle class, on innovation and investing in businesses and creating opportunities and so on, and these numbers now, on jobs per month, have gone from a negative now up to a positive.

The challenge is—we are not done yet—do not stop what we have been doing. This jobs bill on the floor is to get us to a point where those numbers keep going up and up and up, so everybody who wants to work can work. We have turned this around in terms of job loss. The numbers are going up. But it is not enough. We are not there yet, and too many people are caught in the middle. In fact, even though the numbers are better and we are moving in the right direction, we still have five people out of work for every one job opening.

In a moment, I am going to ask for unanimous consent. I will let my col-

leagues on the other side of the aisle know that I will do that in about 5 minutes, to give them a heads-up. But in the meantime, I want to read a few letters and then turn things over to another colleague from Oregon who cares passionately about this.

I want to share with you what have been literally thousands of e-mails and phone calls we have been getting from people in Michigan. I go home every weekend, and I am constantly talking to people who find themselves in very tough situations—people who have never been out of a job before in their lives, never, and now they are in their fifties and trying to figure out what they are going to do, and they find themselves in a situation where they are having to depend upon unemployment benefits, which is the last thing they have ever wanted.

Judith from Taylor:

Both my husband and I have been unemployed for over a year now. We have been trying desperately to find work and haven't even gotten call backs for jobs we have applied for. It has been frightening and discouraging but we keep trying.

Because of our situation, we have been forced to sell our home and we will be closing this month, at a considerable loss!

That is the other piece of this. It is not just about a job. The next thing is you lose your house, and then the ripple effect goes from there.

The bank we have our equity with has refused to settle and has told us they reserve the right to come after us for the balance. We will be having to break into our retirement funds again with penalty. On top of all this, our youngest son, Nathaniel, is a combat medic with the 101st Airborne and will be one of the 30,000 that are being deployed to Afghanistan. Needless to say, my husband and I are on overload!! Please help the unemployed workers in Michigan by extending the emergency funds. PLEASE don't leave so many people literally out in the cold.

That is what is happening. That is what is happening right now by these efforts to block, to say no. We have come to the floor multiple times on individual bills to extend unemployment, plus the two times now we have voted to stop filibusters on the jobs bill. All we get from the other side is no, no, no. As my friend from Rhode Island said, when we get to the estate tax, it will be yes, yes, yes. And it will not matter where the funds come from, if they add to the deficit—oh, no, not for the few hundred people in our country who are the wealthiest.

When somebody is out of work, that is something different. When somebody is out of work, we have a set of rules that say: No, this is not an emergency. We have always said it is an emergency, with emergency funding. This is not an emergency? Well, I tell you what, when 15 million people are out of work, I would consider that an emergency. That is as much of an emergency as a flood, a hurricane, anything else we have seen in this country. Tens of millions of people out of work is an economic emergency and deserves emergency status here in this body.

Let me share one other story before asking unanimous consent. Michele from Suttons Bay:

I am a 50-year-old journeyman carpentry foreman who was laid off by a small construction company in December 2008 after 10-plus years with them. I have been looking for a full-time job ever since. I went through the state's retraining program last summer and am now a BPI certified energy efficiency auditor. But I can't afford to buy the equipment to start my own business. And no companies are hiring energy efficiency auditors right now. I have been looking for any kind of work that allows us to pay the mortgage and our other very basic bills.

My wife has a full-time job in retail. We have two sons—one is 16, and the other is 12. We have been surviving with the aid of my unemployment [insurance]. I have already gone through the state unemployment benefits, and I am now in the second period of [the] federal . . . program.

Please don't forget about us.

Well, that is what this is about this evening. That is what the legislation is about that we are focused on. That is what all of our efforts are focused on—jobs, creating good-paying jobs, partnering with business, manufacturers, small businesses, creating the atmosphere for private sector jobs, and remembering the people who, through no fault of their own, cannot find work today.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3520

So, Mr. President, on behalf of the close to 1 million people right now who have lost their jobs and are now losing their unemployment benefits, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3520, the Unemployment Extension Act of 2010; that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I offered an amendment a week ago during the debate on the extenders legislation that is still on the floor of the Senate that would have paid for all the things the Senator from Michigan would like to see paid for, and we have things we need to do, such as unemployment insurance, an extension of that. We need to deal with the issue of these expiring tax provisions.

What we would do is simply say we start paying for things around here. So I offered an amendment that would do that. It was defeated here in the Senate. But at 8:15, I intend to come back here and offer that again as an alternative because I think probably everybody in the Senate agrees we need to address the concern of people who are unemployed in this economy, but we should do it in a way that is fiscally responsible. That is what my amendment will do. So, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before I yield to my friend from Oregon,

let me say the question before us is whether we take dollars from a jobs bill, from a Recovery Act, where we are creating jobs right now, which is what has been proposed over and over—that we basically take it out of one pocket and put it in the other. We want to make sure we are creating jobs and allowing the recovery—or what has been called the stimulus—to be able to work to do that, and it is beginning to do that. So taking dollars out of that pocket, which is what has been proposed by the other side of the aisle in order to be able to address unemployment benefits, doesn't make sense.

I would state one more time: We have always viewed the extension of unemployment benefits in times of economic hardship to be an emergency, just like any other emergency in this country. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are refusing to acknowledge that this is an emergency. It is an emergency. When over 15 million people are out of work, it is an emergency, and we should do as we have done under every Republican and every Democratic President. We have called it an emergency. We should continue to call it an emergency, and we should allow those benefits to continue.

I now yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, we have a chance on the floor of this Chamber to come and debate issues that are important to the success of our families across this Nation. There are some who will come to this floor and they will argue that we should do everything possible to help the most successful; that we should do everything possible to help the most powerful; we should do everything possible to help the wealthiest, those who already have secured the American dream. They have it in their hands.

I come tonight to argue a different case: that we should put our energy behind helping the working families of this Nation, families who are struggling in an economy where jobs have been disappearing left and right; where families are looking for work but there are multiple applicants for each and every job; where someone may be clinging to a job and then losing it when another firm goes under.

I am delighted we have arrested the slide into another Great Depression. We didn't know a year ago whether we were going to see every single month a 1-percent increase in unemployment until we were at 25 percent unemployment or 30 percent unemployment. So we did what we could to break that cycle, and it has been broken. But we remain at a very high level of unemployment—10 percent plus, on average, across this country and much higher in my home State of Oregon. I have Crook County in eastern Oregon, central Oregon, 17 percent unemployment; Harney County, nearly 16 percent unemployment; Deschutes County, 15 percent unemployment; Josephine, 14.5, and so forth.

Folks are struggling. I have been hearing a lot of stories from people back home, and I thought I would share a couple of those stories tonight to put a face on the challenge.

Dear Jeff: I have worked for 42 years and will lose my unemployment benefits after 6 months without your help. I have 3 girls in college and unemployment benefits are helping to keep us current on basic needs. We need your help in the Senate. This is our only lifeline. Please convince your fellow Senators to do the right thing for everyday families and not throw us under the bus.

That is Mike from Happy Valley. When Mike is saying "don't throw us under the bus," he is saying don't spend our time and energy helping the already successful, the wealthy and the powerful; strengthen the financial foundations of our working families.

Before us tonight is a key measure in that, which is the extension of unemployment benefits for families who are working, doing everything right.

Let me share another story.

Dear Senator Merkley: I have now been without unemployment benefits since May 16. I have been unable to buy food, gas, or pay bills. My son is home from college for the summer and I can't provide for him, either. There are essentially no jobs in Central Oregon. I apply daily. I would go to work tomorrow given the opportunity. Thank you.

That is Donald writing to me from Redmond. He has been without the ability to buy food, gas, or pay bills since May 16. Extension of unemployment benefits is a very real method to help families when we are in times of great economic duress.

It is intriguing to me that my colleagues across the aisle want to take away from the job creation efforts to pay for help for those who are unemployed. In other words, they want to create more unemployed in order to pay unemployment benefits.

Let's step back and realize that it is the policies of my colleagues across the aisle that created this economic crisis. They deregulated Wall Street. They allowed the leverage of major financial firms to double in a single year. Bear Stearns went from 20 to 1 leverage to 40 to 1 leverage in a single year. They allowed retail mortgages to become a form of scam upon working families with prepayment penalties and steering payments, which is a very polite term for payments that are made to brokers so they will sell a mortgage that is wrong for the family but which creates a big bonus for themselves.

They allowed the corruption of the most important financial document that is central to building the financial foundations of our families. They allowed Wall Street to put those into securities and poison all of the financial foundations of the firms that bought those securities.

All this built a house of cards that came down, and now they want to take away from job creation as a way of saying: well, we do care about people who are unemployed. We are just going to create more unemployed in the process. The logic of that escapes me.

Kate from Covallis writes to me:

I am 62 years old and was laid off my job a year ago last March.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President. It is an honor to come and say we need to do right by working families in America, and we need to not do it by creating more unemployment.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I wish to again thank my friend from Oregon who consistently has come to the Senate floor to fight for jobs and to fight for people who are looking for work. I thank him very much for sharing those stories.

I now wish to turn to Senator BERNIE SANDERS who has been another champion in this fight.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Senator for all she is doing for the unemployed in this country.

I wish to briefly quote from an e-newsletter we sent out from our office which is sanders.senate.gov, and this is what the newsletter said recently in discussing the unemployment situation in Vermont:

Adrian Keyser is one of more than 200 people who applied for eight licensed nursing assistant positions at Burlington's Fletcher Allen Health Care earlier this month. She has been unemployed since November.

Eight jobs, 200 people applying for those jobs. This is what she says:

I have been desperately seeking work. Just so many people are looking for jobs. It's very frustrating. It kind of gets on your self-esteem because you are trying so hard and nothing comes through. I know a lot of people that are out of jobs right now.

As Congress debates whether to extend benefits for the seriously and long-term unemployed, an estimated 23,000 Vermonters were jobless in April. Of those, 6,600, or 29 percent, were unemployed for 6 months or longer, according to preliminary data from the Vermont Labor Department.

Thousands of Vermonters who are looking for full-time jobs are only working part-time. The Labor Department estimates 24,100 are working part time, largely because jobs aren't available.

By the way, the recession has not hit Vermont as badly as it has hit many other States, but we have just heard of a situation where eight jobs were being offered, and 200 people were lining up for those jobs.

I wish to make a point about the priorities of many of my Republican friends, which I don't quite understand. When Senator STABENOW, a moment ago, asked for unanimous consent so that we can provide the desperately needed unemployment compensation for almost 1 million workers out there, there was an objection. The objection was, well, we have to pay for that. We have a large deficit.

I understand we have a large deficit and that we have a large national debt, but what I don't understand is that when it comes to tax breaks for billionaires, my word, we don't have to pay for that.

My understanding is that every member of the Republican caucus without

exception voted to repeal completely the estate tax. That would cost the government over \$1 trillion over a 10-year period—\$1 trillion over a 10-year period—and how was that going to be paid for? Oh, it wasn't going to be paid for—but not to worry.

What Senator STABENOW is talking about now is 1 million workers who are in desperate need of help in order to put food on the table, in order to put gas in the car so they can look for work. On the other hand, when you repeal the estate tax, you are not talking about 1 million unemployed workers, you are talking about the top three-tenths of 1 percent of our population, people who are millionaires and billionaires.

Our Republican friends say: Oh, it is OK. We can give them \$1 trillion in tax breaks. We don't have to worry about how we pay for that.

Actually, within a couple of weeks there is going to be another version of providing huge tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country as another form of repealing the estate tax coming before the Congress. I wonder how much concern our Republican friends will have when that bill comes to the floor about how we are going to pay for that.

Right now, interestingly enough, there is no estate tax. For the first time since 1916, you could be a multi-billionaire and your family will not have to pay any taxes when you die. Last month, it turned out that the wealthiest person in Houston, TX, a gentleman named Dan Duncan, became the first multibillionaire to pass along his entire estate, estimated to be worth \$9 billion, to his family without paying any Federal estate taxes.

Now, I don't know, I may have missed it, but what that family would have been paying in Federal taxes is probably between \$3 billion or \$4 billion. That is a lot of money. That can provide a lot of unemployment compensation to workers who have lost their jobs and are living in desperation. Maybe my friend from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, can correct me, but I don't recall hearing any of my Republican friends coming to the floor and saying: Oh, my word.

We have a huge deficit problem. Yet right now billionaire families are not paying any taxes at all for the estate tax—the first time since 1916. I don't know. Did my friend from Michigan hear any great laments about that crisis? No. But when it comes to unemployed workers: Oh, my word, we have to pay for that.

The last point I wish to make is I get a little bit tired of being lectured by our Republican friends for the deficit we are in. Let's go over how we got to the deficit—or a good part of the deficit—right now. I voted against going to the war in Iraq. Most, or all, of my Republican friends voted for it. That war will cost approximately \$3 trillion by the time the last veteran gets the benefits he or she is entitled to. They

voted for it, but they forgot to tell us how they would pay for it.

During the Bush era, our Republican friends pushed for hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. They voted for it; I didn't. The point is, please don't lecture us on the deficit that you largely caused.

With that, I yield the remainder of my time.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Vermont for his passion. I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, who is a true leader on this issue. He has been coming to the floor and standing up for working men and women. It is a pleasure always to work with him on this issue.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am proud to be here with Senator STABENOW who is leading this effort to remind all of us of our obligations—to the most vulnerable Americans—those who have lost their work in this economic crisis, who are looking desperately for work. They have to maintain their families in this very difficult time. Traditionally, we always offer extended unemployment benefits, but memories are too short around here.

Let me take my colleagues back a few years to March of 2002 when the unemployment rate was 5.7 percent and we authorized extended unemployment benefits for 2 years and 1 month. I can't recall any great battles month to month about extending the benefits. I can't recall the "perils of Pauline" episodes where, as soon as we finish the 30-day extension, we have to literally begin the debate on the next one because we understand there will be five or six or seven procedural delays built in to prevent us from doing that.

Today, we are looking at, in my home State of Rhode Island, 12.3 percent unemployment. That is the official numbers. The unofficial numbers are much higher because the underemployment rate—people who are working part time, working odd jobs just to get by—adds significantly more people to the under- and unemployed rolls. We have never in this country declined to extend unemployment benefits as long as the unemployment rate was at least 7.4 percent nationally. Today, that rate is about 9.7 percent. We are more than two percentage points above what is traditionally going back to the Eisenhower administration—the standard of when we can sort of release and dispense with extended unemployment benefits.

By any proportion, we are in the midst of a very serious economic crisis. What we have done routinely is extend unemployment benefits. Yet, we have had fierce opposition. Even in those times when we have been able to extend them, it has been after numerous procedural votes. That was not the situation in other administrations—Eisenhower, Nixon, Kennedy, Clinton administration, and the most recent Bush administration.

The reason, as my colleague from Vermont so passionately and eloquently pointed out, was we have to get hold of the deficit. Well, we are the people who got hold of the deficit. I can recall being a rather junior Member of the House of Representatives and voting for President Clinton's proposal, with not one Republican vote in the House or the Senate. Yet, that policy, together with the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve, resulted several years later in a budget surplus. Then President George Walker Bush walked into Washington with a \$236 billion budget surplus. But it weighed heavy. President Bush felt that he had to move that money out as quick as possible through significant tax cuts, which benefited the wealthiest Americans. Part of that tax bill was the estate tax, which has been dispensed with this year—a tax on the books since 1916.

All of that dissipated, undercut the surplus, and now we are in a significant deficit. Add the cost of the war in Iraq and other operations, and the cost of the Part D Medicare entitlement program that left many seniors without coverage—unpaid for, but a huge boon to the drug industry—all of that was on their watch. Now, suddenly, they are deficit hawks again. It doesn't ring true to people out there who are desperately looking for work and need something to support them.

There is also a very pernicious sort of argument that is made—sometimes between the lines and sometimes explicitly—that people want to be on unemployment because they are doing much better, and they are inherently lazy and they want to collect that money. In Rhode Island, unemployment benefits are about \$360 a week, or about \$15,000 a year. That doesn't buy much in terms of gasoline, in terms of food for your family; and it doesn't take care of those bills, such as a health care bill that comes up, or tuition, if you are trying to send your children to school.

One of the phenomenons today of this economic crisis is that it is not just affecting young workers entering the workforce, or transient workers, those who have a record of working and being laid off; this is hitting at people in their forties and fifties, who have had good, hard, high-paying jobs, relatively speaking, who have a mortgage and are trying to send children to college. That, unfortunately, is the face too often of unemployment today in the United States. Those people want to live on \$360 a week, and they don't want to work? I think that is nonsense. We have to extend unemployment benefits. We always have in the past, and we have to do it now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRIS). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New York, and I thank him for his passionate leadership on behalf of our country.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I compliment my friend and colleague, Senator STABENOW from Michigan, not only for putting this together but for being a clarion voice to the American people. She is one of those—and it is sometimes all too rare here—who talks through all the miasma and the fog, and all the barriers, directly to the average American. That is a rare talent and one that she shows repeatedly. I thank her for that.

I want to follow up on something my colleague from Rhode Island just mentioned, Senator REED, which is this idea that people don't want to work, and if we extend their unemployment benefits, we are going to develop a lazy class of people.

Let me tell you my experience. It is not that the rate of unemployment is the highest it has been since World War II, although it is far too high. That dubious honor goes to 1982, when it was 10.8 percent in that recession. The difference with this recession is that people are employed for a much longer period of time and, second, it goes way up into the middle class and upper middle class—people who have worked hard their whole lives.

When I go around my State, I often meet with the unemployed. I make a special effort to sit down and talk to them. I want to share a story or two, in case anybody is unconvinced of the anguish they go through and their desire to find work.

I met a woman upstate named Dorothy, from the Rochester area. She was about 50, not married and spent her whole life in her company. It was her life. She had risen to be the third highest person in the human resources department at Xerox, which had a big plant over in Webster. She lost her job in May of 2008. My guess is—she never said how much she made—it was probably between \$80,000 and \$100,000 a year—a nice salary. She told me that every day—I met her January 2010, or approximately then—she went online to look for another job—day after day after day. She still had not gotten a job. It was very poignant when she told me, with tears in her eyes, almost dripping down her cheeks—she said that the first thing she did when she woke up Christmas morning was not go to church or to visit her family but, rather, she went online for 2 hours, in the hope that there might be a job that had been posted the night before, Christmas Eve, and no one else would be going online and looking for the job then and she could get first dibs. Is this a lady who is in the habit of laziness, of wishing to get \$350 or \$400 a week in unemployment benefits? Absolutely not. She is looking every day.

I met a man named Clay. Unlike Dorothy, he was a blue collar worker. He had six children. His wife didn't work. He is the only breadwinner in the family. The children were ages 2 to 14. He had ridden to the top of his trade in the machine tools area. He lost his job in the summer of 2008. He said that

here is what he does every week: Sunday night, he gets in his car and drives to Virginia, looks for a job in Virginia on Monday. Tuesday, he goes to the Washington area. Wednesday, he goes to Baltimore. Thursday, he goes to Philadelphia. Friday, he goes to New York City. And late Friday night, he drives home. Then he starts the process again on Sunday night. He still cannot find work. He is desperate for work. He told me that now his children keep asking about the family's livelihood, because he is the breadwinner.

Are we going to cut Clay and his family off? Are we going to tell those children to go on welfare? This is a proud man and a proud family. To cut off benefits will affect 67,000 people in New York State; 60,000 will lose their benefits and another 6,000 to 7,000 will be prevented from moving to tiers. It is wrong. It doesn't look at the problem as is and is virtually inhumane and not part of the great tradition we have established in this country. I hope we will be able to pass this bill. I hope people such as Dorothy and Clay will not be cut off as they desperately look for work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my friend from New York for those very stirring words about the families he talked with. I think all of us can relate to that, as he was talking about someone from New York each day going to a different city and State to look for work.

I go back home every weekend. I go home Fridays and come back on Mondays. I am very frequently now on a plane with somebody who is coming to work in DC—or to look for work—from Michigan. Every week they are going back and forth. People are willing to get on planes to find jobs and to work. People are getting on planes now from Michigan and going across the country. I have talked to people who go from one end of the country to another on an airplane because they want to work. People want to work.

The idea that somehow we should treat this economic recession differently than any other recession in the history of our country—different than any other Republican President or any other Democratic President, any other Republican Congress or any other Democratic Congress, by somehow saying we are not going to categorize it as an emergency—which it is—to make that change, which is what we are talking about here on our side with our colleagues—to make that change, to allow that to happen would be to say to these individuals that we do not understand what is happening in their lives.

I want to take the final couple of moments of my time, before yielding to colleagues, to read a couple more letters. One is from Susan from Grand Rapids, who writes:

My husband has been out of work since September of 2009. His benefits will expire

soon. He has worked all his life, since he was 13 and he had a paper route. He is a veteran. We are 60 years old now. He applies for jobs every [single] day. He has a Bachelor of Science Degree and has worked for the past 20 years in the construction industry. He has had one interview. One. Out of hundreds of jobs he has applied for, not just in Michigan but all over the [country]. Please help us by extending the Federal unemployment benefit. I am frightened that we will lose our house. Sixty year old people should not have to be frightened of becoming homeless [in this country]. This is something you can do right now for hundreds of thousands of desperate people. Not a fix for future but helping the people that are struggling right now.

That is what this is about. Tonight, we can fix this by getting unanimous consent to do what every other White House and Congress has done—to declare that this is an emergency and fund this as an emergency, as we have done year after year after year in this country, given what is happening to millions of people in this country.

We care about the deficit. Some of us have voted to eliminate the deficit, as we voted for balanced budgets and put ourselves into a situation of economic prosperity under the Clinton administration, before it was wiped out in the last administration with deficit spending. But in caring about deficits, it is important to emphasize that we will never get out of deficit with over 15 million people out of work or 20 million or whatever the real number is. We will never get out of deficit with that many people not working and contributing. We will never get out of deficit, which is why we focus on jobs.

We have a jobs bill in front of us. So far not one Republican colleague—not one—has voted with us on this jobs bill to create jobs, to invest to create capital for manufacturers and small businesses, to invest in innovation and, yes, to help those who are currently without a job through no fault of their own. So far not one Republican colleague has been willing to join with us.

We are desperately concerned about the almost 1 million Americans who lost their jobs and now are losing their unemployment benefits. We are simply saying it is time to extend those benefits and to understand what is happening to people all over this country who have worked hard and played by the rules and find themselves in a situation where the world is just tumbling down around them—just tumbling down around them—no matter how hard they are looking and trying to find work.

Claudia from Commerce Township:

I worked hard all my life and this is the first time I have ever had to accept unemployment benefits to help me get by. Believe me, I do not want to be in this situation . . . I would like nothing more than to be working again. I was laid off in January of 2009 from a company that lost multiple contracts with the automotive manufacturers and fell on hard times.

A lot of folks in Michigan are in this story.

I have a great deal of experience in my field of expertise (Human Resources) and I

hold a bachelor's degree. I have been looking for a job for the past year. At times, I have been encouraged by success in assessment testing and interviews I've completed, but I always seem to lose out in the end. I have taken classes to brush up on my job search skills and believe I do well with my resume and in interviews. I even enrolled and paid for a course to assist me in getting an HR certification to make me more marketable. However, I am 56, and the fact is that in this economy—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. If I may have 30 more seconds to complete the sentence.

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

Ms. STABENOW. She said:

I am 56 . . . and employers are opting for the person with a master's degree—or frankly, someone younger . . . I am a hard worker, intelligent, efficient, trustworthy, honest, dependable and upbeat.

Mr. President, these are the folks we are talking about and for whom we are fighting this evening.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to my good friend from Michigan. It is puzzling to me to hear her say what she said because she voted against the amendment by Senator THUNE last week which would have extended the expiring unemployment provisions until November and not added a penny to the debt. I want to say more about that in a minute.

What we are arguing about, what the debate is about is we want to extend unemployment insurance. We want to make sure the State and local tax deductions continue. We want to make sure tuition deduction and the various disaster relief credits and the research and development tax credits all stay in place. But we want to make sure it is done without adding to a Federal debt that we believe is out of control.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3347

Mr. President, before I speak about that issue, I wish to make a request which I hope is a request to which my colleagues could all agree. It is a bipartisan request on behalf of myself, Senator NELSON of Nebraska, and Senator VITTER of Louisiana to extend the Flood Insurance Program in Tennessee.

The largest natural disaster since President Obama took office is the flood of 2010 in Tennessee and a very severe flood in Rhode Island too.

On June 1, the Flood Insurance Program expired. This request I am about to make would permit that to be reinstated so small businesspeople could get flood insurance and get their loans. I will speak more about it in just a minute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 372, S. 3347, a bill that extends the National Flood Insurance Program through December 31, 2010; that the bill be read a third time and passed, and

the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. I certainly understand the concern about this particular program. This is something I support, and it is, in fact, in the broader jobs bill we have. Hopefully, within the next 2 days, we will get another vote to complete this along with unemployment benefits.

Given the fact that we are still in a situation where we have almost 1 million people whose unemployment benefits are running out and that is not included in this request, I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed. What I have done is ask to extend the Flood Insurance Program so that Tennesseans who are recovering from the worst natural disaster since President Obama took office could qualify for flood insurance so they could get their loans so they could operate their businesses again.

This does not add a penny to the debt. The money is there; the authority to do it is not. If you are in Rhode Island, if you are in Tennessee, if you are in New Orleans, if you are in any other place where you are waiting for flood insurance, you should know that Republicans just asked to extend the Flood Insurance Program so you could buy insurance, and Democrats just objected.

That is a very simple request. It does not add a penny to the debt. It is deeply disturbing to me this cannot be done in a simple way.

Tennesseans have not been looting and complaining despite the fact the flood of 2010, as I said, was the largest natural disaster since President Obama took office. Nashville alone had \$2 billion of damage, maybe more than that. There were 45 counties the President eventually declared disaster areas. He declared other counties as disaster areas because of agricultural crops that were washed out. Thousands of homes in Nashville alone—people lost everything in their basements. That means their heating and cooling and all of that equipment. But in many places, in Bellevue, in Nashville, in Millington outside of Memphis, in Clarksville, TN, they lost much more than that. Twenty-nine people lost their lives in this flood—29 people. This was a huge natural disaster.

The President did not ask for extra funds for Tennessee. No one is complaining about that either. FEMA has done a good job with what it has done, but what good does it do for FEMA to be on the site and available, for small business loans to be available, and for flood insurance money to be available, and for Congress to object to a unanimous consent request to allow new policies to be written?

I am deeply disappointed. Let me address a couple of other things I heard said on the floor of the Senate tonight.

I heard some talk about jobs. From our point of view, the American people are concerned about jobs, debt, and terror. That is why the ferment in the country. That is why the people think the country is headed in the wrong direction. Jobs, debt, and terror. We have 10-percent unemployment. If we continue to grow at the rate we grew in the first quarter, we will be at 10-percent unemployment in the last quarter of this year. Jobs, debt, and terror.

Why do we have fewer jobs? Why do we have 10-percent unemployment? The distinguished Senator from Michigan talks about Republican actions, but I am thinking about what the Democrats have been doing the last year and a half. Every step they seem to take talks about jobs but causes us to have fewer jobs. For example, take the health care law which was passed in this Chamber by a purely partisan vote. The health care law taxes job creators and investors. That means fewer jobs.

The financial regulation bill that is being debated today, passing in a partisan way, puts higher tax rates on small business owners. Higher tax rates on small business owners means fewer jobs.

The debt is going up. That is the real argument we are having. We reached \$13 trillion. There are various ways to describe what has happened, but one way to describe it is this: All the Presidents from George Washington to George W. Bush ran up a debt of about \$5.8 trillion. President Obama, in his two terms—if he has two terms—is going to double that debt all by himself. That is what his budgets say. Doubling the debt in 5 years and nearly tripling the debt in 10 years means less credit, higher interest rates, less capital, and fewer jobs.

The financial regulation bill I just discussed—one can watch it being dealt with during the day on television. If one listens carefully to what is being said, it amounts to a Washington takeover of Main Street credit; another big Washington agency telling banks and credit unions, automobile retailers, and dentists what to do about credit.

What is the inevitable result? They are going to shrink away from providing that credit. It is going to be harder to get a loan, harder to get credit, so this financial regulation bill, which was supposed to be tough on Wall Street, is going to be hard on Main Street because it means fewer jobs.

When it comes to jobs, the difference between our friends on the other side and the Republicans on this side is that we are focused on creating an environment for growing private sector jobs. They are focused on creating more government jobs. About the only place the job creation plans and stimulus plans they have enacted are working are in Washington, DC, where incomes are up

and jobs are up. But not in the small towns of Tennessee and not in the small towns across this country, people are out of work. They are out of work because of higher taxes, higher debt, higher spending, too many Washington takeovers, too much focus on more government jobs, and not enough focus on an environment in which to create more private sector jobs.

I mentioned a little earlier there was talk earlier about the unemployment provisions we want to be extended. Senator THUNE will be here in a few minutes to talk about his amendment he offered last week on June 17.

Let's be very clear. The Thune amendment, which every Republican voted for and attracted a Democratic vote but Democrats voted it down, would have extended the expiring employment provisions until November. It would have extended for 1 year dozens of tax provisions. It would have extended the State and local tax deduction, the tuition deduction, the various disaster relief credits, the flood insurance provision that was just objected to. It would increase the payment the government makes to doctors for treating Medicare patients.

The American Medical Association said a little earlier this week that 30 percent of doctors, family physicians, will not see new Medicare patients. This would have taken care of that.

I see the Senator from South Dakota on the Senate floor, and I am sure he will speak more to that when he has the opportunity.

In my concluding remarks, let me say one word about debt and spending. Our policies, the policies of this Congress and this government, are short-changing our children. The Democrats' runaway spending and debt is a serious crisis ruining the future of our children. That is why we do not want to pass even an unemployment compensation bill that adds to the debt. We want to pass it, but we want to make sure it does not add to the debt.

Why do I say it piles up a debt on our children? In January of 2009—if you divide the national debt across each child under 18, in January of 2009 each child's debt was \$85,000. By June of 2010, it was \$114,000. By January of 2017, it will be \$196,000. Because of budgets—and these are the budgets proposed by a Democratic President—during the next 7 years, each child's share of the national debt will more than double, going from \$85,000 to \$196,000.

Here is another way to think about it. All the Presidents combined from George Washington to George W. Bush took 232 years to build up a \$5.8 trillion debt. President Obama's budgets will double that debt in 5 years and triple it in 10. What that means is all 43 Presidents combined, from George Washington to George Bush, ran up a \$5.8 trillion debt in 232 years. In 8 years, President Obama will add twice that much to the national debt, tripling the debt.

We on this side of the aisle and a growing number of Democrats, I am

sure, and I know across this country a growing number of Americans are saying this national debt is a serious crisis. So we are grateful to the Senator from South Dakota and to others who recognize the real needs of this country, whether it is unemployment compensation, whether it is flood insurance, or whether it is important for doctors to be properly paid, reimbursed for dealing with Medicare payments. We can afford that in this country, but we need to pay for it. We need to do it without adding to the debt.

So I am deeply disappointed that Democratic Senators have objected tonight to providing flood insurance to Nashvillians and other Tennesseans who need it. The money is here; the authority is not. It could have been given tonight. We could have passed it. Tennesseans aren't looting or complaining; they are helping each other and cleaning up. This is an unfortunate slap in the face to Americans who are helping themselves get out of trouble, and I regret that it happened.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4853

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4853; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of the Thune amendment 4376 be inserted; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, my colleague's proposal takes money out of job creation to pay for helping people who are out of work. One of the provisions in his proposal would take \$37.5 billion away from creating jobs in order to create help for the unemployed and then create more people who are unemployed. So I regret to say I will have to object to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the amendment I just proffered to the other side which was objected to.

I think there is a consensus in the Senate that we need to fix some of these problems we are facing, one of which is the expiration of unemployment insurance for people who are unemployed. There are a lot of tax provisions that are expiring that need to be extended, things such as the research and development tax credit, which is critical to innovation and competitiveness in this country, and a whole range of other tax credits which affect a broad range of our economy.

Also, I believe it is important that we provide some certainty to people who depend upon Federal policy, and one of those groups would be the physicians in this country who rely upon

Medicare reimbursements for much of their survival because they treat so many Medicare patients. Much of the patient base for many of the physicians in my area of the country, where we have a high elderly population, is Medicare. Obviously, physicians have been facing—up until last week—a 21-percent cut. That was addressed for 6 months, so we have fixed that. We have dealt with it for 6 months. Obviously, that is an issue that will come up again. What my amendment would have done was to solve that issue not just for the next 6 months but to the end of the year 2012. So physicians in this country would have gotten an additional 2 years of relief, so to speak, with regard to their reimbursement.

So I would suggest that inasmuch as these are all things we agree need to be done, the real basic disagreement here revolves around how do we do that.

What the other side has put forward is a series of proposals, starting with the first one, that had \$70 billion in tax increases and almost \$80 billion added to the Federal debt. The last proposal that was put forward by the Democratic majority had \$50 billion in tax increases and \$55 billion added to the Federal debt. We hope that this week we are going to see that slim down even further, and I would suggest we are making progress in the right direction. But I think it is still fair to say these things need to be paid for.

As many of my colleagues have pointed out, we have \$13 trillion in debt that we owe. That includes debt that is owed between governmental agencies—we call that intergovernmental debt—as well as debt held by the public. If you can find it, the debt held just by the public is about \$8.6 trillion. But remember, we are talking about trillions and trillions of dollars.

As my colleague from Tennessee just pointed out, it took 43 Presidents 232 years to get to \$5.8 trillion. The amount of debt we compiled and accumulated between 1776 and 2008—232 years of American history—was \$5.8 trillion. Now, under this President's budget, we will equal that amount in the next 5 years and double it in 10. In other words, we will double the Federal debt today in 5 years and triple it in 10. That is an astounding number. If you think about all of American history up until the year 2008—232 years and 43 Presidents to get to \$5.8 trillion—we are going to double that amount in 5 years and triple it in 10. Staggering.

Under this new administration, we have already racked up enormous amounts of new debt because we added \$1 trillion to the debt to pay for a stimulus bill which has not shown any evidence of job creation other than jobs that have been created here in Washington, DC, at the Federal Government level. I think you could argue that Washington's economy has benefited because we have created some government jobs, most of which are temporary census jobs. But if you look at the overall job statistics, we have lost

somewhere in the neighborhood of 3 million jobs since the passage of the stimulus bill.

We passed health care expansion, which was sold as health care reform but, frankly, does little to reform health care and certainly doesn't do anything consequential to reduce health care costs. I think most Americans now realize, as insurance premiums continue to go up and as the Actuary and the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Tax Committee all attest to the fact, we are going to see the cost curve bend up, not down, as a result of the passage of health care reform. This is a \$2½ trillion expansion over a 10-year period, when it is fully implemented.

That is a massive new entitlement program on top of the entitlement programs that are already bearing down on us and leading us toward a situation where, in a very few years if we don't take some serious steps, this country is going to be bankrupt. We are going to be belly-up. It is as simple as that. You cannot continue to sustain trillion-dollar deficits year after year after year, which is what we are facing for the foreseeable and long-term future, and expect that we are not going to completely drive this country into the ditch.

So the amendment I offer pays for things. It says: Let's change the way we do things around here. Let's quit handing the bill to our children and grandchildren. Let's quit putting it on the credit card and saying to the next generation: You pay this.

There is certainly nothing wrong with the things the other side is trying to accomplish. As I said, I think there is consensus about addressing these serious needs in our economy right now. But the difference of opinion exists here about, how do you do that? We are simply saying: Let's pay for things. Let's start doing something different here in Washington. Let's do what the American family has to do, what the American small businesses have to do. Let's pay for things, for crying out loud. That is what my amendment would do. It would say: Here are some ways we can shave some savings and we can cut spending here in Washington, DC, and do all these things we think we ought to do without adding to the debt and without raising taxes in the process.

A few months back, here in the Senate, we passed legislation which was labeled as historic and passed to great fanfare. It was called pay-go legislation, and it created pay-go rules that suggested that from now on we are going to start paying for things. What has happened since the passage of pay-go? The Senate has approved, if you count the not-paid-for portions of the bill that is on the floor right now—of course, that hasn't been approved yet, but assuming it were—nearly \$200 billion of new debt. From the time we said we are going to start paying for things, which was a few short months

ago, we have waived the very rules that were going to put us on a path to fiscal responsibility and fiscal discipline, declared everything an emergency, and added almost \$200 billion to the Federal debt.

So here we are today debating yet again another measure that will add more to the Federal debt, that will impose taxes on small businesses in our economy at a time when they are trying to get some momentum to help churn us out of this recession, get us back to where we are creating jobs and to a period of economic growth. All we are doing is piling new taxes on them—taxes on investment, taxes on small businesses, and taxes, of course, with the recent passage of the health care bill, literally on everybody because all those tax increases are going to get passed on to the American consumer.

So where are we? Here is where we are. There are a number of things that can be done that would do what the other side wants to do—to pay for the extension of unemployment benefits. One of those things would be that we could save the necessary amount of money to pay for this now.

The cost of extending unemployment benefits in the Democratic proposal, by the way, is \$33 billion. That is a substantial amount of money, but there are many ways in which that could be paid for, all of which were included in my amendment last week, but let me suggest a couple of discrete parts of that amendment that might be stripped out and used to pay just for the unemployment insurance.

We can pay for the extension of the unemployment benefits by returning unspent stimulus funds, which would save \$34.5 billion. So the \$33 billion in unemployment benefits that need to be extended to people who have lost jobs in the recession could be paid for by returning unspent stimulus funds to the tune of \$34.5 billion. So there would be enough to pay for the unemployment benefits and some left over.

It could also be paid for through a 5-percent cut to the 2010 appropriations and an expansion of the affordability exemption to the individual mandate in the health care reform law, which together would save \$33.5 billion. So that would give the \$33 billion that would be necessary to pay for the extension of unemployment benefits.

Alternatively, it could be paid for with the rescission of other unspent Federal funds, which would pay for it by saving \$56 billion. So you could take care of the unemployment benefits, you would have \$33 billion that is necessary to pay for that and \$23 billion left over, hopefully to be put toward the Federal debt, which would be the best thing we could do for our children and grandchildren.

Finally, it could also be paid for with the inclusion in this bill of medical malpractice reform, which was also included in my amendment last week. That would save about \$50 billion. So you would have \$50 billion to pay for

the \$33 billion in unemployment benefits and have \$17 billion left over to put toward the Federal debt, which again would be the best thing we could do for our children and grandchildren.

So all these arguments that are made by my Democratic colleagues that these things are Draconian just aren't true. These are commonsense things that would give us the necessary resources to take care of the problem that is in front of us today but do it in a way that doesn't add billions and billions of dollars to the Federal debt, exacerbating what is already a very serious circumstance facing our children and grandchildren, which the Senator from Tennessee did a very good job of outlining. If you are a child under 18 in America today, the amount of debt you own is about \$85,000. By the year 2017, that is going to be \$196,000. So if you are a young person in America today who is under the age of 18, your share of the Federal debt is \$85,000. Ten years from now, that will be \$196,000—in fact, less than 10 years from now; in the year 2017.

I think all that leaves us with a very clear choice when it comes to how we solve problems here in Congress, here in the Senate, and how we deal with the immediate question before us this evening: How do we extend unemployment benefits to those who have lost jobs in the recession?

The other side has come forward with a proposal, again with billions and billions and billions of dollars that are not paid for, and that does go on the debt and that does get passed on to our children and grandchildren.

What we are offering are some commonsense ways, which means the Congress and the Federal Government may have to live on a little bit less. They are things that would require the Federal Government to go on a diet, if you will, in the same way the American people are having to go on a diet. The American people are being asked, because of this tough economy, to make hard choices with regard to their family budgets, with regard to their individual and personal lifestyles, with regard to their businesses. Everybody in this country is having to make decisions about cutting back a little bit. We could address this issue by just asking the Federal Government to take a little bit of a haircut, put the Federal Government on a little bit of a diet. We can achieve the savings necessary to pay for the proposal that is before us.

Again, as I said, \$33 billion fixes the unemployment benefit issue, and I have just named four ways that could be paid for, with money left over that could be put toward the Federal debts. That is what this is about. That is what the discussion here is. This is very straightforward.

My colleagues on the other side have come up here this evening and will continue to offer unanimous consent requests to go ahead and do this but not pay for it, and people on our side are getting up and saying: Wait a minute.

No, I object, and here is why. And the reason is because we believe in a very straightforward way that we ought to start doing what I think the American people expect of us, and that is for us to live within our means in the same way they do.

Unfortunately, regrettably, today, that is not what is happening here in the Congress. Year over year over year, we continue to spend and spend and spend and borrow and borrow and borrow like there is no tomorrow. Well, the chickens are going to come home to roost. Someday, the bills have to be paid. People where I come from in South Dakota understand that. There is no free lunch. When you borrow money, it has to be paid back. You can't spend money you don't have.

Those are all things that are happening here in Washington, DC today. We are spending money we don't have and we are borrowing money we don't have any idea about how we are going to pay it back. All we are simply doing is giving it to the next generation so they will have a bill facing them and a future that will shackle them with debt that they will be dealing with for their lifetimes and probably the lives of their children and grandchildren as well.

By way of illustration, because I think it is important to put things into perspective—sometimes I think it is very difficult to come to grips with what is \$1 billion, what is \$1 million, what is \$1 trillion. I tried to break that down, to put it in perspective for myself so I can understand a little better what we are talking about. The numbers, the number of zeros on the end of that number, can be almost mind boggling to the average person in this country. Most of us are not used to dealing with numbers that are in that ballpark of \$1 trillion.

What a trillion seconds is—if you took a trillion seconds, what would that translate into, by way of illustration and example—a trillion seconds, if you broke that down into years, would be almost 31,000 years; 31,746 years is what a trillion second is. If you take \$1 trillion and you make a second a dollar and try to put it into terms I think the average American can understand, a trillion seconds represents 31,746 years.

Since most of us here are probably not going to live much more than 80 years—hopefully if we are lucky, we will live beyond that. Most of us here are going to live under 100 years. When you talk about a trillion seconds, which in the last—we have seen about 15 seconds pass here, and you add that up to a trillion, that is 31,746 years. Think about what \$1 trillion represents, how much that is, the scale, the dimension we are talking about and what we are doing to future generations of Americans if we do not start taking the steps that are necessary to pay the bills around here.

This amendment I offered and that was objected to by the other side would have done that. It would have fixed the

physician fee issue, not just until November of this year but for another 2 years beyond that, to the end of the year 2012. It would have addressed the issue of the expiring tax provisions which we are all concerned about. It is an important tax policy that needs to be extended that has expired and needs to be addressed. Also, as I said earlier, there is of course the issue before us this evening of unemployment benefits which, at a cost of \$33 billion, could easily be offset by any of a number of things I suggested this evening.

I see my colleague from Utah has arrived on the floor. I know he too has an amendment he wishes to offer that I think makes a lot of sense. When it comes to creating jobs, he is someone with a small business background and understands what job creation is about and I understand he will have a request he will make of our colleagues on the other side as well, so at this point I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Dakota for the comments he has made and appreciate the time he put into this effort.

We are talking about jobs. That is the issue. The House bill, H.R. 4853, has to do with taxes that would supposedly increase the number of jobs. In that atmosphere, I wish to revisit the Main Street Revitalization Act of 2010 which I offered some time ago, which has to do with small business and tax activities with respect to small businesses.

Let me remind the Senate that small businesses are the economic engine of our economy. Historically, small businesses have been responsible for all of the net new job creation in the United States. At times when large businesses downsize, small businesses grow. Many times, small businesses are created by people who have lost their jobs with the large business and, in an effort to find someplace to find work, they create businesses of their own. I have had that experience. I have lost my job and said, somewhat facetiously but with more accuracy, I had to start my own business because nobody else would hire me. Many of the businesses I started or was involved with failed, but enough of them succeeded that we were able to create jobs, not only for me but for all of the other people who were involved with me.

When I was the CEO of a business that started out with four—I was the fifth employee hired—we took it ultimately to the New York Stock Exchange and hired 4,000 people. This was a demonstration of what could happen with small businesses. With that business I was able to overcome all of the financial losses that occurred in the businesses I started that didn't work.

As I pointed out before, we did that during what the New York Times has called the decade of greed, because that was the period when Ronald Reagan was President and the top marginal tax

rate was 28 percent. I understand the impact of a tax rate at 28 percent because we financed that business with internally generated funds. Yes, we had a line at the bank but we didn't sell stock—because I am not sure anybody would have bought it. We got to keep 72 cents out of every dollar we earned during the decade of greed. That is what allowed us to go from 4 jobs to 4,000 jobs over about that 10-year period.

Today the top marginal rate, when you add the additions that have been made with respect to the Medicare taxes, is over 40 percent, a very significant increase from the 28 percent we had during the time the New York Times was so scandalized by the fact that small businesses were not taxed enough. I can tell you they are not only taxed enough now, they are taxed too much. This recession has hit small businesses particularly hard.

One of the problems dealing with the challenge of creating a small business as you try to get capital is not just the higher tax rate but a lack of certainty in the capital marketplace. Unfortunately, this lack of certainty has been exacerbated by some of the activities of this administration.

My bill, the Main Street Revitalization Act, tries to address these issues and make a circumstance where a business can have a degree of certainty with respect to their tax position and an opportunity to grow the business in an atmosphere that will move a little closer to that atmosphere with which I was so familiar during the Reagan years. There are three targeted tax breaks in my bill that I wish to talk about in detail.

The first one provides a 10-year net operating loss carryback provision for qualifying businesses whose average gross incomes are \$5 million or less. One of the things you learn when you start a small business is that the only thing slightly better, but still bad, for a small business is earning a profit. The worst thing, of course, is a loss. But as soon as you earn a profit the tax man shows up and says "I want mine." I want my 28 percent, if you are in the Reagan years. I want my 42 percent now in the Obama years.

But I haven't got the cash, you say, if you are running a small business. I can't pay the taxes. That money I have shown on a profit and loss statement is tied up in inventory and accounts receivable.

No, says the tax man, I want it now and I want it in cash.

If you have a net operating loss carryback, you can say let me go back and take those years in which we were not earning a profit and apply them, average them in with this time when we have started to earn a profit and thereby avoid paying that tax at this crucial time when I need the cash to grow the business. That is the first thing. We provide a 10-year net operating loss carryback provision for qualifying businesses. It is only, as I

say, for businesses with average gross income less than \$5 million—genuinely a small business.

No. 2, the bill expands the definition of section 179 expensing to include structural changes to the physical property and it makes the current \$250,000 deduction limit permanent. Again, you are starting the business. You have earned some money. You have had to put that money into a physical improvement on your property. But the tax man says I want it in cash. You can't do it, you can't make the business grow without investing it in your property. We expand the definition of this expensing so that you get a tax advantage there.

No. 3, there is, under current law, a startup cost deduction of \$5,000. That is fine but it is not enough in today's world to make a difference for a business to survive. My bill would increase the current startup cost deduction from \$5,000 to \$20,000. This would encourage entrepreneurs to invest now rather than wait for the economy to improve. This says we will exempt this amount up to \$20,000. It will produce a significant increase in the number of small businesses.

Nationally there are 5 million to 6 million small businesses that would qualify and benefit from this bill. In Utah we have done the examination. It would be about 70,000 small businesses. If the 70,000 small businesses that would benefit from this would each hire one additional person, that is 70,000 more jobs in the State of Utah. If they were to hire two additional persons, that would be 140,000 new jobs, which is more than the national increase in hiring that occurred last month. It is not a big deal, one employee per business, if we adopt this bill. It would be a very big deal for the impact on the economy as a whole.

Because it is for only businesses with revenues of \$5 million or less, we can be sure this is not going to be something that big business is going to take advantage of. We can be sure that all of the concern about bailout of large corporations—it does not apply; my bill would not make any impact at all on that end of the economy.

I have a small business owner in Utah who wrote me a letter with respect to all of his challenges. Let me share with you some of the points he made in his letter that I think apply. He said:

I own a small business here in Utah . . . that had employed 20 people and now I am down to 4 people, as I cannot get financing.

I have put close to \$2 million into technology development and we are ready to launch, but we have run out of funds and can't find investor groups . . . willing to take a risk.

I would hire 25 to 30 new people if I could receive the funding that I need to launch my product. Banks won't lend, people are holding onto cash . . . and I don't want to violate the SEC rules so raising funds is difficult.

I had hoped the government would have made Stimulus funds easier to receive by those businesses that could make a difference in the lives of so many looking for employment.

I have a lot of potential business . . . but may need to shut the business down and lay-off the rest of the workers, due to lack of funding.

I believe the tax provisions that are in my bill would make it possible, or easier at least, for this particular small businessman to find the funding he needs and to hire those additional people he talks about. His business plan is sound but his financial circumstance is very difficult.

What this letter tells me, and my own observation elsewhere, is that the stimulus that was supposed to save our economy has not gotten down to small business one bit. This is exactly why I opposed the stimulus bill in the first place. Most of it has been spent in public arenas and has not hit the small business world. The Main Street Revitalization Act will help enable this company to quickly and efficiently access the capital they need to keep the business running, create new jobs, and eventually help them grow and expand.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4853

With that background in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4853, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 3083 be inserted; that the bill as amended be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I first commend my friend from Utah for speaking about small business. This is something that we share a very strong passion regarding. In fact, we are operating right now under some small business reforms that have already been passed this year and a 5-year net loss operating carryback—not the 10 years my friend has talked about, but we have begun that with 5 years.

The section 179 expensing was passed in the jobs bill, which is very important. I am hopeful we will be able to join together on a bipartisan basis when our leaders bring to the floor a small business bill that will exempt capital gains for small business, increase the availability of loans, and that we might work together on the other provisions that my friend has suggested from his bill.

At this point, I will object but look forward to working with him on these very important measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for her spirit of cooperation. I am sorry she is required to object. I must confess, I am not particularly surprised. But I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion and deal with this challenge. If I may close my presentation with, once again, making a comparison between what happened in the 1980s when we created the business that I described and what we are dealing with now.

I remember, in a business prior to the one I just talked about that I was running, during the Carter administration, I went to the bank begging—that is the operative word—begging for a loan, without which we could not meet payroll. I was overjoyed when the banker finally agreed to give us a loan at 21 percent interest.

That was the circumstance through which we were living in those times. We talk about the Great Depression of the 1930s. I remember, very vividly, the great inflation of the 1970s—21 percent interest so that I could meet payroll. That business, to use Abraham Lincoln's words for his store in New Salem, IL, winked out. We did repay the bank loan, but we could not keep the doors open. It was just a few years later that we started the other business during the Reagan administration when the tax circumstances had been changed dramatically.

The Reagan administration inherited the results of the great inflation from the Carter administration, much as the Obama administration has inherited the results of the great housing bubble from the days of the Bush administration. I will not make any attempt to put blame on a partisan basis, but those were the time lines. It was the Carter administration that was there during the time of great inflation; it was the Bush administration that was there when the housing bubble burst. So each President had a dilemma thrust upon it.

Ronald Reagan approached his economic challenge with tax cuts, and it produced the kind of job creation and ultimate economic growth that we are talking about. Reagan was very unpopular in the election that followed his election for President, and his party lost a considerable number of seats in that period. But 2 years later, the economy was roaring forward on such a strong basis, as a result of the Reagan tax cuts, that he was reelected in a landslide.

President Obama chose a different economic theory from that which Ronald Reagan embraced. President Obama followed the advice of the Keynesians and instead of trying to have tax policy that would stimulate the economy, he went to a spending policy to stimulate the economy.

The political pundits are saying President Obama will see losses in November the same way President Reagan did in the off-term election following his Presidential inauguration. My fear is that we will not see the recovery following that because of the Keynesian economics embraced by President Obama. My fear is this recovery will continue to be sluggish, and the unemployment rate will stay very close to double digits.

There are a lot of people who dismissed Ronald Reagan as something of an uneducated, almost simple-minded individual. I would point out Ronald Reagan was the only President we have ever had whose college degree, from his

days in Illinois, was in classical economics, pre-Keynesian economics, back in the days when a college degree from any kind of college was something of a rarity. He brought that concept of classical economics into the Presidency and saw a reversal and an end of the great inflation and set off a period of great prosperity for a long time and is considered one of the pivotal Presidents of the last century.

I disagree with the economic policies of this President. I hope I am wrong and that the recession we are now in ends with the same kind of success story that Ronald Reagan had. But I am afraid I am right and we will see this recession drag on for a longer period of time.

With that little bit of nostalgia, I thank the Senators for their indulgence.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

KAGAN NOMINATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I just returned from spending a weekend in Wyoming talking to many people around the Cowboy State who are concerned about our Nation, concerned about the growing debt, concerned about jobs and the economy, and the concern that Washington has taken our eye off the ball.

They also have considerable concerns and questions specifically about the nominee to the Supreme Court, Elena Kagan. I heard this when I was in Thermopolis, WY; when I was in Sheridan; when I was in Casper.

So what I want to do is spend a few minutes discussing and questioning the views on the second amendment of Elena Kagan. The second amendment in Wyoming, as you know, is nothing we take for granted. It is something we hold very dear. We do not take it for granted because our lives depend upon it.

The second amendment allows us to defend ourselves from harm. It also puts food on our tables. These are the values and the virtues that make this issue so important to Wyoming. I understand next week Ms. Kagan's hearings will begin. It is my hope we will have a clear picture of where she stands on the right to keep and to bear arms.

The window into her views is small. I hope the hearing will open that window wider for the American people. Her clerkship to Justice Thurgood Marshall and the documents connected to her time in the Clinton White House only crack that window a little bit. I want to hear from her.

I want to hear why Ms. Kagan recommended to throw out the *Sandridge v. the United States* case from the Supreme Court. This is a case that involved an individual charged with possession of a handgun and ammunition in the District of Columbia.

In a one-paragraph recommendation to Justice Marshall, Ms. Kagan wrote:

The petitioner's sole contention is that the District of Columbia's firearms statutes violate his constitutional right to keep and bear arms.

She went on to write:

I am not sympathetic.

I want to know why she was not sympathetic to Mr. Sandridge. The second amendment explicitly says:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Well, as we know today, the DC gun ban, the law, was clearly unconstitutional. The individual right to keep and bear arms has been affirmed by the Heller case. Mr. Sandridge's rights were violated. Ms. Kagan had the opportunity to recommend that the Court hear the case, but she did not recommend it.

Was this recommendation a legal opinion or was it a political opinion? The second amendment is pretty clear: The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

During the Clinton administration, Ms. Kagan served as associate White House counsel. The role of the White House counsel's office is to provide the President with the best legal advice possible. This is not a political office.

According to a 1996 memorandum released by the Clinton Library, Ms. Kagan raised concerns that certain organizations would be exempted from liability under the Volunteer Protection Act. This legislation was aimed at providing protections to volunteers, to nonprofit organizations and governmental entities in lawsuits based on the activities of volunteers.

In a memorandum she wrote, she branded some of these organizations as "bad guy orgs." I assume that is bad guy organizations. The bad guy organizations she was referring to she listed as the Ku Klux Klan and the National Rifle Association. So in her capacity as counsel to the President, I want to know why she was concerned that the NRA, the National Rifle Association, would be covered in the Volunteer Protection Act. I want to know why she grouped a violent racist hate organization with the NRA. The NRA, the national organization and chapters around the country, is very active in Wyoming. It teaches firearm safety. It advocates for second amendment rights. Again, this gets to the question of whether Ms. Kagan is able to separate politics from policy.

We have seen Ms. Kagan's resume. Now we need to hear from her. Next week I look forward to hearing her testimony. I also look forward to meeting with Ms. Kagan to discuss these issues

and the importance of the second amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 15 minutes 13 seconds.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

BIODIESEL TAX CREDIT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request but I will wait until a Member from the other side is here to make it. As a predicate to that, I will make a statement on my reason for doing so.

As the majority continues to struggle in an attempt to pass another massive deficit spending bill through Congress, biodiesel plants in Iowa and throughout the country continue to lay off workers because the Democratically controlled Congress has not extended the biodiesel tax credit. This is a simple and noncontroversial tax extension that will likely reinstate 20,000 jobs nationwide and about 2,000 jobs in my State of Iowa all by itself. These jobs have fallen victim to a tactic used by the Democratic leadership to hold this popular and noncontroversial tax provision hostage to out-of-control deficit spending in Washington.

This past February, I worked out a bipartisan deal with Chairman BAUCUS to extend the expired tax provision, including the biodiesel tax credit. However, the Senate Democratic leadership decided to put partisanship ahead of job security for thousands of workers in the biodiesel industry. I am here again to try to put thousands of workers back to work, American workers, in the process of producing a clean and renewable fuel. We already stripped out and passed the so-called doctor fix from the larger extenders bill last week. We should do the same with the biodiesel tax credit right now.

Also there is a difference between the biodiesel tax credit and the other tax provisions in the tax extenders bill. The failure to extend the biodiesel tax credit before it expires has ground the industry to a halt, because biodiesel is now more expensive than gasoline and gas stations know they can't sell it. So, of course, naturally, they don't buy it. Therefore, biodiesel producers have stopped producing it because they have nobody to sell it to. While the other tax provisions are important, they are not as time sensitive as biodiesel, because they are not transactional tax incentives like the biodiesel tax credit but instead are based on the taxable year.

I am going to reserve my unanimous consent request until the Senator from Michigan returns. I will go to other remarks I want to make at this point.

I see the Senator has returned so I will make my unanimous consent request at this point.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4853

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate con-

sideration of H.R. 4853, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 3440, to extend the biodiesel fuel tax credit, be inserted; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank my colleague for his courtesy in allowing me to return to the Chamber and also indicate that this particular provision on biodiesel, which I strongly support, is in the underlying jobs bill. We hope to have this passed in a couple of days. We will have another opportunity to vote on this shortly. As a result of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4853

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have a further unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4853; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and that an amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. 3421, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Reserving the right to object, I again say to my colleague, we will have an opportunity to address this. We had two opportunities last week to address it and did not get the votes. Hopefully, in the next couple days, we will be able to resolve these issues. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, may I ask how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this morning we saw yet another replay of a dialog between some of my friends on the other side and some on my side of the aisle. It kind of goes like this. Republicans make a proposal to make a pending Democratic leadership proposal such as the extenders bill deficit neutral. The Democratic leadership marshals the votes and defeats the deficit-neutral proposal on a largely party-line basis. After the vote, debate ensues. My friends on the other side define the proposal that they defeat in an incorrect way. They define it as a proposal to carry out the policy of a fiscally responsible manner as opposition to the underlying policy in the proposal. Republicans counter that the Republican deficit-neutral proposal carries most, if not all, of the policy contained in the Democratic leadership's proposal.

When the smoke clears, the true differences between the two sides' approaches become very clear. My friends on the other side want to add to the deficit to carry out the underlying ini-

tiative—be it an extension of unemployment benefits or a lot of other things in the bill. On this side, we want deficit neutrality at a minimum by rolling back future bloated spending. The Democratic leadership wants to keep in place the future bloated spending. Tax increases are OK, if they are offset. Bring on hundreds of billions of dollars of tax increase, whether they hit individuals, small businesses, or what have you. As an example, the latest tax is due to hit next week. Next Tuesday, July 1, users of tanning bed services will face a new 10-percent tanning bed excise tax. God help us if someone proposes to make the government even a little bit leaner. That proposal will be met with a brick wall of resistance, even if it is a proposal to roll back future unobligated, unallocated stimulus spending, which stimulus spending has not accomplished what it was intended to accomplish, keeping unemployment under 8 percent.

The upshot is this: For my friends in the Democratic leadership, keeping the spending spigot all the way open trumps deficit reduction. Keep the spending going, in other words. Worry about our deficit sometime down the road. Let our grandchildren worry about it.

On the Republican side, we want to trim the spending and save some taxpayers money by managing priorities. That is a worthwhile debate. It is an intellectually honest debate. It is the kind of debate that can inform fiscal policy judgments. But my friends in the Democratic leadership are not content to have the debate on that basis. Instead, we have seen a pattern where they want to change the subject. Instead of focusing on the present and the future, my friends on the other side want to revisit the past. In veering away from current choices and future fiscal consequences, my friends on the other side take the discussion in a whole different direction. My friends on the other side claim they cannot deal with these problems in a fiscally responsible manner because of Republicans. Republicans only left them with fiscal problems.

People watching C-SPAN witnessed this back and forth last Thursday, and around lunchtime the Senate voted on Senator THUNE's alternative to the Democratic leadership's extender bill. The Thune amendment took the exact opposite approach to the Democratic leadership's substitute. It cut taxes by \$26 billion by extending current law. It cut spending by over \$100 billion and reduced the deficit by \$68 billion. Those are not this Senator's numbers. They come from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the last version of the Democratic leadership's extender substitute would have increased direct spending by about \$105 billion through the year 2020, and raised revenues by about \$50

billion over that period, resulting in a net deficit increase of about \$55 billion. As an aside, last Friday Chairman BAUCUS and I prevailed on the leadership to clear the deficit-neutral bill that extended the so-called Medicare doctor fix. That action will cut those numbers a little bit.

On the larger bill, however, the contrast could not be clearer. The Republican Conference, along with one member of the Democratic caucus, voted to change the bottom line fiscal effects of the Democratic leadership's extender substitute. If Senator THUNE had prevailed, his amendment would have reduced the deficit by \$13 billion more than the amount the Democratic leadership's extender substitute would have added to the deficit. The Thune amendment reached this better fiscal result by simple common sense of restraining Federal spending. All but one Member of the Democratic caucus then in attendance, 57 Senators, voted against the Thune amendment. One of the Senators who voted for the Thune amendment came to the Senate floor to highlight the differences between the Democratic caucus and the Republican Conference in the approach to this extenders bill.

A Member of the Democratic leadership also made some comments on the current fiscal problems. Instead of focusing on the question of whether to offset the policy or not, that Member decided to change the subject. As we saw this morning, that Member of the Democratic leadership wanted to go back several years and talk about fiscal history.

This morning, like last week, there was a lot of revision or perhaps editing of the recent budget history. I expect more of it from some on the other side.

The President signaled as much in an interview with George Stephanopoulos a few months ago. I agree with the President that there is a lot of revisionism in the debate.

The revisionist history basically boils down to two conclusions: One, that all of the "good" fiscal history of the 1990s was derived from a partisan tax increase bill of 1993; and, two, that all of the "bad" fiscal history of this decade to date is attributable to the bipartisan tax relief plans.

Not surprisingly, nearly all of the revisionists who spoke generally oppose tax relief and—do you know what—support tax increases. The same crew generally supports spending increases and opposes spending cuts.

In the debate so far, many on this side have pointed out some key undeniable facts. The stimulus bill passed by the Senate, with interest included, increases the deficit by over \$1 trillion. The stimulus bill was a heavy stew of spending increases and refundable tax credits, seasoned with small pieces of tax relief.

The bill passed by the Senate had new temporary spending that, if made permanent, will burden future budget deficits by over \$2.5 trillion. That is

not Senate Republicans adding that up. It is the official congressional scorekeeper, the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan as they are. In fact, the deficit effects of the stimulus bill passed a year ago March—passed within a short time after the Democrats assumed full control of the Federal Government—roughly exceeded the deficit impact of the 8 years of bipartisan tax relief.

All of this occurred in an environment where the automatic economic stabilizers, thankfully, kicked in to help the most unfortunate in America with unemployment insurance, food stamps, and other benefits.

That antirecessionary spending, together with lower tax receipts, and the TARP activities, has set a fiscal table of a deficit of \$1.4 trillion for the fiscal year that ended several months ago. That is the highest deficit, as a percentage of the economy, in post-World War II history.

It is not a pretty fiscal picture, and it is going to get a lot uglier with the budget put forward by the President this year. It is the same result under the budget crafted last year by the Democratic leadership.

So for the folks who see this bill as an opportunity to "recover" America with government taking a larger share of the economy over the long term, I say congratulations. America has been recovered with a vast expansion of government and the American People have a lot of red ink to look forward to.

Members who voted for the budget and the fiscal policy envisioned in it put us on the path to a bigger role for the government. But supporters of that fiscal policy need to own up to the fiscal course they are charting.

That is where the revisionist history comes from. From the perspective of those on our side, it seems to be a strategy to divert, through a twisted blame game, from the facts before us. How is the history revised? Let's take each conclusion one by one.

The first conclusion is that all of the "good" fiscal history was derived from the 1993 tax increase. To test that assertion, all you have to do is take a look at data from the Clinton administration.

The much-ballyhooed 1993 partisan tax increase accounts for 13 percent of the deficit reduction in the 1990s—13 percent. That 13 percent figure was calculated by the Clinton administration's Office of Management and Budget.

The biggest source of deficit reduction, 35 percent, came from a reduction in defense spending. Of course, that fiscal benefit originated from President Reagan's stare-down of the Communist regime in Russia. The same folks on that side who opposed President Reagan's defense buildup take credit for the fiscal benefit of the "peace dividend."

The next biggest source of deficit reduction, 32 percent, came from other revenue.

Basically, this was the fiscal benefit from pro-growth policies, like the bipartisan capital gains tax cut in 1997, and the freetrade agreements President Clinton, with Republican votes, established.

The savings from the policies I have pointed out translated to interest savings. Interest savings account for 15 percent of the deficit reduction.

Now, for all the chest-thumping about the 1990s, the chest-thumpers, who push for big social spending, didn't bring much to the deficit reduction table in the 1990s. Their contribution was 5 percent.

What is more, the fiscal revisionist historians in this body tend to forget who the players were. They are correct that there was a Democratic President in the White House. But they conveniently forget that Republicans controlled the Congress for the period where the deficit came down and turned to surplus.

They tend to forget they fought the principle of a balanced budget that was the centerpiece of Republican fiscal policy.

Remember the government shutdown of late 1995, my friends on the Democratic side? Remember what that was about? It was about a plan to balance the budget. We are constantly reminded of the political price paid by the other side for the record tax increase they put in the law in 1993. Republicans paid a political price for forcing the balanced budget issue in 1996. But, in 1997, President Clinton agreed. Recall as well all through the 1990s what the year-end battles were about.

On one side, congressional Democrats and the Clinton administration pushed for more spending. On the other side, congressional Republicans were pushing for tax relief.

In the end, both sides compromised. That is the real fiscal history of the 1990s.

Let's turn to the other conclusion of the revisionist fiscal historians. That conclusion is that, in this decade, all fiscal problems are attributable to the widespread tax relief enacted in 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2006.

In 2001, President Bush came into office. He inherited an economy that was careening downhill. Investment started to go flat in 2000. The tech-fueled stock market bubble was bursting. After that came the economic shocks of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Add in the corporate scandals to that economic environment.

And it is true, as fiscal year 2001 came to close, the projected surplus turned to a deficit. But it is wrong to attribute the entire deficit occurring during this period to the bipartisan tax relief. According to CBO, the bipartisan tax relief is responsible for only 25 percent of the deficit change, while 44 percent is attributable to higher spending, and 31 percent is attributable to economic and technical changes.

At just the right time, the 2001 tax relief plan started to kick in. As the

tax relief hit its full force in 2003, the deficits grew smaller. This pattern continued up through 2007.

If my comments were meant to be partisan shots, I could say this favorable fiscal path from 2003 to 2007 was the only period, aside from 6 months in 2001, where Republicans controlled the White House and the Congress. But, unlike the fiscal history revisionists, I am not trying to make any partisan points, I am just trying to get to the fiscal facts.

There is also data that compares the tax receipts for 4 years after the much-ballyhooed 1993 tax increase and the 4-year period after the 2003 tax cuts. I have a chart that tracks those trends.

In 1993, the Clinton tax increase brought in more revenue as compared to the 2003 tax cut. That trend reversed as both policies moved along.

Over the first few years, the extra revenue went up over time relative to the flat line of the 1993 tax increase.

So, let's get the fiscal history right.

The progrowth tax and trade policies of the 1990s, along with the "peace dividend," had a lot more to do with the deficit reduction in the 1990s than the 1993 tax increase. In this decade, deficits went down after the tax relief plans were put in full effect.

No economist I am aware of would link the bursting of the housing bubble with the bipartisan tax relief plans of 2001 and 2003.

Likewise, I know of no economic research that concludes that the bipartisan tax relief of 2001 and 2003 caused the financial meltdown of September and October 2008. I have a chart that shows what the President inherited from a Democratic Congress and a Republican President.

As I said, from the period of 2003 through 2007, after the bipartisan tax relief program was in full effect, the general pattern was this: revenues went up and deficits went down.

That is the past. We need to make sure we understand it. But what is most important is the future. People in our States send us here to deal with future policy. They don't send us here to flog one another, like partisan cartoon cut-out characters, over past policies. They don't send us here to endlessly point fingers of blame.

The substitute before us takes us in the direction of more deficits and debt. The Thune amendment, which was rejected by most of the Democratic Caucus, would have put us on a path in the opposite fiscal direction. My friends on the other side fool no one if they pretend that the fiscal choices made by the Democratic leadership and the President over the last year have nothing to do with this rapidly rising debt.

President Obama rightly focused us on the future with his eloquence during the campaign. I would like to paraphrase a quote from the President's nomination acceptance speech: We need a President who can face the threats of the future, not grasping at the ideas of the past.

President Obama was right.

We need a President, and, I would add, Congressmen and Senators who can face the threats of the future. Grasping at ideas of the past or playing the partisan blame game will not deal with the threats to our fiscal future.

It is not too late to correct the excesses of the stimulus bill or the bloated appropriations bills that will come. The Senate missed an opportunity with a partisan rejection of Senator THUNE's alternative.

We took a small, bipartisan step last Friday. The Senate unanimously approved a paid-for Medicare doc fix bill, led by my friend, Chairman BAUCUS. That was the way we need to go.

There are more bipartisan fiscally responsible efforts underway. Senator MCCASKILL's and Senator SESSIONS' amendment, which calls for a timeout on the exponentially rising levels of appropriations spending, is a good start. The President called on the Democratic leadership to do something similar.

That is what the American people want and need. There is a way to reach a real bipartisan compromise. It is right in front of the Democratic leadership. Efforts to change the subject and blame Republican Congresses of many years ago won't answer the questions about what needs to be done now.

Efforts to blame every fiscal problem on a Republican President who retired a year and a half ago is no answer. It is a strategy that avoids responsibility for the trillions of new spending that the Democratic leadership and this President have muscled through with large majorities. It is time to match the power with responsibility. The American People expect no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Republican time has now ended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. STABENOW. We have 15 minutes to wrap up. Is that my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. STABENOW. First, as a courtesy to my colleagues, I will offer a unanimous consent request at the beginning of our comments, and this relates to the nearly 1 million people who have lost their jobs who have now lost their unemployment benefits because of the inability to move this forward in terms of extending unemployment benefits through the end of November.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3520

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3520, the Unemployment Extension Act of 2010, that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no inter-

vening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Republicans have offered a bill, and it is fully paid for. We have the same concerns. We think, though, we should not be adding to the debt and the deficit. We know the President's budget doubles the national debt in 5 years, triples it in 10. The recommendation here being offered is one that would add to the burden of the debt on our children and grandchildren.

As a result, Mr. President, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would like to now speak both in response to some of what my friends on the other side of the aisle have said and also to talk about why we are here this evening, why we started this whole discussion this evening.

I remember when we, in fact, balanced the budget. We passed a balanced budget under President Clinton. I was against deficits then when I voted, for the first time in 30 years, to balance the budget. I was against deficits when I supported a different way to go with the largest surpluses created by the policies of President Clinton, when I said just focusing on the wealthy in this country and tax benefits for the wealthy not only was not fair, but it was going to balloon the deficit; that not paying for two wars was going to balloon the deficit; that not paying for really any major policy during the 8 years of the Bush administration would balloon the deficit. I was against deficits at that time as well, and I am still against deficits.

When we talk about what happened in the last 8 years, it is not to go back, but it is to learn from what did not work for the American people. One of my friends on the other side of the aisle said they were for private-sector jobs and we were for public-sector jobs. Well, the reality is, during the last 8 years, when deficits did not matter—I will never forget the former Vice President saying deficits did not matter. When they were trying to pass their policies that affected the wealthiest in the country, at the expense of the middle class, deficits did not matter.

But we lost 6 million private-sector jobs during that time—6 million manufacturing jobs—when there was a focus on cheap products instead of American jobs. We lost jobs. Well, deficits mattered to me at that time too, as well as deficits in jobs, which is the main engine of our economy: middle class jobs.

Well, it is true. When we came into the majority and President Obama came into office, after that time of losing 750,000 jobs a month, we took a different tack. We did. We said: Do you

know what. Instead of focusing on big bailouts for Wall Street, and losing 8 million jobs because of that, or people losing their pensions or 401(k)s, we think we ought to have a different set of priorities. We think we ought to focus on the middle class in this country and working people and people who spend all their lives playing by the rules who are saying: What about us?

So we did something different. We put in an investment jobs plan that our colleagues have spent the last year and a half trying to talk down, trying to make sure it did not work. But we put in place a jobs plan to begin to turn things around. And that 750,000 jobs that were lost a month that President Obama inherited went down to zero by the end of the year.

As shown on this chart, this is where we were on jobs in the Bush administration. If their approach had worked, I would say great. If people in my State had not been hit by an economic tsunami during this time, I would say great. I would be out here promoting it. I would be promoting what they are talking about—if it had worked for the majority of Americans. The problem is it did not work.

Now, people listening I know get very confused because there are all kinds of back and forth and different versions of what happened in history. I would ask people just to think about their own lives.

As shown on this chart, it did not work here, starting in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005. I can tell you, in my State, where we lost a million jobs, these policies did not work. So we tried something else, when we started focusing on people, investing in innovation, partnering with manufacturers—private-sector jobs.

Yesterday, I went to a facility groundbreaking for a battery manufacturing plant. We have 16 different battery manufacturing facilities in Michigan now because of the Recovery Act that are creating private-sector jobs. The manufacturing tax credit we put in for alternative energies is creating private-sector jobs. Now, they are not as fast as we want. They are not as fast as we need. But we are beginning to turn this huge economic ship around. The ship that was going down, down, down—we are beginning to turn it around. We are beginning to turn it around.

My colleagues say we should help people who are out of work by taking money away from this. Let's stop this. Let's take money away from creating jobs to help people out of work.

Well, that does not make any sense. What we have said is we want to continue this. That is why we are saying no to the proposals. That is why I objected to proposals tonight on the floor

that sound great on the surface. They sound great. Well, why not just pay for it? Well, you are talking about taking money away from jobs in order to be able to put it into something that is desperately needed as well—both are needed—helping people who are out of work.

We say no. Keep investing. Keep moving it forward, and at the same time—at the same time—let's help people who are out of work in the same way every President—Republican and Democrat—for decades has done; that is, we call it an emergency. It is an emergency in this country when over 15 million people are out of work. And the reality is, from an economic standpoint, we will never get out of a deficit with over 15 million people not working and contributing to the tax base and contributing to the economy, buying things as consumers. We will never get out of debt.

So, yes, we do have a different view. We do. We have a view that worked under President Clinton when 22 million jobs were created. We have that same view now, that same view that says we are going to move ourselves out of this by investing in the middle class of this country, working people. We are going to invest in innovation. We are going to partner with our businesses. They are competing with countries around the world right now to create good private-sector jobs.

And, yes, to support small business, we have done more in tax policies related to small business, and we intend to do even more than I think at any other time I can think of in terms of support for small business. All of that is true.

Mr. President, in order for my colleague from Pennsylvania to speak, will you please tell me when there is 5 minutes left of our time. I do not want to lose the opportunity for the Senator from Pennsylvania to be able to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a minute and a half.

Ms. STABENOW. Before the 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank you very much.

Let me conclude by saying we are moving in the right direction, but we inherited a huge hole. By the way, the folks who created the hole want us to give them more shovels to go back and create another hole, a deeper hole. We are saying, do you know what. Take away the shovels. Take them away. We need to fill in the hole, not dig a deeper one.

So that is what we have been doing. But here is the reality. It was six people out of work for every one job. Now it is five. OK, it is moving in the right

direction. We have a long ways to go. But five people are looking and trying to find every one job. That is what this debate is all about.

Millions of people—most of them worked all their lives, never been out of work in their entire life and are humiliated at the idea they have to ask for help from anybody—find themselves in a position where they are going to lose their house, they are not going to be able to care for their kids, unless we give them the dignity of temporary help. That is all this is, the dignity of temporary help, and the dignity of saying, yes, this is an emergency; yes, we are not changing the rules just for you. We are not going to have a different set of rules for the wealthy in this country and separate rules for somebody who is out of work who is 55 years old who has worked all their life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. That is what this is about, and it is my great pleasure tonight, as we end, and as we continue to fight for these Americans, to turn our final 5 minutes over to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been a real champion standing up for working families in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator, there are now 4½ minutes.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, first of all, I commend Senator STABENOW for her words tonight to put in perspective what this debate is all about. It really is a question of jobs—not only creating jobs, as we have been able to do, and still have a long way to go to get out of the ditch, but also preserving jobs. Also, I commend the Senator for her stamina tonight. She has spent a lot of time on the Senate floor.

I want to make two points. One is about unemployment insurance and one is about COBRA premium assistance for health care.

First, with regard to unemployment insurance—the debate we are having on the bill this week and last week, for a number of days now—one of the real points of contention is what we do about those who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I can just tell you what it means for Pennsylvania. Here is the reality in Pennsylvania—and I will ask consent that the following document be made a part of the RECORD: Estimated Exhaustions of All Available Unemployment Compensation Benefits, calendar year 2010. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that document be printed in the RECORD.

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

ESTIMATED EXHAUSTIONS OF ALL AVAILABLE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS (UP TO A MAXIMUM OF 99 WEEKS) CALENDAR YEAR 2010

[These estimates reflect the total number of individuals in each month projected to exhaust all available state and federal unemployment compensation (UC) benefits under current law—Regular UC, Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC), and High Unemployment Period Extended Benefits (HUP EB).]

	YTD Through April	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual Total
EUC/EB phase-out beginning June 2 ¹	30,000	5,200	111,000	94,000	65,000	41,000	32,000	25,000	26,000	429,200
EUC/EB phase-out extended to Dec 31 ²	30,000	5,200	4,800	5,600	5,900	6,600	9,100	7,300	64,000	138,500

¹ These projected exhaustions are based on current law, whereby the phase-out of EUC begins on June 2, 2010 (last payable week of EUC is week ending November 6, 2010) and the last payable week of HUP EB is week ending June 5, 2010.

² These projections reflect the estimated number of exhaustions that would occur if the phase-out of EUC and EB was extended to December 31, 2010.

Mr. CASEY. What this says is if we don't act to extend unemployment insurance, to give people some help, to get from joblessness to a job, to get across that long bridge, 111,000 Pennsylvanians will be out of unemployment insurance by the end of June. Unfortunately, that number goes up by another 94,000 at the end of July if we do nothing. By the end of this year, 429,200 Pennsylvanians will have no unemployment insurance.

We have to act on that. It makes all the sense in the world when we are recovering—and we are in recovery, thank goodness, but we have a way to go—that we give people the opportunity to at least have the peace of mind to know they have unemployment insurance.

Secondly, with regard to COBRA, if anyone has any doubts as to what this means to real people, I would submit one part of one sentence from a single Pennsylvanian by the name of Lisa. She sent a letter to me talking about chemotherapy treatments she needs and the COBRA premium assistance. She said: "COBRA benefits have kept me alive." That is exactly what we are talking about here—about life and death. Why should a family—as they are trying to get a job, trying to find their way out of joblessness—why should they have to worry and have the additional nightmare of having no health insurance? We can help so many Americans as we did in the Recovery Act. Two million households across the country were helped by the COBRA premium assistance program in 2009. In our State, over 107,000 Pennsylvanians had the benefit of that.

So as we wrap up this debate about preserving jobs and creating jobs—and I think in a sense getting a sense of whose side you are on—are you going to be on the side of slowing things down and playing games or are you going to be on the side of helping the unemployed get a job and help them with their family's health care. As we wrap up this debate, it is about saving jobs and preserving jobs and literally, in some cases, saving lives, not only by way of health care but also by way of the additional debate we are having on Medicaid and what that means to vulnerable people as well as what it means to public safety and other priorities. We can get this right, but we need to have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle recognize that this is a high stakes game they are engaged in and that the loser here in the end is not going to be some political party. Those who will be left out are very vulnerable

people who, in addition, are without a job.

With that, I yield the floor to my colleague from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 20 seconds remaining.

Ms. STABENOW. On that note, I will simply say again that we are here and we will continue to be here fighting on behalf of people who are counting on us to do the right thing. We remember what it is like for too many families right now whose breadwinner cannot bring home any bread because there is no job. We want to remember them and we want to help them and support them as they are looking for work, as all Americans want to be able to have a job and the dignity of work, and that is what we are fighting for.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO FRED ANVIL NEWTON III

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary work of Fred Anvil Newton III, who is retiring this week. During his 28 years with the Intergovernmental Program Office, his distinguished career elevated him to the highest levels of decisionmaking in one of our government's most sensitive programs. His work greatly enhanced the safety and security of the United States Senate, staff, and visitors.

Mr. Newton dedicated his professional life to mission accomplishment, while always ensuring that the people he led were well-trained and cared for. He managed resources in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Mr. Newton cultivated and maintained partnerships with the U.S. Capitol Police, the offices of the U.S. Senate Sergeant at Arms and the U.S. House of Representatives Sergeant at Arms. Regarded as the dean of the continuity community, he has been at the forefront of strategic continuity planning and his innovative approach to problem solving has set the standard for many of today's continuity programs.

Mr. Newton has many significant accomplishments including the oversight, response, and mitigation of the effects of the public disclosure of a very sensitive national strategic continuity asset. He developed a new strategy for effective use of private sector assets in fulfilling a strategic continuity mission; the result being minimal cost to government and maximum flexibility for planners.

Mr. Newton provided advice and counsel to national level emergency managers attempting to mitigate and recover from the effects of a biological warfare attack on the United States Senate. Additionally, Mr. Newton held a great ability to identify subject matter experts, which significantly reduced recovery time and expense.

During his tenure, Mr. Newton oversaw the acquisition, staffing, and operation of multiple relocation assets in support of the strategic continuity mission. He also advocated and oversaw the development of a purpose-built tactical waterborne evacuation asset whose capabilities significantly enhance the efficient and timely movement of essential government personnel from threat zones.

He also oversaw a major chemical, biological, radiological and explosives defense effort protecting a highly symbolic national asset. This effort uniquely combines surveillance/identification technologies, defensive measures, and incident management and mitigation capabilities to form a standard by which other large-scale protective efforts are now measured.

I, along with my colleagues in the Senate, congratulate Fred on his well-deserved retirement. We wish Mr. Newton all the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREA ROGERS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I honor Andrea Rogers, the CEO and founding executive director of the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts. I have had the privilege to congratulate Andrea over the years on her many accomplishments within the arts community, including her most recent award from the Vermont Arts Council, the Walter Cerf Lifetime Achievement in the Arts award. Today, I once again recognize her decades of invaluable service to Vermonters and I wish her future success as she retires from her executive director position at the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts after 30 years of dedicated service.

In 1980, Andrea led a campaign to purchase an old movie house in downtown Burlington, with the hope of turning it into a home for performing arts groups. She was successful, and the old building became an independent theatre. Andrea organized many fundraising efforts to restore the antiquated space, and within the next 5 years, the Flynn succeeded in hosting over 350 performances presented by 50 different organizations. Today, 30 years

later, the Flynn Theatre is known as the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts and is firmly embedded into Chittenden County and Vermont's cultural landscape.

Since its founding, the Flynn has expanded and renovated its space, hosted thousands of diverse performances, opened an art gallery and created many educational programs. Because of Andrea's leadership, the Flynn has received several awards across the state, the country, and even the world. It was the only organization honored by both the Ford Foundation and the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation in 2000. The Flynn's educational program has also been recognized by the Dana Foundation as one of eight outstanding arts programs in the country, and has recently received the Outstanding Historic American Theatre Award at a national conference put on by the League of Historic American Theatres.

I am proud to say that all of these accomplishments happened under Andrea's tenure. She is widely recognized for her passion for performing arts and community development, and her dedication has had an extraordinary impact on the arts in Vermont. Marcelle and I have spent some of our most memorable evenings at the Flynn, and Andrea's enthusiasm for her work and for her colleagues will be dearly missed. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following article to permanently recognize Andrea's contribution to the State of Vermont.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press]

FLYNN CENTER DIRECTOR EXITS, STAGE RIGHT
(By Sally Pollak)

A monoprint of a jazz trombone quartet hangs above Andrea Rogers' desk in her office at the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts. The piece is alive with color—gold and purple—and appears at first to be an abstract work. But a second look reveals players, instruments, music stands: art and music in vibrant harmony. "I love the alive feeling of it," Rogers said. "I have all this artwork, and no place at home to put it."

Rogers has until the end of the month to find wall space in her Burlington house. The last day of June will be the final day of Rogers' tenure as executive director of the Flynn. She will be succeeded by John Killacky, who has been manager of the arts and culture program for the San Francisco Foundation. Rogers, who will turn 70 on July 14, has guided the Flynn since before its creation—when she and other community members recognized potential in a dilapidated Main Street theater being used as a cinema. "The Flynn was of interest to me—the potential of the theater to serve as a performing-arts center," Rogers said. She was intrigued by the idea of preserving a historic building, one whose existence was threatened, and adapting it to community use.

"It's something that I saw that needed to be done. I never dreamed I'd be the director. . . . "Burlington was my home, and I could see there was a need. If people want something, and there's a reasonable chance that they can come together to make it happen, it can happen. There were many times when

I cried, and wondered if we could pull it off. But I went to the public: Every step forward we made, it was because the community was behind us. It was very organic." Thirty years after accepting the job she never dreamed of, Rogers is stepping down as the only executive director the Flynn has had.

She has both envisioned the nonprofit performing-arts center, and guided its growth: The Flynn has a \$6 million endowment, an education department that presents student matinees, offers classes and develops and implements arts curriculums in local schools.

The theater presents its own season of shows, commissions work and plays host to artists' residencies. The Flynn's own programming has grown from about three shows a year to 50 to 60 annual performances, Rogers said. It serves as a performance space for other organizations, such as the Vermont Symphony Orchestra and Lyric Theatre. The smaller FlynnSpace is a venue for more experimental pieces, where about 40 percent of the shows are Flynn presentations.

"I love the Flynn," said Jaime Laredo of Guilford, VSO music director and a violinist and conductor who performs around the world. "It's one of the most vibrant arts centers anywhere, not just in the state of Vermont. "It's so amazing what goes on there, the range of things—from symphonies to country music to Broadway shows to recitals to jazz. I don't know many places like that. I think it's fantastic. And I think what Andrea has done is miraculous."

Bob Dylan and Phish played at the Flynn in the 1990s; Mikhail Baryshnikov has performed on its main stage three times; the World Saxophone Quartet blew free jazz on a winter's night in the late '80s. The contemporary dancer/choreographer Bill T. Jones presented his first full version of "Last Supper at Uncle Tom's Cabin/The Promised Land," outside of New York City, at the Flynn. The major work, co-commissioned by the Flynn and addressing hot-button issues, included workshops with Jones and dozens of community members naked on stage as part of the performance.

ART AND COMMUNITY

The Jones piece could serve as Exhibit A in what people say is Rogers' most important contribution to Burlington: bringing together art and community, with each step of the building of the Flynn a commitment to that ideal.

"Andrea has allowed her life to be defined by the mission of what the Flynn Center is all about," guitarist Paul Asbell said. "You do it out of love and a sense of mission. It is her vision that has been implemented." Asbell knows the Flynn as a performer and an audience member, and he knows Burlington before the Flynn existed.

"The contribution to Burlington is too deep to even count it all," Asbell said. "It's been remarked thousands of times that for the size of the city, it's incredible the type of cultural events and musical events and artistic awareness in Burlington. It's unbelievable what we've grown accustomed to."

Along the way, the Flynn has earned a national reputation among arts organizations and arts funders for its programming, its audience-building and its community engagement.

"To this day, the Flynn stands as model of how to do it right, how to have a strong artistic program and at the same time be a central node for community," said Philip Bither, senior curator of performing arts at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis. He is the former Flynn director of programming/artistic director of the Burlington Discover Jazz Festival.

"We talk about attempting to create cultural commons, places that a diverse range

of audiences can gather and celebrate live performing arts," Bither said. "The Flynn is that. It's really a remarkable success story. Andrea has been there from Day 1, and has really had the vision to see how to get to that place."

The audience ranges from wealthy patrons who attend frequent performances to children in Burlington's Old North End. Kids not only attend shows, but also participate in mini-artist workshops: Third-graders at the Integrated Arts Academy recently had a song swap with singers in the African Children's Choir—trading and singing songs together.

"For many children, the only time they walk down Church Street is when they go with their class to the Flynn," said Joyce Irvine, principal of IAA.

ACTIVE TILL HER EXIT

With retirement three weeks away, Rogers has little time to think about her exit. In fact, pending retirement never looked so active. She tracks jazz festival ticket sales every day, comparing numbers with last year and the year before—an activity that shows Rogers takes nothing for granted, including next season's existence.

"It takes a lot to keep this going," Rogers said. "It's not a shoo-in. We start from scratch every year, raising an operating budget." Rogers is immersed in putting together next season's sponsorship, and then comes the budget for fiscal 2011. "The biggest part of what I do is supporting everybody else," Rogers said. She has evening jazz festival events and shows to attend. "That part never felt like work," Rogers said. She notes a particular change that will come with retirement: "I have to pay now. I'm going to be a good patron."

A COMMUNITY ORGANIZER

Rogers came to her work at the Flynn through community organizing. She grew up in New Britain, Conn., and attended college at the University of Michigan, where she studied history, history of art and French. After college, Rogers moved to New York City, where she lived for almost 10 years. She worked for the American Field Service, doing community-service work with teenagers.

She moved here in 1970, interested in living in a small city and drawn to Burlington by a beloved great aunt and uncle who lived here, and by her love for skiing and sailing. Soon after arriving, Rogers started working in community-based drug-prevention efforts. The job combined her interests in community organization and working with young people. She liked the community involvement, setting up and organizing systems—but the core issue was not where her true interests lay, Rogers said.

After four years working in drug-abuse prevention, Rogers became founding director of the Church Street Center for Community Education, a university-affiliated center that preceded the Firehouse Center for Visual Arts. Her involvement with a community effort, spearheaded by Lyric Theatre, to purchase and renovate the Flynn led to her hiring as its first director. She was writing grants for the project and doing other organizational work when Rogers was asked if she'd open an office, she recalled.

"Well," she replied, "you have to pay me." It was only a "pittance," she said, but it was enough to persuade her to devote herself to the Flynn effort. Syndi Zook, executive director of Lyric Theatre, was a Lyric performer when the company endeavored to return the theater—then owned by Merrill Jarvis—to a live performance space. "We wanted to put on plays," Zook said. "We didn't want to be engaged in the multimillion-dollar campaign that it would take to bring that

beautiful building back to its historic stature." That was left to the newly created Flynn board, and to Rogers.

"What we were trying to do was save it from the wrecking ball," Zook said. "What Andrea has done is save this beautiful historic landmark that is just a jewel in the center of the city."

During her years at the Flynn, Rogers said her artistic sensibility grew to include an appreciation for contemporary dance. She had always enjoyed music—listening, singing and playing piano—and contemporary art. "I found the merging of music and movement and abstract ideas to be really eye-opening and exciting," Rogers said. "I came to really appreciate it, and not to feel the need to totally understand it."

COURAGE AND AMBITION

Ambiguity and complex, challenging works would become part of the Flynn's programming. Although Rogers said she had the authority to manage programming, she chose not to exercise it. This is the purview of artistic director Arnie Malina and Bither, his predecessor.

Bither came to the Flynn in 1988 from the Brooklyn Academy of Music, where he curated experimental music and avant-garde jazz. Conversations with Rogers before he was hired indicated the direction she wanted to take the theater. It was not necessarily what one might have predicted, given the Flynn's previous programming, Bither said.

"She said she wanted the kind of new thinking, and sometimes provocative programming," Bither said. "She wanted the freshest, most interesting artists that are happening, not just in New York City but around the world."

The notion that this kind of programming would work in a city the size of Burlington was "a leap of faith, to say the least," Bither said. In those days, management would pin up fliers for Flynn shows on trips to the supermarket, part of the effort to fill the house, Bither recalled.

A fund to honor Rogers, Andrea's Legacy Fund, was created by the Flynn board to raise money for programming and education, initiatives the board identified as key to Rogers' tenure. Board chairman Fred "Chico" Lager said the goal of raising \$1.5 million in cash is nearly met. With deferred donations, Andrea's Legacy Fund totals almost \$2 million, he said.

"Andrea is fiercely committed that we not retreat in any way, as is the board," Lager said. "She's leaving us in great shape. The legacy fund will ensure that we will be able to sustain everything that we are doing, and actually continue to grow."

Rogers has her own ideas about her legacy, which she believes is centered on connecting themes: artistic excellence and community involvement. "You never had one without the other," she said. And though events are planned around her retirement, including a free evening of entertainment June 26 at the Flynn, called "Exit Laughing," Rogers has her own ideas about how she'd like to leave: "Personally," she said, "I would've put a barrel on my head and snuck out the door."

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, in Hawaii all beaches are public. It is one of the things that makes our State a special place, and it is due to a landmark 1968 ruling by the Hawaii Supreme

Court authored by Chief Justice William S. Richardson. As a military veteran, attorney, political party leader, elected official, State supreme court justice and trustee of Hawaii's largest private landowner, Chief Justice Richardson's many contributions helped shape our Nation's youngest State. This great man, a dear brother and friend, died yesterday at the age of 90.

As Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court from 1966 to 1982, C.J., as many of us affectionately knew him, did so much to preserve Hawaii's rich culture and heritage. As he explained it:

Hawaii has a unique legal system, a system of laws that was originally built on an ancient and traditional culture. While that ancient culture had largely been displaced, nevertheless many of the underlying guiding principles remained. During the years after the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893 and through Hawaii's territorial period, the decisions of our highest court reflected a primarily Western orientation and sensibility that wasn't a comfortable fit with Hawaii's indigenous people and the immigrant population. Thus, we made a conscious effort to look to Hawaiian custom and tradition in deciding our cases—and consistent with Hawaiian practice.

A self-described "local boy from Hawaii," C.J. graduated from Roosevelt High School and the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and received his law degree from the University of Cincinnati. In World War II, he joined the U.S. Army and served as a platoon leader with the 1st Filipino Infantry Regiment. He was later inducted into the Infantry Officer Candidate School Hall of Fame. C.J. served as the chairman of the Hawaii Democratic Party and as the State's first Lieutenant Governor of Hawaiian ancestry. Upon retirement from the Hawaii Supreme Court, Chief Justice Richardson served as a trustee of the Kamehameha Schools.

C.J.'s modest beginnings influenced his future dedication to the underrepresented, minority, and indigenous communities of Hawaii. His mixed heritage of native Hawaiian, Chinese, and Caucasian ancestry reflected the diverse culture and history of the people. He understood the issues most important to the people and fought hard to ensure that the legal system provided remedies for the most vulnerable populations. He will also be remembered for his work to establish the State's only law school—The William S. Richardson School of Law. Chief Justice Richardson fought vigorously for its creation because he believed Hawaii students who could not travel to or afford mainland law schools should have an opportunity to study law nevertheless.

Chief Justice Richardson was a true son of Hawaii. He lived his life in service to others and did so with a warm and kind disposition. We celebrate his life, achievements, and contributions to the State of Hawaii.●

EMERADO, NORTH DAKOTA

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to recognize a community

in North Dakota that is celebrating its 125th anniversary. On July 10, the residents of Emerado, ND, will gather to celebrate their community's founding.

When the railroad came to Emerado in 1882, a town began to take shape on the Hancock homestead. The town site was platted in September 1885 by Henry Hancock, originally of Ontario, Canada, and by Lewis Emery, Jr., from Bradford, PA. The village was named for Emery, owner of one of the first bonanza farms in North Dakota, consisting of 4,480 acres of land.

Among the early businesses were Fred Ludwick and Henry Raymond, blacksmith; Plup and Morgans Grocery Store; Emery Hotel, built about 1882; the Virginia Hotel, built around 1915 by A.A. Hood; Dakota St. Anthony Elevator; Farmers Elevator; and Bill Hancock Hardware. The first post office was established on November 25, 1885, with Edmund Gale, Jr., serving as the postmaster.

The mill was built in the late 1890s by J.R. Cooper. Over time, other businesses were developed. Among these were the Gritzmacher General Store; Seebart Brothers painters and decorators; S.S. Hood General Merchandise; William L. Sibell, barber; Charles Emery Ford Car and International dealer; George Dean Grocery; Fosnes Hardware and Machinery; Ralph Bosard, blacksmith; S.S. Grantham Coop Store; Mary Kelly Cafe; and the "Blind Pig" pool hall and barber shop operated by Nick Hickson.

Emerado was a thriving small town until the disastrous events of May 9, 1928. Ashes cleaned out of a nearby locomotive ignited, leading to a fire that razed 24 structures, including the town's church, town hall, elevator, several businesses, homes, and barns. The church, elevator, town hall, and one home were soon rebuilt.

Emerado is very proud of the Emerado Elementary School, home of the Bulldogs. Students from kindergarten through eighth grade are privileged to be taught by caring professionals who share the belief that "each student is the most important person in school."

In honor of the city's 125th anniversary, community leaders have organized a parade, carnival games, an all-school reunion, and many other fun and exciting events.

I ask that my colleagues in the U.S. Senate join me in congratulating Emerado, ND, and its residents on their first 125 years and in wishing them well in the future. By honoring Emerado and all other historic small towns of North Dakota, we keep the great pioneering frontier spirit alive for future generations. It is places such as Emerado that have helped shape this country into what it is today, which is why this fine community is deserving of our recognition.

Emerado has a proud past and a bright future.●

TRIBUTE TO HARRIET O'NEILL

• Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on June 20, Texas Supreme Court Justice Harriet O'Neill retired after a judicial career of more than 17 years. On behalf of the people of Texas, I would like to take this time to recognize her many accomplishments.

After graduating with honors from the University of South Carolina School of Law and practicing for a decade in the field of complex business litigation, Justice O'Neill was elected to Texas' 152 District Court in 1992. On that court, her ability to conduct fair and impartial hearings was widely-recognized and won her the praise of lawyers on both sides of the civil bar.

Less than 3 years later, Justice O'Neill's superior record in the district court earned her an appointment and subsequent election to Texas' 14 Court of Appeals. As an appeals court judge, she once again stood out from the crowd. In the words of her colleague, Judge David West, "Harriet was considered one of the most reliable judges we had. . . She was absolutely flawless."

After earning a 91 percent approval rating from the Houston Bar Association, the highest on her nine-member court, the people of Texas elected Justice O'Neill to the Texas Supreme Court in 1998, where she served with honor ever since. In 2002, and again in 2006, the Texas Association of Civil Trial and Appellate Specialists named her the Appellate Justice of the Year. Even more profoundly, in the case of TGS-NOPEC v. Combs, Justice O'Neill broke down a long-term barrier when she became the first woman ever elected to the Texas Supreme Court to preside as Chief Justice.

As a Judge in the Texas Court System, Justice O'Neill has been a model for judicial restraint and faithfully interpreting the law, as written. Her opinions have consistently explained the law and the judicial role in a manner accessible to the general public. Clearly, she has provided an example for all judges to follow.

Justice O'Neill's service to the State of Texas, however, has extended far beyond the courtroom doors. Most admirably, she has been an unwavering champion for the legal rights of our society's most vulnerable citizens.

Since its inception in 2001, Justice O'Neill has been an active member of the Texas Access to Justice Commission. Through her work with this organization, she has helped to develop and implement initiatives designed to ensure that the court system is available to meet the basic legal needs of low-income Texans. In particular, she was heavily involved in creating and distributing a self-help Protective Order Kit that enables victims of domestic violence to file their own applications for court-ordered protection for themselves and their children. Because so many of our most important rights depend upon judicial enforcement, her efforts have ensured that countless Tex-

ans will be able to enjoy the equal justice under the law so central to the American dream.

Justice O'Neill has also worked to protect Texas' most innocent and disadvantaged citizens through serving as the chairwoman of the Permanent Judicial Commission for Children, Youth and Families. After spearheading the creation of this commission in 2007, she has worked tirelessly to strengthen court practices in the Texas child-protection system. Thanks to her efforts, Texas' 30,000 abused and neglected foster children can rest assured that they will be able to look forward to a better tomorrow.

Justice O'Neill's dedication to protecting the vulnerable has also been recognized at the national level. In 2006, she was appointed by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales to serve on the Department of Justice's National Advisory Committee on Violence Against Women. In this capacity, she assisted with the implementation of the Violence Against Women Act and supplied policy advice on programs addressing domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. Because these crimes are so heinous and their victims are so defenseless, Justice O'Neill's work in this area is particularly important and praiseworthy.

Although her professional accolades are impressive in their own right, Justice O'Neill's personal accomplishments are equally so. While devoting countless hours to serving the people of Texas, she has simultaneously managed to serve as a loving wife to her husband Kerry and a dedicated mother to her three children. Despite 17 years of full caseloads, she has found the time to stay actively involved with her family, including a tenure coaching her daughters' youth basketball teams. In this busy day and age, Justice O'Neill has provided all of us with an example of what it truly means to fulfill our duty.

While June 20 marked the end of her service on the Texas Supreme Court, I have no doubt that Justice O'Neill will remain active in the causes that she cares so deeply about. On behalf of the people of Texas, I thank her for her many contributions. We can only hope that her next 17 years will be as remarkable.●

TRIBUTE TO LINDA TYLER

• Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I congratulate State Representative Linda Tyler of Conway, who was recently elected by her peers as the majority leader for the Arkansas State House of Representatives. She is the first female elected to the position, and I commend her for this significant achievement.

Along with my staff, I have worked with Representative Tyler on behalf of our constituents, and she has always done an excellent job representing the needs of those in her district. As a small business owner, she knows the

economic challenges that face so many Arkansas families, and she works tirelessly to help them access the resources and help they need.

Along with all Arkansans, I thank Linda and the entire Arkansas Legislature for their leadership and their dedication to keeping our State strong. I also recognize the other representatives who were recently elected to leadership positions:

David "Bubba" Powers, D-District 3, Majority Whip; Charolette Wagner, D-District 17, Secretary; Barbara Nix, D-District 28, Treasurer; Butch Wilkins, D-District 74, 1st District Whip; Fred Allen, D-District 33, 2nd District Whip; Greg Leding, D-District 92, 3rd District Whip; and Johnnie Roebuck, D-District 20, 4th District Whip.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL K. NEAL

• Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I recognize Arkansas wildlife officer Michael K. Neal, who put himself in harm's way earlier this year to save the lives of his fellow law enforcement officers.

Officer Neal is credited by the West Memphis police for stopping a shootout with suspects in the deaths of two of their fellow officers. On May 20, Officer Neal rammed his truck into a van occupied by a father and son suspected of gunning down West Memphis officers Brandon Paudert and Bill Evans during a traffic stop on Interstate 40, before exchanging gunfire with law officers who cornered them in a parking lot.

Officer Neal was one of 13 officers from multiple agencies involved in the shootout, and I commend the bravery and heroism of every law enforcement officer involved in this tragic event. I also send my heartfelt condolences to the families and loved ones of those who lost their lives.

Mr. President, I am also proud that Officer Neal's bravery and heroism were recently honored during a ceremony at the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, where he was presented with the Medal of Valor by Governor Mike Beebe. Officer Neal has received recognition from West Memphis-area legislators, the city of West Memphis and its police department, and by the Crittenden County Quorum Court and sheriff's office.

Officer Neal represents the best of Arkansas, and he is more than deserving of these honors. I commend him for his valor, bravery, and selflessness.●

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRICKFEST

• Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I congratulate the residents of Malvern in my home State of Arkansas as they celebrate the 30th anniversary of Brickfest, a time-honored tradition that commemorates the importance of brick production to the history of the city of Malvern and Hot Spring County. Abundant clay in the area makes it a prime location for brick production, and since 1887, the industry has played a leading role in the area's economic development.

Nicknamed "The Brick Capital of the World," Malvern celebrates Brickfest each year on the last weekend of June. I am looking forward to attending this year's event, which will take place June 24-26 at Malvern City Park, complete with live entertainment, a 5K race, a car and tractor show, motorcycle show, and awards for best dressed brick, brick toss, brick car derby, and much more.

Acme, now the only brick company operating in the Malvern area, provides a display of its product, and every year it manufactures dated mini-bricks that are distributed as souvenirs.

I salute the entire community of Malvern and Hot Spring County as they celebrate this historic milestone. I commend them for keeping the history and heritage of their community alive.●

ARKANSAS' NATIONAL HISTORY DAY WINNERS

● Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I congratulate the Arkansas elementary and secondary school students who recently joined students from across the Nation to participate in the annual Kenneth E. Behring National History Day Contest in Washington, DC. This contest in our Nation's Capitol is the final stage of a series of National History Day contests throughout the school year at the State and local level.

Each year, more than half a million students, encouraged by thousands of teachers nationwide, participate in National History Day. Students choose historical topics related to a theme and conduct research through libraries, archives, museums, oral history interviews and historic sites. The students then present their work in original papers, Web sites, exhibits, performances, and documentaries, which are evaluated by professional historians and educators.

I commend the commitment to learning so clearly on display from the young Arkansans who took part in this event. Their hard work and dedication represents the best of our State, and I am proud of their achievements. By participating in events like National History Day, our young citizens can develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills, along with confidence and self-esteem. These skills will prepare them for the future and help keep our State and Nation strong.

Arkansas students recognized in the annual Kenneth E. Behring National History Day Contest are:

SPECIAL AWARD: HISTORY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Conway High School East
Conway
Senior Group Exhibit: The Road to Innovation: The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956
Teachers: William Richardson & Charles Williams
Students: Lauren Hart, Anna Jordan, Annie Patton

OUTSTANDING ENTRIES FOR ARKANSAS

Lisa Academy-North

Sherwood, AR
Best Junior Division Project: Sputnik: The Sky is Never the Limit
Teacher: Dustin Seaton
Students: Morgan Depriest, Alena Higgins, Yulia Batalina
Alma High School
Alma
Best Senior Division Project: Disney Animations: A Lifetime of Innovation
Teachers: Toney McMurray, Erin Mills, Manesseh Moore
Students: Courtney Craft, Breanna Witherspoon

JUNIOR GROUP DOCUMENTARY

Lisa Academy-North
Sherwood
Project: Sputnik: The Sky is Never the Limit
Teacher: Dustin Seaton
Students: Morgan Depriest, Alena Higgins, Yulia Batalina
Northridge Middle School
Van Buren
Project: Weather Satellites: The Difference Between Survival and Death
Teacher: Jeanie Perkins
Students: Braydon Montgomery, Peyton Bettencourt

JUNIOR INDIVIDUAL EXHIBIT

Carl Stuart Middle School
Conway
Project: Crossett Experiment of 1916: An Innovation That Changed Malaria Eradication
Teachers: Sherry Holder, Kaye McMillian
Student: Rebecca Philpott
JUNIOR PAPER
Russellville Jr. High School
Russellville
Project: The Innovation of the Flushing Toilet: The Beginning of Human Civilization
Teacher: Aimee Mimms
Student: Emily Austin

SENIOR GROUP EXHIBIT

Conway High School East
Conway
Project: The Road to Innovation: The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956
Teacher: William Richardson, Charles Williams
Students: Lauren Hart, Anna Jordan, Annie Patton

SENIOR INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENTARY

Conway High School East
Conway
Project: A Picture is Worth A Thousand Words: The Innovation of Photojournalism
Teachers: William Richardson, Charles Williams
Student: Elisa Detogni

SENIOR GROUP PERFORMANCE

Conway High School East
Conway
Project: One Giant Leap for Mankind: Apollo 11 and The Innovative Idea To Put A Man On The Moon
Teachers: William Richardson, Charles Williams
Students: Jeannie Corbitt, Rachel Ford

SENIOR WEB SITE

Pulaski Academy
Little Rock
Project: Deng Xiaoping: China's Economic Revolution
Teacher: Jody Musgrove
Student: Tc Zhang●

ARKANSAS' "40 UNDER 40"

● Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I honor and congratulate 40 of Arkansas's brightest young professionals who

were recently named to Arkansas Business' "40 Under 40" list for 2010.

These young adults represent the best of our State, and I am proud to see them earn this recognition. I am particularly proud to see one of my own staffers on this list, Little Rock native Tamika Edwards. I have seen Tamika's hard work and dedication firsthand, and I know that her work ethic is shared by all of the recipients of this prestigious honor.

These honorees now join an elite group of business and community leaders, and I look forward to working with them as they continue to grow in their careers.

I also commend the editors and readers of Arkansas Business for choosing to highlight these young individuals and their efforts for our State.

Members of the 2010 "40 Under 40" group, as named by Arkansas Business, are:

Alexandru Biris, 36—UALR Nanotechnology Center
Chris Bates, 38—The Computer Hut
Allison Cox, 35—Windstream Corp.
John E. Heard, 38—McGehee-Desha County Hospital
Josh Jenkins, 36—Parker Cadillac
Mandy Kelley, 38—Greater Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce
Deanna Newberry, 38—Honeywell International Inc.
Brian Vandiver, 35—Mitchell Williams Selig Gates & Woodyard PLLC
Michele Simmons Allgood, 39—Williams & Anderson PLC
Kristine G. Baker, 39—Quattlebaum Grooms Tull & Burrow PLC
Elizabeth Bintliff, 33—Heifer International
Shannon E. Butler, 32—City Year Little Rock/North Little Rock
Craig Shelly, 34—USA Truck Inc.
Jim Chidester, 39—Chidester Engineering PLLC
Courtney Henry, 37—Arkansas Court of Appeals and Arkansas Supreme Court
Audrey House, 32—Chateau Aux Arc Vineyards & Winery
Sam O'Bryant III, 30—Pulaski County Government
Dan Young, 37—Rose Law Firm
Tom Leonard Jr., 35—PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
Robert Coon, 30—Impact Management Group
John Bacon, 39—eStem Public Charter Schools
Chad Evans, 39—Arvest Bank
Kyle Allmendinger, 33—Datek Inc.
Tim Hicks, 38—Bank of the Ozarks
Cristian Murdock, 39—Arkansas State University
Jason Taylor, 35—First Community Bank
Justin Acri, 36—KABZ-FM, 103.7
Jean C. Block, 36—Office of the Arkansas Attorney General, Health Care Bureau
Chris Cranford, 37—Jones Film Video
Tamika Edwards, 31—Office of Senator Blanche Lincoln
Tara Smith, 31—Arkansas Department of Higher Education
Brooke Vines, 37—Vines Media
Shayla Copas, 36—Shayla Copas Interiors
Russell Harris, 39—Entergy Arkansas Inc.
Roberts Lee, 39—Meadors Adams & Lee
Gwendolyn Bryant-Smith, 35—Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System
Melissa Hendricks, 37—Pulaski Technical College
Scott Shirey, 34—KIPP Delta Public School

Kevin Keech, 39—Keech Law Firm
Melissa Snell, 33—Snell Prosthetic &
Orthotic Laboratory●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ED JACKSON

● Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the service of COL Donald E. "Ed" Jackson, Jr., as the Commander of the Little Rock District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, from June 28, 2007, to June 15, 2010. Colonel Jackson has been assigned to serve as chief of staff of the 8th U.S. Army in Korea where I have no doubt he will go on to serve our country in a proud and loyal fashion. He has been a pleasure to work with and I wish him well on his next mission.

While Commander of the Little Rock District, Colonel Jackson displayed excellent leadership for one of the most diverse Army Corps of Engineer districts in the United States while managing roughly 730 employees, 13 locks and dams, 12 multipurpose lakes and 7 powerplants. Colonel Jackson showed exemplary skill in working with stakeholders, building relationships, and providing necessary leadership to execute the district's programs.

Under his command, the district initiated many major projects including construction on Ozark Hydro-electric powerplant rehabilitation and the landmark White River Minimum Flow Project along the Upper-White River Basin. These were not easy assignments, but under his leadership, Arkansas made significant headway. I also commend him for the critical leadership he provided for his neighboring districts to improve quality of service at Corps of Engineers operated campgrounds. And, he did an excellent job of implementing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding for the Little Rock District, which provided much needed investments in aging infrastructure. He did this while also overseeing the operation and maintenance of the McClellan-Kerr Navigation Channel, which is one of our nation's best navigation systems serving as a critical component of our economy.

To go along with his service on energy and water infrastructure projects, he played a critical role in overseeing and executing a \$750 million program of military construction for the Little Rock Air Force Base and Pine Bluff Arsenal to improve the quality of life and work for our soldiers. Colonel Jackson also developed strong relationships with the Regional Veteran's Administration by assisting with \$175 million in projects critical to the healthcare system, and he assumed a new mission by managing the world-wide Air Force Medical Command O&M program with a \$180 million budget.

In addition to his skills in managing scheduled operations, Colonel Jackson exhibited adaptability and care for the people during local and regional emergencies in different major events. Dur-

ing record Arkansas flooding in the spring of 2008, Colonel Jackson successfully directed the district's management and control of water in the Upper-White River Basin to minimize flood related losses. He also deployed to the State of Texas to assist in the recovery from Hurricane Ike in Galveston, TX.

Colonel Jackson is a proven leader of people and organizations. His passion, leadership, and influence have greatly increased the readiness and effectiveness of the Little Rock District. I fully believe that he helped shape the district to meet the future needs of the people of Arkansas. I appreciate his service to the people of Arkansas, and I wish him well in his continued service to our country.●

REMEMBERING CLARENCE WOLF GUTS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Clarence Wolf Guts, of Wanblee, SD. Clarence passed away on June 16, 2010, at the age of 86.

The last surviving Oglala Lakota code talker, Clarence Wolf Guts was an American hero. Serving in World War II as a Native American code talker, Clarence helped win the war by transmitting critical military messages in his native language, which the Japanese and German militaries could not translate.

Clarence enlisted in the U.S. Army on June 17, 1942, at age 18. One of 11 South Dakotan Lakota, Nakota, and Dakota Native American code talkers, Clarence was recruited to help develop a phonetic alphabet based on the Lakota language. This alphabet was eventually used to develop the Lakota code.

Serving as a code talker, Clarence's primary job was transmitting coded messages from a general to his chief of staff in the field. Courageous and self-sacrificing, the efforts of Clarence and other code talkers were essential for the Allied victory.

Honorably discharged on January 13, 1946, Pfc. Wolf Guts was a man willing and able to serve his country. I have a great deal of respect for Clarence and for the extraordinary contributions Mr. Wolf Guts made to our country. The efforts of the Lakota Code Talkers saved the lives of many soldiers, and Clarence Wolf Guts was a true American hero.

Today I wish to celebrate the life of an extraordinary man. As we mourn the loss of this great South Dakotan, I extend my thoughts, prayers and best wishes to Clarence's family, friends, and loved ones.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6301. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National

Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2010 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications" (RIN0648-XQ49) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6302. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 31; Correction" (RIN0648-AX67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6303. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Red Snapper Closure" (RIN0648-AX75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6304. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Amendment 3" (RIN0648-AW65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6305. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Restrictions and Observer Requirements in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2009-2011" (RIN0648-XW12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6306. A communication from the Acting Director of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XW47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6307. A communication from the Acting Director of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 m) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XW55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 16, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6308. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Encryption Export Controls: Revision of License Exception ENC and Mass Market Eligibility, Submission Procedures, Reporting Requirements, License Application Requirements, and Addition of Note 4 to Category 5,

Part 2" (RIN0694-AE89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6309. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California and Imported Table Grapes; Relaxation of Handling Requirements" (Docket Nos. AMS-FV-09-0085; FV10-925-1 FIR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6310. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sweet Onions Grown in the Walla Walla Valley of Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon; Changes to Reporting and Assessment Due Dates" (Docket Nos. AMS-FV-10-0020; FV10-956-1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6311. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Order Amending Marketing Order No. 930" (Docket Nos. AO-370-A8; AMS-FV-06-0213; FV07-930-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6312. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2010-2011 Marketing Year" (Docket Nos. AMS-FV-09-0082; FV10-985-1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6313. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2009-2010 Crop Year" (Docket Nos. AMS-FV-09-0069; FV09-930-2 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6314. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sweet Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Change in the Handling Regulation" (Docket Nos. AMS-FV-09-0033; FV09-923-1 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6315. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rates" (Docket

Nos. AMS-FV-09-0091; FV10-916-917-2 FR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6316. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Increase Membership" (Docket Nos. AMS-FV-09-0022; FV-09-705) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6317. A communication from the Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fees for 2010 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers" (Docket Nos. AMS-CN-09-0011; CN-10-001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 18, 2010; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KERRY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3104. A bill to permanently authorize Radio Free Asia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111-214).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 3517. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of claims for disability compensation filed with the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3518. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit recognition and enforcement of foreign defamation judgments in United States Courts where those judgments undermine the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to provide a cause of action for declaratory judgment relief against a party who has brought a successful foreign defamation action whose judgment undermines the first amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3519. A bill to stabilize the matching requirement for participants in the Hollings Manufacturing Partnership Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3520. A bill to provide for an extension of unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 3521. A bill to provide for the reestablishment of a domestic rare earths materials production and supply industry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3522. A bill to protect children affected by immigration enforcement actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 311

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 311, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign non-governmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 334

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 334, a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Moldova.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to utilize home monitoring and communications technologies.

S. 478

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 478, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure the right of employees to a secret-ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide continued entitlement to coverage for immunosuppressive drugs furnished to beneficiaries under the Medicare Program that have received a kidney transplant and whose entitlement to coverage would otherwise expire, and for other purposes.

S. 714

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 714, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1055

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1237

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1237, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the grant program for homeless veterans with special needs to include male homeless veterans with minor dependents and to establish a grant program for reintegration of homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and reduce the occurrence of sudden unexpected infant death and to enhance public health activities related to stillbirth.

S. 1545

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1545, a bill to expand the research and awareness activities of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to scleroderma, and for other purposes.

S. 1598

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1598, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system.

S. 2750

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2750, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to eligible States for the purpose of reducing the student-to-school nurse ratio in public secondary schools, elementary schools, and kindergarten.

S. 2801

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2801, a bill to provide children in foster care with school stability and equal access to educational opportunities.

S. 2882

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2882, a bill to amend the Inter-

nal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to the treatment of individuals as independent contractors or employees, and for other purposes.

S. 2903

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2903, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks for child care providers.

S. 3058

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3058, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the special diabetes programs for Type I diabetes and Indians under that Act.

S. 3108

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3108, a bill to amend title 31 of the United States Code to require that Federal children's programs be separately displayed and analyzed in the President's budget.

S. 3234

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3234, a bill to improve employment, training, and placement services furnished to veterans, especially those serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 3320

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. BURRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3320, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Pancreatic Cancer Initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 3339

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3339, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers.

S. 3345

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3345, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to remove the cap on punitive damages established by the Supreme Court in *Exxon Shipping Company v. Baker*.

S. 3347

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3347, a bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program through December 31, 2010.

S. 3364

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3364, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish the Office of Energy and Renewable Energy as the lead Federal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local assistance provided to promote the energy retrofitting of schools.

S. 3479

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3479, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to establish and implement a birth defects prevention, risk reduction, and public awareness program.

S. 3481

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3481, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution.

S. 3512

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 3512, a bill to provide a statutory waiver of compliance with the Jones Act to foreign flagged vessels assisting in responding to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

S. 3513

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3513, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for one year the special depreciation allowances for certain property.

S. RES. 411

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 411, a resolution recognizing the importance and sustainability of the United States hardwoods industry and urging that United States hardwoods and the products derived from United States hardwoods be given full consideration in any program to promote construction of environmentally preferable commercial, public, or private buildings.

S. RES. 541

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 541, a resolution designating June 27, 2010, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day".

S. RES. 546

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. LEMIEUX) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 546, a resolution recognizing the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the

Smithsonian Institution, as the only museum in the United States dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience.

S. RES. 552

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 552, a resolution designating June 23, 2010, as "Olympic Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 4342

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4342 intended to be proposed to H.R. 4213, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. AKAKA:

S. 3517. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of claims for disability compensation filed with the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I introduce the proposed Claims Processing Improvement Act of 2010, to focus on enhancements that can be made to adjudicate veterans' disability compensation claims in a more timely and accurate manner.

VA has seen a dramatic rise in the number of claims, driven by a number of factors, including the aging of the general veteran population and our prolonged involvement in two overseas conflicts. Further complicating matters, many claims are increasing in complexity, as veterans seek service-connection for multiple disabilities and for disabilities that are difficult to diagnose, such as traumatic brain injury and post traumatic stress disorder.

Claims adjudication is an intricate process that has seen many piecemeal changes in recent years. Unfortunately, these changes have yet to produce the results that veterans deserve. My goal, a goal that I am sure is widely shared, is to ensure that veterans are provided accurate and timely resolution to their claims.

This legislation I am introducing today would make several improvements in the claims adjudication process. Provisions in title I of the bill would establish a pilot program that would utilize ICD codes to identify disabilities of the musculoskeletal system. Over fifty percent of Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom veterans that the Department of Veterans Affairs has had some health care contact with have a possible musculoskeletal diagnosis. ICD codes are standard medical condition identification codes used in electronic records that have been

adapted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for electronic transmission of medical data.

This proposed pilot program would take place in six to ten regional offices and require VA to develop a new method of rating claims, which would consider the frequency, severity, and duration of symptoms of the disability in rating the claim, rather than the current rating schedule published in the Code of Federal Regulations. The current rating schedule adds to the complexity of claims adjudication, because many disabilities claimed are not exactly as described in the regulation and several rating codes may need to be considered. The new rating schedule would focus on the impact of the disability, for example, an inability to walk normally, rather than a particular VA rating code classification. All limitations resulting from all disabilities of the musculoskeletal system would be combined to provide one rating, rather than separate ratings for each individual disability. This information would be placed into an organized and searchable electronic record. A veteran could elect to not participate in the pilot program. I believe that such an approach will result in fairer, comprehensive ratings for the entire musculoskeletal system.

Title II of the bill includes a number of provisions that are intended to yield some near-term changes to the claims processing system and should help reduce the overall time a claim is under consideration by VA. During the last several years, the Committee has held oversight hearings on the claims processing system. Many of the provisions in this legislation were first suggested by veterans service organizations and other interested parties in connection with those hearings. Others have been recommended by the administration. The legislation I am introducing today serves as a starting point to move forward in our effort to improve VA's claims adjudication process.

Provisions in title II would allow for VA to issue partial ratings of claims that include multiple issues for those issues that can adjudicated expeditiously; give equal deference to private medical opinions during the rating process; and clarify that the Secretary is required to provide notice to claimants of additional information and evidence required only when additional evidence is actually required. It would also modify filing periods for notices of disagreement from one year to 180 days and require a claimant to file a substantive appeal within 60 days of the Department issuing a post-Notice of Disagreement decision both of these modifications would contain good cause exceptions to the filing deadlines.

Other provisions in title II would automatically waive the review of new evidence by the agency of original jurisdiction, usually a Regional Office, so that any evidence submitted after the initial decision would be subject to ini-

tial review at the Board of Veterans' Appeals unless the claimant or the claimant's representative requests in writing that the agency of original jurisdiction initially review such evidence. This legislation would also replace the Secretary's obligation to provide a Statement of the Case with an obligation to provide a post-Notice of Disagreement decision. The post-Notice of Disagreement decision would be in plain language and contain a description of the specific facts in the case that support the decision including, if applicable, an assessment as to the credibility of any lay evidence pertinent to the issue or issues with which disagreement has been expressed; a citation to pertinent laws and regulations that support the decision; the decision on each issue and a summary of the reasons why the evidence relied upon supports such decision under the specific laws and regulations applied; and the date by which a substantive appeal must be filed in order to obtain further review of the decision. The Secretary would also be required to send, with a rating decision, a form that if completed and returned, would suffice as a notice of disagreement.

This is not a comprehensive recitation of all of the provisions within this important veterans' legislation but does, I hope, provide an overview of the changes encompassed in this bill.

Everyone involved realizes that there is no quick fix to solving the myriad issues associated with disability claims processing, but the Committee intends to do everything within its power to improve this situation. To bring optimal change to a system this complicated and critical, we must be deliberative, focused, and open to input from all who are involved in this process.

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. 3517

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Claims Processing Improvement Act of 2010".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—RATING OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES MATTERS

Sec. 101. Pilot program on evaluation and rating of service-connected disabilities of the musculoskeletal system.

TITLE II—ADJUDICATION AND APPEAL MATTERS

Sec. 201. Partial adjudication of claims for disability compensation consisting of multiple issues one or more of which can be quickly adjudicated.

- Sec. 202. Clarification that requirement of Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide notice to claimants of additional information and evidence required only applies when additional information or evidence is actually required.
- Sec. 203. Equal deference to private medical opinions in assessing claims for disability compensation.
- Sec. 204. Improvements to disability compensation claim review process.
- Sec. 205. Provision by Secretary of Veterans Affairs of notice of disagreement forms to initiate appellate review with notices of decisions of Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 206. Modification of filing period for notice of disagreement to initiate appellate review of decisions of Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 207. Modification of substantive appeal process.
- Sec. 208. Provision of post-notice of disagreement decisions to claimants who file notice of disagreements.
- Sec. 209. Automatic waiver of agency of original jurisdiction review of new evidence.
- Sec. 210. Authority for Board of Veterans' Appeals to determine location and manner of appearance for hearings.
- Sec. 211. Decision by Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims on all issues raised by appellants.
- Sec. 212. Good cause extension of period for filing notice of appeal with United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.
- Sec. 213. Pilot program on participation of local and tribal governments in improving quality of claims for disability compensation submitted to Department of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE I—RATING OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES MATTERS

SEC. 101. PILOT PROGRAM ON EVALUATION AND RATING OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES OF THE MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM.

(a) **PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of applying an alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities of the musculoskeletal system.

(b) **SCHEDULE FOR RATING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 240 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities of the musculoskeletal system.

(2) **PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.**—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish the alternative schedule established under paragraph (1) in the Federal Register.

(3) **COLLABORATION.**—The Secretary shall establish the alternative schedule required by paragraph (1) collaboratively through the Under Secretary for Benefits, the Under Secretary for Health, and the General Counsel.

(4) **ELEMENTS.**—The alternative schedule for rating disabilities under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The use of the International Classification of Diseases, as adopted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 1173(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2(c)) and any successor revisions to such classification so adopted, for purposes

of identifying disabilities of the musculoskeletal system.

(B) A residual functional capacity assessment instrument to describe the functional musculoskeletal loss resulting from any disability of the musculoskeletal system.

(C) Mechanisms for the assignment of one residual functional capacity rating for all musculoskeletal disabilities determined to be service-connected, which mechanisms shall take into account the following:

(i) Frequency of symptoms affecting residual functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system, set forth as a range of—

(I) infrequent (once a year or less);

(II) several (two to six) times a year;

(III) occasional (seven to twelve times a year);

(IV) weekly; and

(V) daily or continuous.

(ii) Severity of symptoms affecting residual functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system resulting in loss of functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system, set forth as a range of—

(I) minimal (symptoms present but requiring no treatment);

(II) slight (such as requiring minor alteration of activity or treatment with over-the-counter medication);

(III) mild (such as requiring rest of relevant body part and use of over-the-counter medication, prescription medication, or therapy, such as ice or heat to an affected part);

(IV) moderate (such as requiring medical evaluation and treatment or prescription medication for pain or symptom control with side effects which can be expected to interfere with full performance of work-related activities); and

(V) moderately severe to severe (such as requiring the need to use assistive devices for ambulation, use of opioid or similar prescription medication to control pain which precludes driving or being around machinery, in-patient hospitalization or rehabilitation or frequent out-patient treatment physical therapy, or loss or loss of use of functional capacity in both arms or feet, or one arm and one foot, or requiring a wheelchair for mobility).

(iii) Duration of symptoms affecting residual functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system resulting in reduced functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system, set forth as a range of—

(I) one day or less to one week;

(II) more than one week but less than four weeks;

(III) four weeks or more but less than six months;

(IV) six months or more but less than one year; and

(V) one year or more.

(D) Mechanisms for the assignment of ratings of disability in certain cases as follows:

(i) If the veteran has an active musculoskeletal cancer or other active musculoskeletal disability likely to result in death, a rating of 100 percent.

(ii) If the veteran would qualify for a temporary disability rating under section 1156 of title 38, United States Code, the rating provided under that section.

(iii) If the veteran would qualify for a temporary disability rating under any regulations prescribed by the Secretary not provided for under this section, the rating assigned under such regulations.

(E) Such other mechanisms as the Secretary considers appropriate for the pilot program.

(5) **FORMS FOR RECORDING RESIDUAL FUNCTIONAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall establish one or more functional capacity assessment forms to be used in performing as-

sessments with the instrument required by paragraph (4)(B).

(B) **AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make the forms established under subparagraph (A) available to the public in an electronic format for use by any physician or other medical provider in assessing the residual functional capacity related to disabilities of the musculoskeletal system.

(6) **EXEMPTION FROM APA.**—The establishment of the alternative schedule required by paragraph (1) shall not be subject to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Administrative Procedure Act").

(c) **APPLICATION OF ALTERNATIVE SCHEDULE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary shall apply the alternative schedule for rating disabilities established under subsection (b) to veterans described in paragraph (3) who have a condition of the musculoskeletal system that has been determined to be a disability incurred or aggravated during military service to determine the rating to be assigned for such disability.

(2) **APPLICATION THROUGH REGIONAL OFFICES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall apply the alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities under this subsection through not fewer than six and not more than ten regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs selected by the Secretary for purposes of the pilot program.

(B) **DIVERSITY OF SELECTION.**—In selecting regional offices under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall select—

(i) at least one regional office considered by the Secretary to be a small office;

(ii) at least one regional office considered by the Secretary to be a large office; and

(iii) regional offices representing a variety of geographic settings.

(3) **COVERED VETERANS.**—Veterans described in this paragraph are veterans who—

(A) submit to the Secretary more than one year after their date of discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service an original claim for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary;

(B) allege in the claim described in subparagraph (A) the existence of a condition of the musculoskeletal system that was incurred or aggravated in such military, naval, or air service;

(C) file such claim with a regional office of the Department with original jurisdiction of the claim that is participating in the pilot program; and

(D) have not expressly declined participation in the pilot program.

(4) **RELATION TO COMBINED RATINGS TABLE.**—A rating assigned for a musculoskeletal service-connected disability under the pilot program shall be determined without regard to the Combined Ratings Table in title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, except that in determining the final rating of all service-connected disabilities, the rating for musculoskeletal disabilities as determined under the pilot program shall be combined with any other disabilities using such table.

(5) **TREATMENT OF DISABILITY RATINGS FOR LOSS OF BODILY INTEGRITY.**—Compensation under laws administered by the Secretary for a disability receiving a disability rating under the schedule established under subsection (b)(1) shall be, as applicable, in addition to or consistent with any compensation otherwise provided under subsections (k) through (s) of section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(6) **LIMITATIONS ON DENIAL OF SERVICE CONNECTION.**—During the pilot program, the Secretary may not determine a musculoskeletal

condition of a veteran to be not service-connected for purposes of the veteran's participation in the pilot program unless the Secretary—

(1) obtains, or receives a report of, a medical examination of the veteran which—

(A) includes a brief history of the veteran's military service relevant to the condition;

(B) identifies the diagnosed musculoskeletal disabilities in accordance with the classification required by subsection (b)(4)(A); and

(C) describes the functional limitations of such conditions, and if applicable, any secondary conditions related to such alleged conditions or any non-service connected disability aggravated by the alleged conditions; and

(2) obtains or receives a medical opinion on—

(A) the nexus between any diagnosed musculoskeletal condition alleged to be service-connected and the active military, naval, or air service of the veteran; and

(B) if applicable, the relationship between any service-connected disabilities of the veteran and any secondary disabilities related to such disabilities or any non-service connected disability aggravated by the alleged conditions.

(e) RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall maintain for purposes of the pilot program a separate searchable electronic file on each veteran covered by the pilot program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The electronic file maintained with respect to a veteran under paragraph (1) shall include for the following:

(A) An index of the documents contained in the electronic file.

(B) The claim of the veteran for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary, including any reapplication with respect to such claim.

(C) The service treatment records of the veteran from medical care received while serving in the active military, naval, or air service and any other medical treatment records of the veteran from service during periods of active or inactive duty for training.

(D) The personnel records of service of the veteran—

(i) in the active military, naval, or air service; and

(ii) in the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(E) Such other private or public medical records of the veteran as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(F) Records of any medical examinations and medical opinions on the residual functional capacity of the musculoskeletal system of the veteran, including any examinations and opinions obtained under subsection (d).

(G) Records of any medical examinations and medical opinions concerning any non-musculoskeletal disabilities claimed by the veteran as service-connected.

(H) Any non-medical evidence applicable to the claim.

(I) Current information and evidence on any dependents of the veteran for purposes of the laws administered by the Secretary.

(J) Ratings and decisions of the Secretary with respect to the claims of the veteran.

(K) Information concerning the amount of compensation paid to the veteran under laws administered by the Secretary.

(L) Any notices or correspondence sent by the Secretary to the veteran or any correspondence submitted by the veteran to the Secretary in connection with the claim that does not contain evidence or information applicable to the claims of the veteran.

(3) ORGANIZATION.—Each file required by paragraph (1) shall be stored or displayed

with separate sections for each element required under paragraph (2).

(f) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION.—The Secretary shall cease the application to veterans under subsection (c) of the alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities under subsection (b) for purposes of the pilot program on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) PRESERVATION OF RATINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a disability rating assigned under the alternative schedule established under subsection (b) shall not be reduced during or after termination of the pilot program absent evidence of clear and unmistakable error in the original assignment of the rating or evidence of an improvement in the musculoskeletal disability manifested by less frequent, less severe, or shorter duration of symptoms measured over a period of at least six months in the year prior to any reevaluation.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to ratings assigned for temporary periods as provided in subsection (b)(4)(D).

(h) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, all applicable provisions of law administered by the Secretary shall apply to decisions of the Secretary made under the pilot program.

(i) INTERIM REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives an interim report on the pilot program.

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

(A) A description of the alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities established under subsection (b).

(B) The rationale for the alternative schedule as described under subparagraph (A).

(C) A description of the policies and procedures established under the pilot program.

(j) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years and 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the pilot program.

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

(A) A copy of the alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities established under subsection (b) and any changes made to such schedule during the pilot program.

(B) A description and assessment of the application of the alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities of veterans, including—

(i) the total number of veterans to which the alternative schedule was applied;

(ii) the total number of veterans determined to have a service-connected disability consisting of a condition of the musculoskeletal system; and

(iii) the ratings of disability assigned to veterans described in clause (ii), set forth by percentage of disability assigned.

(C) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of applying the alternative schedule for rating service-connected disabilities to additional claimants.

(D) A comparison of a representative sample of decisions rendered by different regional offices for similar disabilities participating in the pilot program.

(E) The number of appeals filed for claims adjudicated under the pilot program.

(F) An assessment of the effectiveness of the electronic file maintained under subsection (e) in—

(i) the adjudication of claims under the pilot program; and

(ii) improving the efficiency of decision making by the Department.

(G) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate in light of the pilot program.

(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "active military, naval, or air service" has the meaning given that term in section 101(24) of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term "non-service-connected", with respect to a disability, has the meaning given that term in section 101(17) of title 38, United States Code.

(3) The term "service-connected", with respect to a disability, has the meaning given that term in section 101(16) of title 38, United States Code.

TITLE II—ADJUDICATION AND APPEAL MATTERS

SEC. 201. PARTIAL ADJUDICATION OF CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION CONSISTING OF MULTIPLE ISSUES ONE OR MORE OF WHICH CAN BE QUICKLY ADJUDICATED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1157 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) ASSIGNMENT OF PARTIAL RATINGS.—(1) In the case of a veteran who submits to the Secretary a claim for compensation under this chapter for more than one condition and the Secretary determines that a disability rating can be assigned without further development for one or more conditions but not all conditions in the claim, the Secretary shall—

"(A) expeditiously assign a disability rating for the condition or conditions that the Secretary determined could be assigned without further development; and

"(B) continue development of the remaining conditions.

"(2) If the Secretary is able to assign a disability rating for a condition described in paragraph (1)(B) with respect to a claim, the Secretary shall assign such rating and combine such rating with the rating or ratings previously assigned under paragraph (1)(A) with respect to that claim."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to claims filed on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. CLARIFICATION THAT REQUIREMENT OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO CLAIMANTS OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE REQUIRED ONLY APPLIES WHEN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR EVIDENCE IS ACTUALLY REQUIRED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5103(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: "If the Secretary receives a complete or substantially complete application that does not include information or medical or lay evidence not previously provided to the Secretary that is necessary to substantiate the claim, the Secretary shall, upon receipt of such application, notify the claimant and the claimant's representative, if any, that such information or evidence is necessary to substantiate the claim."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to claims filed on or after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. EQUAL DEFERENCE TO PRIVATE MEDICAL OPINIONS IN ASSESSING CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

(a) PROVISION OF DEFERENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5103A the following new section:

“§ 5103B. Treatment of private medical opinions

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If a claimant submits a private medical opinion in support of a claim for disability compensation in accordance with standards established by the Secretary, such opinion shall be treated by the Secretary with the same deference as a medical opinion provided by a Department health care provider.

“(b) SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION.—(1) If a private medical opinion submitted as described in subsection (a) is found by the Secretary to be competent, credible, and probative, but otherwise not entirely adequate for purposes of assigning a disability rating and the Secretary determines a medical opinion from a Department health care provider is necessary for such purpose, the Secretary shall obtain from an appropriate Department health care provider (as determined pursuant to the standards described in subsection (a)) a medical opinion that is adequate for such purposes.

“(2) If the Secretary obtains a medical opinion from a Department health care provider under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall ensure that the medical opinion is obtained from a health care provider of the Department that has professional qualifications that are at least equal to the qualifications of the provider of the private medical opinion described in such paragraph.

“(c) DEPARTMENT HEALTH CARE PROVIDER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘Department health care provider’ includes a provider of health care who provides health care under contract with the Department.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5103A the following new item:

“5103B. Treatment of private medical opinions.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 5103B of such title, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to claims pending or filed on or after the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) NOTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5103(a) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) A notice provided under this subsection shall inform a claimant, as the Secretary considers appropriate with respect to the claimant’s claim—

“(A) of the rights of the claimant to assistance under section 5103A of this title; and

“(B) if the claimant submits a private medical opinion in support of a claim for disability compensation, how such medical opinion will be treated under section 5103B of this title.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (3) of such section 5103(a), as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect on the date that is 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. IMPROVEMENTS TO DISABILITY COMPENSATION CLAIM REVIEW PROCESS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FAST TRACK CLAIM REVIEW PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 51 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 5103B, as added by section 203 of this Act, the following new section:

“§ 5103C. Expedited review of initial claims for disability compensation

“(a) PROCESS REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall establish a process for the rapid identification of initial claims for disability compensation that should, in the adjudication of such claims, receive priority in the order of review.

“(b) REVIEW OF INITIAL CLAIMS.—As part of the process required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall assign employees of the Department who are experienced in the processing of claims for disability compensation to carry out a preliminary review of all initial claims for disability compensation submitted to the Secretary in order to identify whether—

“(1) the claims have the potential of being adjudicated quickly;

“(2) the claims qualify for priority treatment under paragraph (2) of subsection (c); and

“(3) a temporary disability rating could be assigned with respect to the claims under section 1156 of this title.

“(c) PRIORITY IN ADJUDICATION OF INITIAL CLAIMS.—(1) As part of the process required by subsection (a) and except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, in the adjudication of initial claims for disability compensation submitted to the Secretary, give priority to the order of review of such claims to claims identified under subsection (b)(1) as having the potential of being adjudicated quickly.

“(2) The Secretary may, under regulations the Secretary shall prescribe, provide priority in the order of review of initial claims for disability compensation for the adjudication of the following:

“(A) Initial claims for disability compensation submitted by homeless claimants.

“(B) Initial claims for disability compensation submitted by veterans who are terminally ill.

“(C) Initial claims for disability compensation submitted by claimants suffering severe financial hardship.

“(D) Partially adjudicated claims for disability compensation under section 1157(b) of this title.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5103B, as so added, the following new item:

“5103C. Expedited review of initial claims for disability compensation.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 5103C of such title, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR CLAIMANTS TO END DEVELOPMENT OF CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such subchapter is further amended by inserting after section 5103C, as added by subsection (a), the following new section:

“§ 5103D. Procedures for fully developed claims

“Upon notification received from a claimant that the claimant has no additional information or evidence to submit, the Secretary may determine that the claim is a fully developed claim. The Secretary shall then undertake any development necessary

for any Federal records, medical examinations, or opinions relevant to the claim and may decide the claim based on all the evidence of record.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 51 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5103C, as added by subsection (a), the following new item:

“5103D. Procedures for fully developed claims.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 5103D of such title, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. PROVISION BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENT FORMS TO INITIATE APPELLATE REVIEW WITH NOTICES OF DECISIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “also include (1) a” and all that follows and inserting the following: “include the following:

“(1) A statement of the reasons for the decision.

“(2) A summary of the evidence relied upon by the Secretary in making the decision.

“(3) An explanation of the procedure for obtaining review of the decision.

“(4) A form that, once completed, can serve as a notice of disagreement under section 7105(a) of this title.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. MODIFICATION OF FILING PERIOD FOR NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENT TO INITIATE APPELLATE REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FILING OF NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENT BY CLAIMANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 7105(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “one year” and inserting “180 days” in the first sentence; and

(B) by striking “one-year” and inserting “180-day” in the third sentence.

(2) ELECTRONIC FILING.—Such paragraph is further amended by inserting “or transmitted by electronic means” after “post-marked”.

(3) GOOD CAUSE EXCEPTION FOR UNTIMELY FILING OF NOTICES OF DISAGREEMENT.—Such section 7105(b) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) A notice of disagreement not filed within the time prescribed by paragraph (1) shall be treated by the Secretary as timely filed if—

“(i) the Secretary determines that the claimant, legal guardian, or other accredited representative, attorney, or authorized agent filing the notice had good cause for the lack of filing within such time; and

“(ii) the notice of disagreement is filed not later than 186 days after the period prescribed by paragraph (1).

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, good cause shall include the following:

“(i) Circumstances relating to any physical, mental, educational, or linguistic limitation of the claimant, legal guardian, representative, attorney, or authorized agent concerned (including lack of facility with the English language).

“(ii) Circumstances relating to significant delay in the delivery of the initial decision or of the notice of disagreement caused by natural disaster or factors relating to geographic location.

“(iii) A change in financial circumstances, including the payment of medical expenses or other changes in income or net worth that are considered in determining eligibility for benefits and services on an annualized basis for purposes of needs-based benefits under chapters 15 and 17 of this title.”.

(b) APPLICATION BY DEPARTMENT FOR REVIEW ON APPEAL.—Section 7106 of such title is amended in the first sentence by striking “one-year period described in section 7105” and inserting “period described in section 7105(b)(1)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to claims filed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 207. MODIFICATION OF SUBSTANTIVE APPEAL PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7105 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “The claimant will be afforded” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e)(1) A claimant shall be afforded a period of 60 days from the date the post-notice of disagreement decision is mailed under subsection (d) to file a substantive appeal.

“(2)(A) The period under paragraph (1) may be extended for an additional 60 days for good cause shown on a request for such extension submitted in writing within such period.

“(B) For purposes of this paragraph, good cause shall include the following:

“(i) Circumstances relating to any physical, mental, educational, or linguistic limitation of the claimant, legal guardian, or other accredited representative, attorney, or authorized agent filing the request (including lack of facility with the English language).

“(ii) Circumstances relating to significant delay in the delivery of the initial decision or of the notice of disagreement caused by natural disaster or factors relating to geographic location.

“(iii) A change in financial circumstances, including the payment of medical expenses or other changes in income or net worth that are considered in determining eligibility for benefits and services on an annualized basis for purposes of needs-based benefits under chapters 15 and 17 of this title.

“(3) A substantive appeal under this subsection shall identify the particular determination or determinations being appealed and allege specific errors of fact or law made by the agency of original jurisdiction in each determination being appealed.

“(4) A claimant in any case under this subsection may not be presumed to agree with any statement of fact contained in the post-notice of disagreement decision to which the claimant does not specifically express disagreement.

“(5) If the claimant does not file a substantive appeal in accordance with the provisions of this chapter within the period afforded under paragraphs (1) and (2), as the case may be, the agency of original jurisdiction shall dismiss the appeal and notify the claimant of the dismissal. The notice shall include an explanation of the procedure for obtaining review of the dismissal by the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

“(6) In order to obtain review by the Board of a dismissal of an appeal by the agency of original jurisdiction, a claimant shall file a request for such review with the Board within the 60-day period beginning on the date on which notice of the dismissal is mailed pursuant to paragraph (5).

“(7) If a claimant does not file a request for review by the Board in accordance with paragraph (6) within the prescribed period or if such a request is timely filed and the Board affirms the dismissal of the appeal, the determination of the agency of original jurisdiction regarding the claim for benefits under this title shall become final and the claim may not thereafter be reopened or allowed, except as may otherwise be provided by regulations not inconsistent with this title.

“(8) If an appeal is not dismissed by the agency of original jurisdiction, the Board may nonetheless dismiss any appeal which is—

“(A) untimely; or

“(B) fails to allege specific error of fact or law in the determination being appealed.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to claims filed on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 208. PROVISION OF POST-NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENT DECISIONS TO CLAIMANTS WHO FILE NOTICE OF DISAGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7105 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “statement of the case” each place it appears and inserting “post-notice of disagreement decision”; and

(2) in subsection (d), as amended by section 207 of this Act—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(A) A description of the specific facts in the case that support the agency's decision, including, if applicable, an assessment as to the credibility of any lay evidence pertinent to the issue or issues with which disagreement has been expressed.

“(B) A citation to pertinent laws and regulations that support the agency's decision.

“(C) A statement that addresses each issue and provides the reasons why the evidence relied upon supports the conclusions of the agency under the specific laws and regulations applied.

“(D) The date by which a substantive appeal must be filed in order to obtain further review of the decision.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) The post-notice of disagreement decision shall be written in plain language.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7105A of such title is amended by striking “statement of the case” each place it appears and inserting “post-notice of disagreement decision”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to notices of disagreements filed on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 209. AUTOMATIC WAIVER OF AGENCY OF ORIGINAL JURISDICTION REVIEW OF NEW EVIDENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7105 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 207 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) If, either at the time or after the agency of original jurisdiction receives a substantive appeal, the claimant or the claimant's representative, if any, submits evidence to either the agency of original jurisdiction or the Board of Veterans' Appeals for consideration in connection with the issue or issues with which disagreement has been expressed, such evidence shall be subject to initial review by the Board unless the claimant

or the claimant's representative, as the case may be, requests in writing that the agency of original jurisdiction initially review such evidence. Such request for review shall accompany the submittal of the evidence or be made within 30 days of the submittal.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (f) of such section, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to claims for which a substantive appeal is filed on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 210. AUTHORITY FOR BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS TO DETERMINE LOCATION AND MANNER OF APPEARANCE FOR HEARINGS.

(a) LOCATION.—Subsection (d) of section 7107 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “An appellant” and all that follows through the end and inserting the following: “Upon request by an appellant for a hearing before the Board, the Board shall determine whether the hearing will be held at its principal location or at a facility of the Department, or other appropriate Federal facility, located within the area served by a regional office of the Department as the Secretary considers most appropriate to schedule the earliest possible date for the hearing.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) A determination by the Board under paragraph (1) with respect to the location of a hearing shall be final unless the appellant demonstrates, on motion, good cause or special circumstances warranting a different location.”.

(b) MANNER OF APPEARANCE.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “afford the appellant an opportunity” and inserting “, as the Chairman determines appropriate, require the appellant”;

(B) by striking the last sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) A determination by the Chairman under paragraph (2) with respect to the participation of an appellant in a hearing shall be final unless the appellant demonstrates, on motion, good cause or special circumstances warranting a different determination.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to requests for hearings filed on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 211. DECISION BY COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS ON ALL ISSUES RAISED BY APPELLANTS.

Section 7261 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “, to the extent necessary to its decision and when presented, shall” and inserting “shall, when presented”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) In carrying out a review of a decision of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, the Court shall render a decision on every issue raised by an appellant within the extent set forth in this section.”.

SEC. 212. GOOD CAUSE EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR FILING NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7266 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b)(1) The Court may extend the initial period for the filing of a notice of appeal set forth in subsection (a) for an additional period not to exceed 120 days from the expiration of such initial period upon a motion—

“(A) filed with the Court not later than 120 days after the expiration of such initial period; and

“(B) showing good cause for such extension.

“(2) If a motion for extension under paragraph (1) is filed after expiration of the initial period for the filing of a notice of appeal set forth in subsection (a), the notice of appeal shall be filed concurrently with, or prior to, the filing of the motion.”; and

(3) in subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “subsection (c)(2)” and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to notices of appeal filed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 213. PILOT PROGRAM ON PARTICIPATION OF LOCAL AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS IN IMPROVING QUALITY OF CLAIMS FOR DISABILITY COMPENSATION SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of entering into memorandums of understanding with local governments and tribal organizations—

(1) to improve the quality of claims submitted to the Secretary for compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code; and

(2) to provide assistance to veterans who may be eligible for such compensation in submitting such claims.

(b) MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In carrying out the pilot program required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall enter into memorandums of understanding with at least two tribal organizations.

(c) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “tribal organization” has the meaning given that term in section 3765 of title 38, United States Code.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3518. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit recognition and enforcement of foreign defamation judgments in United States Courts where those judgments undermine the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to provide a cause of action for declaratory judgment relief against a party who has brought a successful foreign defamation action whose judgment undermines the first amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, two years ago the United Nations' Human Rights Committee observed a problem that “discourage[d] critical media reporting on matters of serious public interest, adversely affect[ed] the ability of scholars and journalists to publish their work,” and “affect[ed] freedom of expression worldwide on matters of

valid public interest.” That problem was “libel tourism,” a troubling trend of foreign lawsuits that have stifled Americans' First Amendment rights. Today, I am introducing legislation to put a stop to this harmful trend.

The First Amendment is a cornerstone of American democracy. Freedom of speech and the press enable vigorous debate over issues of national importance, and enable an exchange of ideas that shapes our political process. Authors, reporters and publishers are primary sources of this information, and their ability to disseminate their writings is critical to our democracy.

Over recent years, American authors, reporters and publishers have fallen victim to libel lawsuits in countries with significantly weaker free speech protections that what our First Amendment affords. In many cases, the foreign plaintiff sought out that country, where there is no regard for freedom of the press, so that they could easily prevail. These suits occur regardless of whether the plaintiff or the publication has significant connections to the foreign forum. On a broad scale, this results in a race to the bottom, and causes U.S. persons to defer to the country with the most chilling and restrictive free speech standard, to determine what they can or cannot write or publish. This is libel tourism. As the son of a printer, I consider this a matter of great national importance.

Today, I am introducing with Senators SESSIONS, SPECTER, SCHUMER and LIEBERMAN legislation that will ensure American authors, journalists and publishers are shielded from the chilling effects of libel tourism. This legislation guarantees that a foreign defamation judgment cannot be enforced in the United States if that country's libel standards are inconsistent with American law. Our legislation also provides American victims of unconstitutional libel suits the opportunity to clear their name by filing for a declaratory judgment in an American court.

Over the past several years, the problem of libel tourism has grown. Today, countries whose weak libel laws impact American authors are no longer confined to a small number. England, Brazil, Australia, Indonesia, and Singapore are just a few of the countries whose weak libel protections have attracted libel lawsuits against American journalists and authors. This threat to American free speech must end, and the time to act is now.

New accounts of libel tourism lawsuits emerge every day. This is because the dissemination of materials through the Internet, as well as the increased number of worldwide newspapers and periodicals, has compounded their threat. The likelihood that a book or story will have some contact with a foreign country is simply that much higher, as is the probability that a foreign court will determine that it has a basis for asserting jurisdiction over an American author or publisher. As we heard at a recent Judiciary Committee

hearing, this has a dramatic chilling effect on Americans' free speech.

The impact and extreme nature of these foreign libel lawsuits is best understood through examples. The most well known is the case of American journalist Rachel Ehrenfeld, who wrote a book about the financiers of the 9/11 attacks. She did not market her book in England yet was sued for libel there by a Saudi businessman she linked to terrorism. The content of her publication would have been protected under our laws, but a British court applying its laws issued a multimillion dollar default judgment against her. Today, Ms. Ehrenfeld continues to experience reluctance from American publishers who fear that plaintiffs will target her and bring another libel action against anything she writes on the subject of terrorism financing.

The scientific community has also been affected by libel tourism. An article last year in *New Scientist* magazine notes that now “Challenging the scientific validity of a product or claim can be fraught with danger. . . [because] such challenges are leaving scientists and science writers [to] face[] an expensive libel action before the English high court. Many individuals and publications have been threatened with libel actions, and some have had proceedings launched against them. Many more writers have had their work edited before publication to avoid any risk of such legal action.” Publications exposing financial improprieties, consumer protection issues, medical malpractice, and sexual abuse have all fallen victim to libel tourism lawsuits around the world.

Even Roman Polanski sued *Vanity Fair* for libel in England. Mr. Polanski, a fugitive from justice who fled America after being convicted of sexually abusing a young girl, filed the suit in 2004. He has fought extradition while living in Europe. The *Vanity Fair* article recounted a story of his alleged aggressive sexual advances made just after his wife was murdered, and portrayed him as being insensitive to her death. The article was written in the U.S., edited in the U.S., and primarily sold in the U.S., but the British court claimed jurisdiction, and ruled in favor of Mr. Polanski.

Foreign libel judgments impact American authors' livelihood, credibility and employment potential. They also have the potential to limit the types of books and articles that talented and reputable authors can get published in the future. But most importantly, their suppression limits the information that Americans have a constitutional right to access. Journalists writing about issues of national security and safety should not be chilled. These lawsuits are designed to stifle the dissemination of that information in both the United States and the world. Journalists willing to investigate and write about such important issues deserve protection.

I am encouraged that some countries have taken steps to strengthen their

libel protections and jurisdictional requirements in the wake of these lawsuits, but that is not enough. As one country tightens its libel protections, another may just emerge as the next-best-available forum of choice for libel plaintiffs willing to travel to file suit.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, Senator SESSIONS, for working with me on this legislation. I also want to thank Senators SCHUMER and SPECTER, for their support in moving toward a legislative compromise on this important issue. Their bills provided a valuable basis from which the bipartisan compromise that we are introducing today emerged.

We cannot legislate changes to foreign law that are chilling protected speech in our country. What we can do, however, is ensure that our courts do not become a tool to uphold foreign libel judgments that undermine our First Amendment or due process rights. We can also provide American authors and reporters the ability to clear their name in our courts.

I hope all Senators will support our bipartisan effort to pass this important legislation this summer to protect the free speech rights of all Americans.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3519. A bill to stabilize the matching requirement for participants in the Hollings Manufacturing Partnership Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, along with Senators KOHL and LIEBERMAN, to reduce the cost share amount that Manufacturing Extension Partnership, or MEP, centers face in obtaining their annual funding. The MEP is a nationwide public-private network of counseling and assistance centers that offer our nation's nearly 350,000 small and medium manufacturers services and access to resources that enhance growth, improve productivity, and expand capacity. In Fiscal Year 2009 alone, MEP clients created or retained roughly 53,000 jobs; provided cost savings in excess of \$1.41 billion; and generated over \$9.1 billion in sales. Similarly, clients of the Maine MEP reported saving or retaining 550 jobs, experiencing \$8.3 million in cost savings, and generating over \$78.3 million in sales in 2009. As such, the MEP's contribution to the health of American manufacturing is indisputable.

At present, individual MEP centers must raise a full 2/3 of their funding after their fourth year of operation, placing a heavy burden on these centers. The National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, at the Department of Commerce, in turn, provides one-third of the centers' funding. MEP centers can meet their portion of the cost share requirement through funds from universities, State and local governments, and other institutions.

In today's tumultuous economy, these centers are experiencing in-

creased difficulties finding adequate funding from both private and public sources. As economic concerns weigh down on all of us, states, organizations, and groups that traditionally assist MEP centers in meeting this cost share are reluctant to expend the money—or do not have the resources to do so.

Our bill, which is a modified version of S. 695 that I and several of my colleagues introduced last March, is simple and straightforward. It would reduce the statutory cost share that MEP centers face to 50 percent for fiscal years 2011 through 2013 as a temporary stimulative measure. Frankly, the Nation's MEP centers are subject to an unnecessarily restrictive cost share requirement. And it is inequitable, as the MEP is the only initiative out of the 80 programs funded by the Department of Commerce that is subject to a statutory cost share of greater than 50 percent. There is no reason for this to persist, particularly not during this trying economy when so many manufacturers are trying to remain afloat.

Clearly, Congress must act swiftly to bolster our country's manufacturing industry rather than sitting on the sidelines as other countries surpass our nation's economic leadership in a variety of areas. Indeed, last Sunday's Financial Times included an article titled "US manufacturing crown slips" highlighting that, "The U.S. remained the world's biggest manufacturing nation by output last year, but is poised to relinquish this slot in 2011 to China—thus ending a 110-year run as the number one country in factory production." This news should be a clarion call that investing in the manufacturing sector is critical given the detrimental ramifications that losing our leadership would have to our overall economy.

The MEP is an essential resource for the small and medium manufacturers that will help reinvigorate our Nation's economy. With centers in all 50 states, as well as Puerto Rico, its reach is unmatched and its experience in counseling manufacturers is unrivaled. It is my hope that my colleagues will support this legislation as a direct way to bolster an industry that is indispensable to our nation's economy health.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 3521. A bill to provide for the reestablishment of a domestic rare earths materials production and supply industry in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation in the Senate to help the United States minerals industry resume production of rare earths in this country. These metals are increasingly important to our military, strategic, and economic priorities due to their use in clean energy technologies and many other high-tech applications.

For many years the United States was a leader in the mining and processing of rare earths—a group of 17 elements that, while widespread in nature, are difficult to find in concentration, extract from the earth, and process for commercial use. Rare earths are increasingly vital to a host of modern defense technologies, from radar and sonar systems to weapons systems and advanced lasers. They are essential to the production of clean energy technologies, including advanced batteries, electric motors, high-efficiency light bulbs, solar panels, and wind turbines.

The U.S. is estimated to contain 15 percent of the world's rare earth reserves, but with the closure of the nation's only operating rare earth mine at Mountain Pass, CA, America has become dependent upon China for imports of nearly all rare earths, oxides, and alloys. In fact, China now produces 97 percent of the world's rare earth supply.

More importantly, China recently moved to implement rules announced in March that will cut production and exportation of rare earths in an effort to raise world prices for the minerals. While the world demand for rare earths tripled to 120,000 tons per year over the past decade, China announced on June 2nd that it will stop issuing new domestic licenses for rare earth production and cap production at 89,200 tons for this year. As a result, only 35,000 tons of rare earths will be exported annually over the next five years, on average.

These actions may work out well for China, but they will harm the United States. Fortunately, we can do something about it. Rather than sit on our hands while China corners the market on these strategic minerals, we can and should pursue timely production of the rare earth supplies that exist within our own borders.

Efforts are currently underway to reopen Molycorp Minerals' California mine and Ucore Uranium is continuing exploration of a large rare earth deposit found near Bokan Mountain in Alaska, about 37 miles from Ketchikan. Ucore's new Alaska subsidiary, Rare Earth One LLC, has been working to study the deposit on Dotson Ridge at Bokan Mountain since 2007. The U.S. Bureau of Mines more than 20 years ago estimated the site contains at least 374 million pounds of recoverable rare earths, which is more than enough to break China's stranglehold on the market and protect America's access to the rare earths that are vital to the production of cutting-edge technologies in this country.

So what should we be doing to reestablish domestic rare earth? My answer is a companion measure to legislation introduced earlier this spring in the House by Rep. MIKE COFFMAN, a fellow Republican from Colorado. My bill would establish it as the policy of the

United States to take appropriate actions to increase investment in, exploration for, and development of domestic rare earths. To do that it would require—under the leadership of the Secretary of the Interior—the Secretaries of Energy, Agriculture, Defense, Commerce, and State along with the Director of OMB and the Chairman of CEQ to expedite permitting, review supply chains, and consider strategic stockpiling of rare earths. The bill would also provide the rare earth industry with access to federal loan guarantee programs meant to advance clean energy technologies.

There is a great deal of emphasis on the need for expansion of clean energy manufacturing in the United States. Promises of “green jobs” abound, but they will only be realized if American industries have access to the raw materials needed to produce these new technologies. This legislation represents an important first step in our efforts to grow domestic manufacturing of clean energy technologies. The bill will also help to create more jobs in America’s minerals industry, where firms provide good, high-wage jobs and pay taxes that will help to reduce our deficit. Furthermore, decreasing our reliance on foreign minerals will reduce our balance of payments deficit and strengthen national security.

I hope this bill advances quickly, and I encourage my colleagues to join as cosponsors of the measure. We have an ambitious agenda given the small amount of time that remains in the current Congress, but there is too much at stake for our military strength and our clean energy goals to ignore the problems we have in accessing affordable and secure supplies of rare earths.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 3522. A bill to protect children affected by immigration enforcement actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, on December 12, 2006, Immigration and Customs Enforcement staged raids on Swift & Company meatpacking plants in six states—Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska, Texas, Utah, and my home State of Minnesota.

Over 1,500 unauthorized immigrants were arrested in these raids. They also left countless children—most of them citizens and legal residents—without their parents and with no way of finding them. One second-grader in Worthington, MN—a U.S. citizen—came home that Tuesday night to find his 2-year-old brother alone and his mother and father missing.

For the next week, this boy stayed at home caring for his 2-year-old brother while his grandmother traveled to Worthington to care for her grandchildren.

On June 22, 2007, ICE agents staged another raid, this one in the Jackson

Heights Manufactured Home Park in Shakopee, MN. Early that Friday morning, around 6 a.m., Federal agents seized a husband and his wife for suspected immigration violations. Somehow, they didn’t even notice their daughter, who was sleeping. So later that morning, that 7-year-old girl was found wandering the park, looking for her parents.

Stories like these happen every day. They are happening to innocent children, most of them United States citizens. Children who have committed no crime, who have hurt no one, but who have had their lives torn apart because of the sins of their parents.

According to the U.S. Customs and Immigration Service, over 100,000 parents of U.S. citizen children were deported in the past 10 years. Four million U.S. citizen children in our country have at least one undocumented immigrant parent. Forty thousand of those children live in Minnesota.

Our country is not doing enough to protect these innocent kids. That is why Senator KOHL and I have crafted a bill to fix that.

So I am proud to stand today with Senators KOHL, MENENDEZ, KLOBUCHAR, FEINGOLD, DURBIN and FEINSTEIN to introduce the Humane Enforcement and Legal Protections for Separated Children Act, or the HELP Separated Children Act. This is a simple but strong bill to protect our Nation’s kids from unnecessary harm from immigration enforcement actions.

I want to take a few moments to talk about what this bill does—the problems it solves, and how it solves them.

But before I do that, I want to take a second to talk about what this bill does not do. This bill is strictly about protecting children. It doesn’t change our laws on immigrant admission, exclusion, or removal. No one is going to get in or stay in this country because of this bill. It has nothing to do with so-called amnesty or any decisions about deportation.

So what does this bill actually do?

This bill fixes four problems in our immigration enforcement system.

The first problem is notice to State authorities. Invariably, in almost all immigration enforcement actions, it is our local communities that have to clean up after the government’s dirty work.

It’s state and child welfare services that take in kids who have lost their mom or dad in a raid. It’s local shelters and churches that feed those kids—again, most of whom are citizens—when their family breadwinner is taken away. And it’s local schools that have to take care of kids when no one picks them up after soccer practice.

After the Swift raids, the Bush administration finally understood this. And so in 2007, it put in place humanitarian guidelines that call upon ICE to reach out to state authorities and child welfare services before major enforcement actions. Again, that is the Bush administration. President Obama ex-

panded these guidelines in 2009 so that they would cover more worksite actions.

But it still isn’t enough. Local authorities still don’t find out about actions until way too late—and when they are notified, they aren’t given enough time to help. In 2008, after these guidelines were put into place, the New Mexico Children, Youth, and Families Department testified before the House of Representatives that they still did not receive notice of enforcement actions before they happened.

State authorities in Massachusetts were notified months ahead of a raid in New Bedford. But almost immediately after it happened, the detainees were transferred to Texas, leaving state agencies unable to help. Governor Deval Patrick called it a “race to the airport.”

Our bill makes sure that whenever possible, the Governor, local and state law enforcement, and child welfare agencies find out about raids ahead of time. It also makes sure that schools and community centers are notified after these actions so that they too can help.

That brings me to the second problem. If they want to help, state child welfare agencies and community organizations must be allowed to help identify detainees who have children at home. Mothers and fathers detained in enforcement actions often don’t tell ICE agents that they have children at home—because they are afraid that ICE will detain them, too.

As Troy Tucker, the sheriff of Clark County, Arkansas said after an action there, ICE is “not doing their job by simply questioning [people] and asking them whether they have children and not contacting anyone locally.”

Even though the Bush administration guidelines allow state authorities and local non-profits to help screen detainees, this is not happening often enough. So our bill requires ICE and State agencies enforcing immigration laws to allow these groups to confidentially screen detainees and identify those who have kids at home.

Our bill makes another critical fix in our immigration enforcement system. The Bush and ICE detention guidelines require authorities to give detainees free emergency phone calls. But again, it isn’t being done enough, and it isn’t being done right.

In the Swift raid in Worthington, one mother told ICE agents that she had kids at home, but still wasn’t allowed to call them or let anyone know what had happened until later the next day. In Iowa, after a raid in Postville, some children went 72 hours without seeing their parents or knowing what happened to them.

Any parent knows how scared kids get just when you come home late. Can you imagine how scared they would get if you went missing for a whole day? For 3 days? Can you imagine what would happen if they didn’t know who to call? Can you imagine what would

happen if they didn't have anything to eat?

Our bill requires Federal and State authorities to allow parents, legal guardians, or primary caregivers to make free phone calls to their family, to lawyers, and to child welfare agencies to make sure that their kids aren't abandoned.

Finally, our bill averts one other major problem.

When a parent is detained, even if their kids know where they are, it is still extremely difficult for kids and parents to stay in contact. And it is extremely difficult for parents to participate in legal proceedings that affect their kids.

This means that parents can't tell a family court judge about a brother or sister or neighbor that could take care of their child. Children have actually been adopted by well-meaning families or put into foster care because their parents were unable to participate in custody proceedings.

Our bill makes sure that after they're detained, parents can continue to have access to phones to call their kids, their lawyers, and family courts. Our bill also requires ICE to consider the best interests of children in decisions to transfer detainees between facilities, or put them into reliable and cost-effective supervised release programs.

Our immigration system isn't broken. It is in shambles. And while our bill doesn't fix 99.9 percent of those problems, it takes a small but important step to make sure our kids don't suffer any more than they have to already.

I am proud to say that because this is such a critical, albeit narrowly targeted measure, our bill has gained the support of the top faith, child welfare, and immigrant advocacy organizations in the country.

I'm also proud to say that it has won the support of faith leaders across Minnesota, the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Chief Tom Smith of the St. Paul Police Department, and countless immigrant advocacy groups in the State.

While immigration may be complicated, protecting our kids isn't. It's something we can all agree on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a list of supporters be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3522

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 "Humane Enforcement and Legal Protections for Separated Children Act" or the "HELP Separated Children Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPREHENSION.—The term "apprehension" means the detention, arrest, or custody by officials of the Department of Homeland Security or cooperating entities.

(2) CHILD.—The term "child" has the meaning given to the term in section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)).

(3) CHILD WELFARE AGENCY.—The term "child welfare agency" means the State or local agency responsible for child welfare services under subtitles B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(4) COOPERATING ENTITY.—The term "cooperating entity" means a State or local entity acting under agreement with, or at the request of, the Department of Homeland Security.

(5) DETENTION FACILITY.—The term "detention facility" means a Federal, State, or local government facility, or a privately owned and operated facility, that is used to hold individuals suspected or found to be in violation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(6) IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—The term "immigration enforcement action" means the apprehension of, detention of, or request for or issuance of a detainer for, 1 or more individuals for suspected or confirmed violations of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) by the Department of Homeland Security or cooperating entities.

(7) LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY.—The term "local education agency" has the meaning given to the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(8) NGO.—The term "NGO" means a non-governmental organization that provides social services or humanitarian assistance to the immigrant community.

SEC. 3. APPREHENSION PROCEDURES FOR IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES.

(a) NOTIFICATION.—

(1) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION.—Subject to paragraph (2), when conducting any immigration enforcement action, the Department of Homeland Security and cooperating entities shall notify the Governor of the State, the local child welfare agency, and relevant State and local law enforcement before commencing the action, or, if advance notification is not possible, immediately after commencing such action, of—

(A) the approximate number of individuals to be targeted in the immigration enforcement action; and

(B) the primary language or languages believed to be spoken by individuals at the targeted site.

(2) HOURS OF NOTIFICATION.—Whenever possible, advance notification should occur during business hours and allow the notified entities sufficient time to identify resources to conduct the interviews described in subsection (b)(1).

(3) OTHER NOTIFICATION.—When conducting any immigration action, the Department of Homeland Security and cooperating entities shall notify the relevant local education agency and local NGOs of the information described in paragraph (1) immediately after commencing the action.

(b) APPREHENSION PROCEDURES.—In any immigration enforcement action, the Department of Homeland Security and cooperating entities shall—

(1) as soon as possible and not later than 6 hours after an immigration enforcement action, provide licensed social workers or case managers employed or contracted by the child welfare agency or local NGOs with confidential access to screen and interview individuals apprehended in such immigration enforcement action to assist the Department of Homeland Security or cooperating entity in determining if such individuals are parents,

legal guardians, or primary caregivers of a child in the United States;

(2) as soon as possible and not later than 8 hours after an immigration enforcement action, provide any apprehended individual believed to be a parent, legal guardian, or primary caregiver of a child in the United States with—

(A) free, confidential telephone calls, including calls to child welfare agencies, attorneys, and legal services providers, to arrange for the care of children or wards, unless the Department of Homeland Security has reasonable grounds to believe that providing confidential phone calls to the individual would endanger public safety or national security; and

(B) contact information for—

(i) child welfare agencies in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, all United States territories, counties, and local jurisdictions; and

(ii) attorneys and legal service providers capable of providing free legal advice or free legal representation regarding child welfare, child custody determinations, and immigration matters;

(3) ensure that personnel of the Department of Homeland Security and cooperating entities do not—

(A) interview individuals in the immediate presence of children; or

(B) compel or request children to translate for interviews of other individuals who are encountered as part of an immigration enforcement action; and

(4) ensure that any parent, legal guardian, or primary caregiver of a child in the United States—

(A) receives due consideration of the best interests of his or her children or wards in any decision or action relating to his or her detention, release, or transfer between detention facilities; and

(B) is not transferred from his or her initial detention facility or to the custody of the Department of Homeland Security until the individual—

(i) has made arrangements for the care of his or her children or wards; or

(ii) if such arrangements are impossible, is informed of the care arrangements made for the children and of a means to maintain communication with the children.

(c) NONDISCLOSURE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION ABOUT APPREHENDED INDIVIDUALS AND THEIR CHILDREN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Information collected by child welfare agencies and NGOs in the course of the screenings and interviews described in subsection (b)(1) about an individual apprehended in an immigration enforcement action may not be disclosed to Federal, State, or local government entities or to any person, except pursuant to written authorization from the individual or his or her legal counsel.

(2) CHILD WELFARE AGENCY OR NGO RECOMMENDATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a child welfare agency or NGO may—

(A) submit a recommendation to the Department of Homeland Security or cooperating entities regarding whether an apprehended individual is a parent, legal guardian, or primary caregiver who is eligible for the protections provided under this Act; and

(B) disclose information that is necessary to protect the safety of the child, to allow for the application of subsection (b)(4)(A), or to prevent reasonably certain death or substantial bodily harm.

SEC. 4. ACCESS TO CHILDREN, LOCAL AND STATE COURTS, CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES, AND CONSULAR OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all detention facilities operated by or under agreement with the Department of Homeland Security

implement procedures to ensure that the best interest of the child, including the best outcome for the family of the child, can be considered in any decision and action relating to the custody of children whose parent, legal guardian, or primary caregiver is detained as the result of an immigration enforcement action.

(b) ACCESS TO CHILDREN, STATE AND LOCAL COURTS, CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES, AND CONSULAR OFFICIALS.—At all detention facilities operated by, or under agreement with, the Department of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) ensure that individuals who are detained by reason of their immigration status may receive the screenings and interviews described in section 3(b)(1) not later than 6 hours after their arrival at the detention facility;

(2) ensure that individuals who are detained by reason of their immigration status and are believed to be parents, legal guardians, or primary caregivers of children in the United States are—

(A) permitted daily phone calls and regular contact visits with their children or wards;

(B) able to participate fully, and to the extent possible in-person, in all family court proceedings and any other proceeding impacting upon custody of their children or wards;

(C) able to fully comply with all family court or child welfare agency orders impacting upon custody of their children or wards;

(D) provided with contact information for family courts in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, all United States territories, counties, and local jurisdictions;

(E) granted free and confidential telephone calls to child welfare agencies and family courts;

(F) granted free and confidential telephone calls and confidential in-person visits with attorneys, legal representatives, and consular officials;

(G) provided United States passport applications for the purpose of obtaining travel documents for their children or wards;

(H) granted adequate time before removal to obtain passports and other necessary travel documents on behalf of their children or wards if such children or wards will accompany them on their return to their country of origin or join them in their country of origin; and

(I) provided with the access necessary to obtain birth records or other documents required to obtain passports for their children or wards; and

(3) facilitate the ability of detained parents, legal guardians, and primary caregivers to share information regarding travel arrangements with their children or wards, child welfare agencies, or other caregivers well in advance of the detained individual's departure from the United States.

SEC. 5. MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.

The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop and implement memoranda of understanding or protocols with child welfare agencies and NGOs regarding the best ways to cooperate and facilitate ongoing communication between all relevant entities in cases involving a child whose parent, legal guardian, or primary caregiver has been apprehended or detained in an immigration enforcement action to protect the best interests of the child and the best outcome for the family of the child.

SEC. 6. MANDATORY TRAINING.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and independent child welfare experts, shall require and provide in-person training on the protections required under sections 3 and 4 to all personnel of the

Department of Homeland Security and of States and local entities acting under agreement with the Department of Homeland Security who regularly come into contact with children or parents in the course of conducting immigration enforcement actions.

SEC. 7. RULEMAKING.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall promulgate regulations to implement this Act.

SEC. 8. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendment to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE HELP SEPARATED CHILDREN ACT

AFL-CIO; America's Promise Alliance; American Humane Association; American Immigration Lawyers Association; American Muslim Voice; American Nursery & Landscape Association; Amnesty International USA; Arizona Council of Human Service Providers; Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum; Asian American Justice Center; Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance; Bridging Group; Catholic Charities USA; Center for Asian Pacific Islander; Center for Farmworker Families; Child Welfare League of America; Church World Service, Immigration and Refugee Program; The Episcopal Church; Every Child Matters Education Fund; Family Violence Prevention Fund; First Focus Campaign for Children; Foster Care Alumni of America; Foster Family-based Treatment Association; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS); Human Rights Watch; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Immigration Equality; Juvenile Law Center; Kids in Need of Defense (KIND); Latino Commission on AIDS; Legal Momentum; Lutheran Immigrant and Refugee Service (LIRS); Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS); Mennonite Central Committee U.S.—Washington Office; Midwest Coalition for Human Rights; Moms Rising; National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth; National Association of Social Workers; National Consumers League; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of La Raza; National Federation of Filipino American Associations; National Foster Care Coalition; National Immigrant Justice Center; National Immigration Forum; National Immigration Law Center; National Korean American Service & Education Consortium; National Latino AIDS Action Network; National Policy Partnership; OCA; Physicians for Human Rights; Saavedra Law Firm; Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law; Sisters of Mercy of the Americas, South Central Community; Sojourners; South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT); Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; Union for Reform Judaism; Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations; United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society; Voices for America's Children; Women's Refugee Commission; Youth Build USA; Zero to Three.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE HELP SEPARATED CHILDREN ACT

ARIZONA

Arizona Council of Human Service Providers; Children's Action Alliance; Florence

Project; Global Family Legal Services; MEChA Arizona Student Union; Tumbleweed, Center for Youth Development.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Voices.

CALIFORNIA

Asian Law Alliance; California Immigrant Policy Center; Children Now; Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles; East Bay Community Law Center; International Institute of the Bay Area; Public Counsel.

COLORADO

Lutheran Advocacy Ministries; Rocky Mountain Immigrant Advocacy Network.

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut Voices for Children.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ayuda; The Episcopal Church.

FLORIDA

Florida Immigrant Advocacy Center; Florida Legal Services, Inc.; Gulfcoast Legal Services, Inc.; Legal Aid Society of the Orange County Bar Association, Inc.; Legal Ministry H.E.L.P., Inc.

GEORGIA

Asian American Legal Advocacy Center, Inc. (AALAC) of Georgia; Georgia Rural Urban Summit; Latinos for Education & Justice Organization.

ILLINOIS

Instituto del Progreso Latino; Maria Baldini-Potermin & Associates.

IOWA

Child and Family Policy Center; Lutheran Services in Iowa; National Association of Social Workers, Iowa Chapter.

KENTUCKY

Kentucky Youth Advocates.

LOUISIANA

New Orleans Workers' Center for Racial Justice.

MAINE

Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Maine Children's Alliance.

MARYLAND

CASA de Maryland; Lutheran Office on Public Policy.

MICHIGAN

Bethany Children's Services; Immigrant Legal Advocacy Project; Michigan's Children.

MINNESOTA

Advocates for Human Rights; American Immigration Lawyers Association, Minnesota/Dakotas Chapter; Ascension Church; Benedictine-Franciscan Immigrant Justice Commission (St. Joseph & Little Falls, MN); Casa Guadalupana; Catholic Charities of St. Paul & Minneapolis; Center for Asian Pacific Islanders; Center for Mission, Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis; Children's Defense Fund Minnesota; Children's Law Center of Minnesota; Chinese Social Service Center; Church World Service; Congregational Council, the Miracle Lutheran Church; Department of Social Concerns, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of St. Cloud; Family & Children's Service; Franciscan Sisters of Little Falls; Great River Interfaith Partnership; Hmong American Partnership; Hospitality Minnesota; Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota; Immigration Task Force, Minnesota Conference United Church of Christ; Interfaith Coalition on Immigration; ISIAH; Jewish Community Action; Justice Commission of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet and Consociates; Latin America

& Haiti Focus Group, St. Luke's Presbyterian Church; Legal Rights Center; Lutheran Coalition for Public Policy in Minnesota; Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota; Metropolitan Consortium of Community Developers; Mid-Minnesota Legal Assistance; Midwest Food Processors Association; Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights; Minnesota AFL-CIO; Minnesota Agri-Growth Council; Minnesota Alliance With Youth; Minnesota Business Immigration Coalition; Minnesota Catholic Conference; Minnesota Chamber of Commerce; Minnesota Fathers & Families Network; Minnesota Hispanic Bar Association; Minnesota Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Minnesota Lodging Association; Minnesota Milk Producers Association; Minnesota Nursery & Landscape Association; Minnesota Restaurant Association; Minnesota School Social Workers Association; Minnesota Strengthening Our Lives (SOL); No More Children Left Behind; Office of Justice, Peace & Integrity of Creation, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Mankato; Project for Pride in Living; Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 26—Minneapolis; Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Minnesota State Council; Sisters Online; Social Concerns & Family Office, Diocese of New Ulm; Sowers Leadership Team, Guardian Angels Catholic Church; St. John Neumann Catholic Church; The Minneapolis Foundation; UFCW Local 1161—Worthington; UFCW Local 789—South St. Paul; UNITE Here, Minnesota State Council; United Cambodian Association of Minnesota; United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), Local 1161—Worthington; United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), Local 789—South St. Paul; Willmar Area Comprehensive Immigration Reform; YWCA of Minneapolis.

MINNESOTA FAITH LEADERS, ELECTED OFFICIALS & COMMUNITY ADVOCATES SUPPORTING THE HELP SEPARATED CHILDREN ACT

Rabbi Morris J. Allen, Beth Jacob Congregation; Rabbi Renee Bauer, Mayim Rabim Congregation; Rev. Ralph Baumgartner, Galilee Lutheran Church, Roseville, MN; Rev. Chris Becker, Peace Lutheran Church, Inver Grove Heights, MN; Pastor Chris Berthelsen, First Lutheran Church, St. Paul, MN; Rev. Mariann Budde, St. John's Episcopal Church, Minneapolis, MN; Pastor Sarah Campbell, Mayflower Community Congregational Church, Minneapolis, MN; Mayor Chris Coleman, City of St. Paul; Rev. Doug Donley, University Baptist Church, Minneapolis, MN; Rabbi Amy Eilberg, Jay Phillips Center for Jewish-Christian Learning; Pastor Paul Erickson, Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, St. Paul, MN; Rev. James Erlandson, Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, St. Paul, MN; Rev. G. Allen Foster, Citadel of Hope Church, Brooklyn Park, MN; Pastor Pam Fickenscher, Edina Community Lutheran Church, Edina, MN; Luz Maria Frias, Human Rights & Equal Economic Opportunity Dept., City of St. Paul; Pastor Dan Garnaa, Grace University Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, MN; Rev. Chad Gilbertson, Willmar, MN; Revs. Patrick & Luisa Cabello Hansel, Minneapolis Area Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, MN; Rev. Richard Headen, Presbyterian Church USA, Plymouth, MN; Allan D. Henden, Lay Leader, United Church of Christ, Minneapolis, MN; Rev. Karen Hering, Unity Unitarian Church, St. Paul, MN; Rev. Anita C. Hill, St. Paul, MN; Loan T. Huynh, Attorney at Law; Bishop Craig E. Johnson, Minneapolis Area Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, MN; Elder Karen Larson, St. Luke Presbyterian Church, Minnetonka, MN; Rabbi Michael

Latz, Shir Tikvah Congregation; Charles & Hertha Lutz, Peace and Justice Advocates, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, MN; Miguel Lucas Lindgren, DFL Latino Caucus Treasurer, Roseville, MN; Brianna MacPhee, Executive Board, Minnesota Latino Caucus, Minneapolis, MN; Pastor Rod Maeker, Faculty (ret.), Luther Seminary, St. Paul, MN; Rev. Naomi Mahler, Paz y Esperanza Lutheran Church, Willmar, MN; Pastor Susan Maetzold Moss, Episcopal Diocese of Minnesota; Sen. Mee Moua (Dist. 67), Chair, Minnesota Senate Judiciary Committee, St. Paul, MN; Lauren Morse-Wendt, Mission and Ministry Developer, Edina, MN; Pastor Richard Mork, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, St. Paul, MN; Rev. Jen Nagel, Salem English Lutheran, Minneapolis, MN; Rev. Karsten Nelson, Our Redeemer Lutheran Church, St. Paul, MN; Rev. Keith H. Olstad, St. Paul-Reformation Lutheran Church, St. Paul, MN; Rafael Ortega, Ramsey County Commissioner; Pastor Paul Slack, New Creation Community Church, Brooklyn Park, MN; Rev. Dr. Karen Smith Sellers, Minnesota Conference United Church of Christ; Roxanne Smith, Social Justice Dir., St. Joseph the Worker Church, Maple Grove, MN; Chief Tom Smith, St. Paul Police Department; Pastor Grant Stevensen, St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, St. Paul, MN; Rabbi Adam Stock Spilke, Mount Zion Temple; Pastor Eric Strand, Edina Community Church, Edina, MN; Rev. Dale Stuepfert, Director of Chaplaincy (ret.), Hennepin County Medical Center, Minneapolis, MN; Pastor Steve Sylvester, Our Savior's Lutheran Church, Circle Pines, MN; Linda Thompson, Lay Leader, St. Luke Presbyterian Church, Plymouth, MN; Sen. Patricia Torres Ray (District 62); Rev. Jill Tollefson, La Mision San Jose Obrero de Episcopal, Montgomery, MN; Rev. Susan Tjornehoj, Minneapolis Area Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, MN; Pastor Jason Van Hunnik, Westwood Lutheran Church, St. Louis Park, MN; Pastor Mark Vinge, House of Hope Lutheran Church, New Hope, MN; Rev. David Wangaard, Minneapolis Area Synod, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Minneapolis, MN; Pastor Mark Wegener, Woodlake Lutheran Church, Richfield, MN; Rev. Bruce M. Westphal, Westwood Lutheran Church, St. Louis Park, MN; Rev. Jonathan Zielske, Hope Lutheran Church..

NEW JERSEY

Association for Children of New Jersey; Casa Esperanza; IRATE & First Friends; Statewide Parent Advocacy Network.

NEW MEXICO

For Families, LLC.; Lutheran Advocacy Ministry; New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Protective Services Division; New Mexico Women's Justice Project; PBJ Family Services, Inc.

NEW YORK

Coalition for Asian American Children and Families; Make the Road New York; The Osborne Association; Schuyler Center for Analysis and Advocacy.

NORTH CAROLINA

Action for Children North Carolina; The Exceptional Children's Assistance Center.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Institute for Child Advocacy.

OREGON

Immigration Counseling Services (Portland, OR).

SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina Applesseed.

TEXAS

Catholic Charities of Dallas, Inc., Immigration & Legal Services; Center for Public

Policy Priorities; Daya Inc.; Wilco Justice Alliance.

VIRGINIA

Voices for Virginia's Children.

WASHINGTON

Children's Home Society of Washington; Northwest Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to add two bills for the previously announced hearing scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, June 24, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to hear testimony on the following bills: S. 3497, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require leases entered into under that Act to include a plan that describes the means and timeline for containment and termination of an ongoing discharge of oil, and for other purposes; and, S. 3431, a bill to improve the administration of the Minerals Management Service, and for other purposes.

Adding bills: S. 3509, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to promote the research and development of technologies and best practices for the safe development and extraction of natural gas and other petroleum resources, and for other purposes; and, S. 3516, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to reform the management of energy and mineral resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150, or by e-mail to Abigail.Campbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Linda Lance at (202) 224-7556 or Abigail Campbell at (202) 224-1219.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 22, 2010, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on

June 22, 2010, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 22, 2010, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 22, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Iran Policy in the Aftermath of United Nations Sanctions."

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing entitled "The ADA and Olmstead Enforcement: Ensuring Community Opportunities for Individuals with Disabilities" on June 22, 2010. The hearing will commence at 2:30 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 22, 2010 at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND, TOXICS, AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund, Toxics, and Environmental Health of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 22, 2010, at 2:30 p.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION DISCHARGED

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged of the following nomination: PN1573, Rafael

Moure-Eraso, to be a member of the Chemical Safety and Hazardous Investigation Board, and that the nomination then be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed en bloc to Calendar Nos. 945, 946, 947, 949, 950, and 951; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, as if read, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

Cynthia Chavez Lamra, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2010.

JoAnn Lynn Balzer, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2012.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

Tracie Stevens, of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Pamela Cothran Marsh, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Florida for the term of four years.

Peter J. Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

Kevin Anthony Carr, of Wisconsin, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2010

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 23; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the final 30 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, we expect to resume consideration of the House message on H.R. 4213, the tax extenders legislation. Rollcall votes are expected to occur throughout the day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 23, 2010, at 9:30 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination by unanimous consent and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*RAFAEL MOURE-ERASO, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, Tuesday, June 22, 2010:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

BRIAN HAYES, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2012.

MARK GASTON PEARCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2013.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ANTHONY R. COSCIA, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

ALBERT DICLEMENTE, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JULY 26, 2011.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

MARK R. ROSEKIND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

JIM R. ESQUEA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JUDITH ANN STEWART STOCK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS).

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PATRICIA A. HOFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ELECTRICITY DELIVERY AND ENERGY RELIABILITY).

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

ARI NE'EMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DAVID T. MATSUDA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

MICHAEL F. TILLMAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2011.

DARYL J. BONESS, OF MAINE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2010.

DARYL J. BONESS, OF MAINE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2013.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

EARL F. WEENER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2010.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JEFFREY R. MORELAND, OF TEXAS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ARTHUR ALLEN ELKINS, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

PEACE CORPS

CAROLYN HESSLER RADELET, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

ELIZABETH L. LITTLEFIELD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA

LANA POLLACK, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A COMMISSIONER ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD

DANA KATHERINE BILYEU, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 11, 2011.

MICHAEL D. KENNEDY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2010.

MICHAEL D. KENNEDY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2014.

SPECIAL PANEL ON APPEALS

DENNIS P. WALSH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL PANEL ON APPEALS FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS.

THE JUDICIARY

MILTON C. LEE, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

TODD E. EDELMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

JUDITH ANNE SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

DONALD L. COOK, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SHARON E. BURKE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL ENERGY PLANS AND PROGRAMS.

KATHERINE HAMMACK, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MICHAEL J. MCCORD, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (CONTROLLER).

ELIZABETH A. MCGRATH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JEFFREY A. LANE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (CONGRESSIONAL AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS).

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

CHERYL A. LAFLEUR, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2014.

PHILIP D. MOELLER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2015.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

MICHAEL JAMES WARREN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 17, 2011.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES

ADAM GAMORAN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 28, 2011.

DEBORAH LOEWENBERG BALL, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 28, 2012.

MARGARET R. MCLEOD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 28, 2012.

BRIDGET TERRY LONG, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 28, 2012.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DAVID K. MINETA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR DEMAND REDUCTION, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SHERRY GLIED, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

MARIE COLLINS JOHNS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

CYNTHIA CHAVEZ LAMAR, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 19, 2010.

JOANN LYNN BALZER, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 19, 2012.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

TRACIE STEVENS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

EARL F. WEENER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2015.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BENJAMIN B. TUCKER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN H. LAUB, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE.

JAMES P. LYNCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUARDO M. OCHOA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JAMES L. TAYLOR, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD

ROBERT WEDGEWORTH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2013.

CARLA D. HAYDEN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2014.

JOHN COPPOLA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2013.

WINSTON TABB, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2013.

LAWRENCE J. PIJEAUX, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2014.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

DANIEL J. BECKER, OF UTAH, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2010.

JAMES R. HANNAH, OF ARKANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2010.

GAYLE A. NACHTIGAL, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2012.

JOHN B. NALBANDIAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2010.

MARSHA J. RABITEAU, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2010.

HERNÁN D. VERA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THOMAS EDWARD DELAHANTY II, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WENDY J. OLSON, OF IDAHO, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JAMES A. LEWIS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DONALD J. CAZAYOUX, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

HENRY LEE WHITEHORN, SR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

KEVIN CHARLES HARRISON, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

CHARLES GILLEN DUNNE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

PAMELA COTHRAN MARSH, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

PETER J. SMITH, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

KEVIN ANTHONY CARR, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. SCORE AND ENDING WITH DEMIAN A. BAILEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 8, 2010.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SMALL BUSINESS JOBS AND CREDIT ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2010

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5297) to create the Small Business Lending Fund Program to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make capital investments in eligible institutions in order to increase the availability of credit for small businesses, and for other purposes:

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 5297, the Small Business Jobs and Credit Act. I want to thank the Chairmen of the Financial Services and Small Business Committees, Representatives BARNEY FRANK, D-MA, and NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, D-NY, respectively, for their leadership in bringing to bear this jobs-creating measure and Congressman GARY PETERS, D-MI, for providing critical guidance for Michigan on the bill as it moved forward.

Today, we are, voting on legislation that will encourage lending to small businesses and in-turn job creation. First, H.R. 5297 sets up a \$30 billion small business lending fund for small- and medium-sized community banks, which could leverage up to \$300 billion in lending. The fund encourages small business lending by decreasing the interest rate at which the loan is paid back when the bank expands lending to small businesses. Second, the bill creates a State Small Business Credit Initiative to be administered by the Treasury Department which would provide funding for new or existing state lending programs. It is estimated the new Credit Initiative would create an estimated \$20 billion in new lending. Finally, H.R. 5297 contains a provision to restart private investment to meet small businesses' evolving financing needs through a new SBA public-private partnership.

While the Democratic Congress blunted the downward spiral of our economy that was born out of Bush administration policy, our unemployment rate still hovers around 9.5 percent nationwide and around 14 percent in Michigan. It is clear that we can and must do more to ensure our government continues to put the economy on the path to recovery. In particular, small businesses must have access to capital so they can expand and hire workers. In the beginning of this month at a Federal Reserve Bank meeting in Detroit, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke highlighted this need as he called on banks to lend to small businesses "for the safety and soundness of our banking system." This legislation fulfills the need articulated not only by Mr. Bernanke and other leading economists, but by small businesses in the 15th district such as our automotive suppliers and manufacturers, high tech start ups, and innovative alternative energy firms. I have listened to the concerns of small

businesses in my district about the lack of available credit and with the passage of this bill we are taking action to address their concerns.

The statistic has been cited many times before, but it is worth remembering that small businesses have created two-thirds of net new jobs over the past 15 years. Let's help our small businesses help grow our economy by passing this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 5297.

HONORING LT. COL. DUDLEY R.
CANNON, JR., TITUSVILLE, FL

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Lt. Col. D.R. Cannon Jr. who, on June 25th of this year, will be retiring after 28 years of service to the United States Air Force. Today, we celebrate his dedication to his family, our country, and the Judge Advocate General's Corp.

Col. Cannon was a direct appointee to the United States Air Force Judge Advocate General's Department, starting as first lieutenant in June 1982. He began active duty in July 1982 and served four years at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts. Upon leaving active duty in June 1986, he joined the active reserves and was stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, FL until June 31, 1988. From August 1986 until June 1988, he served a split attachment with his tour at Eglin Air Force Base and inactive training at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida. In June of 1988, Col. Cannon was re-attached to the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Eastern Space and Missile Center (now 45th Space Wing), at Patrick Air Force Base. After leaving active duty, Col. Cannon started working for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with the office of Chief Council at Kennedy Space Center. Since November 2004, he has been the Director of Procurement at Kennedy.

Among his various awards, Col. Cannon has been awarded the Air Force Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster, NASA's Exceptional Achievement Medal, NASA's Exceptional Service Medal, and the NASA Small Business Administrator's Cup Award for Fiscal Year 2009.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Col. Cannon has remained a dedicated and caring leader, husband and father; putting his all in everything he does. His legacy will continue in the hundreds of JAG Corps personnel he has mentored through the years.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Lt. Col. Dudley Cannon on the occasion of his retirement and thanking him for his service to our great nation.

SUPPORT TAIWAN

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, as a long-time friend of Taiwan, and as one of the 140 bipartisan Members of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting an issue that my Taiwanese-American constituents and I care deeply about.

During the previous Congress, I introduced H. Con. Res. 250, which supports Taiwan's full membership in international organizations such as the United Nations. To me, it seems only fair that a country with a population of 23 million be represented in the U.N. and its affiliated organizations.

If it weren't for China's disapproval, Taiwan would likely have become a member of the U.N. long ago. China consistently blocks Taiwan's membership in the U.N. because China opposes international recognition of Taiwan's status as a sovereign and independent country. And since China is a large country, and Taiwan a small one, Taiwan's involvement in international organizations has become contingent upon Chinese approval.

A prime example of China's influence occurred just a short while ago. In early April of this year, the media reported that China would permit Taiwan's Health Minister to attend the annual summit of the World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva for the second year in a row.

Then, in mid-April, our State Department sent a report to Congress supporting "meaningful participation" by Taiwan in the WHO. It read: "As we plan for the 63rd WHA [World Health Assembly] session this May, the U.S. welcomes the extension of WHA's invitation once again to Taiwan to send an observer delegation. [. . .] The invitation to attend the 2009 WHA was issued after the People's Republic of China agreed to Taiwan's participation." Clearly, Taiwan attended this year's summit only because China allowed it to do so.

I am concerned that other countries and international organizations will now begin to view China as Taiwan's suzerain. If this view becomes the accepted international norm, Taiwan's current status as an independent, sovereign state will be undermined further.

Some applaud the fact that Taiwan had any presence in this year's summit. I would like to point out though that, due to Chinese pressure, Taiwan participated under the name "Chinese Taipei," even though the name of the country is "Taiwan." Taipei is merely Taiwan's capital. In addition, Taiwan participated in the WHA session as a mere "observer." This meant that Taiwan's representatives did not have the right to vote during the weeklong meeting. Furthermore, Taiwan's participation was not permanent; it came under Beijing's sponsorship on a one-year-at-a-time basis.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Rather than supporting “meaningful participation,” I believe the U.S. should promote Taiwan’s full membership in international organizations such as the WHO. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Taiwan’s full and equal membership in the United Nations, the WHO, and other international organizations.

A TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT
ZACHARY WALTERS

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Marine Sergeant Zachary Walters who was killed in Helmand, Afghanistan on June 8, 2010 while serving with the 2nd Battalion, 6th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force based out of Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

Sergeant Walters attended Flagler Palm Coast High School and was a member of the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC). He graduated in 2005 and joined the United States Marine Corps the next day, passing up college scholarships and job offers so he could serve the country he loved. During his initial tour in the Marine Corps, he deployed from August 2008 to March 2009 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

After his initial enlistment was complete, Sergeant Walters could have returned to civilian life, but he instead chose to re-enlist in the Marine Corps. Sergeant Walters learned that the Marines whom he had trained would be deployed to Afghanistan, and he felt it was his duty to lead the Marines he had prepared into combat. He selflessly chose to answer the call once again. Sergeant Walters shipped out in May for Afghanistan, just days before his 24th birthday.

Sergeant Walters lost his life to a roadside bomb while doing what he had chosen to do: leading men into combat. Our Nation can never repay the debt we owe to this brave man and his family. Sergeant Walters represents the best values of this Nation and the Marine Corps, embodying the Corps’ values of Honor, Courage and Commitment.

I cannot state it any better than Sergeant Walters’ mother, Regina Walters, did, when she said: “I’ve never been prouder in my life. My precious boy made the ultimate sacrifice. He would not have had it any other way.”

I wish to extend my condolences to Sergeant Walters’ family and hope that they continue to find solace in his lasting impact on both his grateful Nation and his proud Corps.

IN HONOR OF THE 51ST ANNUAL
DINNER OF THE CLEVELAND
CHAPTER OF THE NAACP

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 51st Annual Dinner of the Cleveland Chapter NAACP. The Cleveland Chapter and all NAACP Chapters were a

driving force behind our nation’s civil rights movement. Founded in 1912, the Cleveland Chapter continues to serve as a source of support and strength on behalf of the rights and freedoms of minorities.

While the Cleveland Chapter began as a small group, they quickly grew to 1,600 members by 1922. The population of African Americans in Northeast Ohio increased during the 1920s and 1930s, allowing political leadership to organize and emerge. In 1923, supported by the Cleveland Chapter of the NAACP, Thomas W. Fleming was elected the first-ever African American to Cleveland City Council. A few years later, three more African Americans were elected to serve on the Cleveland City Council. In 1927, Harry E. Davis was elected to serve on the Cleveland Civil Service Commission and Mary Martin Brown was elected as a member of the Cleveland City School Board. They too were the first African Americans to hold these positions.

During its first few decades, the Cleveland Chapter of the NAACP fought fiercely against racism. Chapter leaders and members rallied and organized for fair housing, educational and job opportunities, and an end to segregation. The Cleveland Chapter of the NAACP filed lawsuits against theaters, restaurants and other establishments that discriminated against African Americans. Chapter members also worked diligently behind the scenes to persuade white business owners to stop discriminatory practices.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of the members and leaders, past and present, of the Cleveland Chapter of the NAACP as they gather to celebrate their 51st Annual Dinner. Since their formation in 1912, members have risked their lives and their livelihoods to fight for equality and tear down the walls of racism. In their quest for freedom they paved the way for a society where equal opportunity and justice exist for many as never before and where someday, will exist for all.

HONORING LAURA DESTEFANO

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Laura DeStefano, the Award of Merit Winner for the 4th Congressional District’s high school art competition, “An Artistic Discovery.” An Artistic Discovery recognizes and encourages the artistic talent in the Nation, as well as in each congressional district. The Congressional Art Competition began in 1982 to provide an opportunity for Members of Congress to encourage and recognize the artistic talents of their young constituents. Since then, over 650,000 high school students have been involved with the nationwide competition.

Laura DeStefano, a resident of the 4th Congressional District, is currently a senior at East Meadow High School in East Meadow, New York. Ms. DeStefano offered her digital photography piece, “Where the Side Walk Ends.” Laura’s eye for beauty is certainly a testament to her achievement.

The contest in the 4th Congressional District continues to flourish and I owe it to all of the

talented students like Laura from our high schools that submitted their art to be displayed in this distinguished contest. It is essential for art programs and curricula to remain in our schools and communities. I believe that having a forum for our young people to express themselves in a creative way is extraordinarily important and I will continue to work in Congress to ensure that the arts are preserved.

The future of this country depends on the hopes and dreams of its children. Our community, and our Nation, is enhanced by the contributions of students like Laura DeStefano. Additionally, I would like to recognize the work of the teachers and administrators at East Meadow High School who dedicate their lives to their students. The staff is the backbone of the students’ success and I thank them for all that they do on a daily basis.

Madam Speaker, it is with pride and admiration I offer my thanks and recognition to Laura DeStefano.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER SHAWNEE
CITY COUNCILMEMBER FRANK
GOODE

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Frank Goode, who recently concluded 32 years of public service to the citizens of Shawnee, Kansas. In April, Frank Goode concluded a 30-year tenure as an elected member of the Shawnee City Council, which was preceded by 2 years of service on the Shawnee City Planning Commission.

On April 12, the City of Shawnee announced that it is naming the city’s Public Works Service Center after former Councilmember Goode, in recognition of his long and distinguished service to Shawnee. As Mayor Jeff Meyers said in making the announcement, “I’m sure we couldn’t find but a handful of individuals across the county who have served their community for 32 years. That kind of commitment to the community deserves recognition that a plaque could never give.”

Frank Goode grew up in Shawnee, attending St. Joseph Grade School and St. Joseph High School. He also attended Donnelly College, Rockhurst College and Finlay Engineering School. A Korean War veteran, Goode was a division sales manager for the Stuart Hall Company. He first became involved with local issues when he was appointed to the Planning Commission in 1977; in the following year, he launched his first campaign for City Council.

As Council member, Goode focused on expanding the city and improving its infrastructure, while holding the line on taxes. He was particularly supportive of tax abatements, particularly those for Bayer Animal Healthcare, which he credits with keeping that major employer in Shawnee.

Having left the Council at age 80, Frank Goode is certainly entitled to a relaxing retirement. Nonetheless, he’s still going strong, having spent the past few years also working at Goode Brothers Asphalt, a business started by his brothers at about the same time he first

was elected to the Council. I know Frank will also remain aware of and involved with local issues before the Shawnee government.

Madam Speaker, I know that you and all Members of this House join with me in paying tribute to a dedicated public servant who has been key to the growth and prosperity of Shawnee, Kansas, for the past several decades. I am pleased to have this opportunity to recognize former Shawnee City Council Member Frank Goode.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE ORDER OF THE KNIGHTS OF RIZAL, CLEVELAND CHAPTER, AND THE 149TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF DR. JOSE PROTACIO RIZAL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the contribution of the Cleveland Chapter of the Order of the Knights of Rizal and to honor Dr. Jose Protacio Rizal on the occasion of the 149th anniversary of his birth.

A hero of the Filipino Independence movement in the 1800s, Dr. Rizal continues to inspire. His heroic and poignant writings and efforts focused on freedom from oppression and liberty for all. He inspired and energized people beyond his native Philippines.

A young and idealistic doctor, Dr. Rizal wrote of freedom and independence from Spain. His writings soon struck a chord and he went on to found the Filipino independence movement, Luga Filipina, in Manila in 1892. By 1898, an armed struggle for independence had begun, and government officials accused Dr. Rizal of leading the charge. On the evening of December 30, 1896, Dr. Rizal was executed by firing squad in what is now known in Manila as Rizal Park. The night before his scheduled execution, he wrote the poem 'Mi Ultimo Adios,' a heart-rending and poignant expression of his love for country and people of the Philippines.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honoring and celebrating the life of Dr. Jose Protacio Rizal, and in recognition of the members of the Order of the Knights of Rizal, Cleveland Chapter. Dr. Jose Rizal's story is the embodiment of the innate human quest for freedom, justice and liberty.

RECOGNIZING JACOB COSTELLO FOR EARNING THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD GOLD MEDAL

HON. JOHN BOOZMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Jacob Costello from Wesley, Arkansas for achieving the Congressional Award Gold Medal. This prestigious award is the highest honor given to America's youth by the U.S. Congress.

The Congressional Award Program recognizes excellence and service among young

Americans who are challenged to set goals and carry through in public service, personal development and physical fitness and expedition or exploration.

Jacob had the motivation and resolve to achieve this major accomplishment; completing 400 hours of voluntary public service, 200 hours of personal development activities, 200 hours of physical fitness and 4 consecutive days and nights of an exploration or expedition.

Reflecting on his efforts and the time it took to accomplish this award, Jacob said that he "realized that personal growth can go hand-in-hand with service to others." It is refreshing to see that young Americans in my district and all across the country are working so hard to improve themselves and their communities.

I want to congratulate Jacob for his determination and dedication and encourage him to continue working towards his goals.

RECOGNIZING JAMES A. PARETTI, JR.

HON. JOHN KLINE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, those of us privileged to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives do not do our jobs alone. We rely on the expertise and tireless energy of staff members who share our commitment to serving our constituents and our nation. As one of my staff members prepares to depart, I recognize and applaud his years of service to this, The People's House.

James A. Paretti, Jr. first came to Capitol Hill in 1987, and has served on the staff of the Education and Labor Committee since 2003. As Workforce Policy Counsel, Jim has helped reform and modernize employment policy with the overarching goal of protecting workers and fostering innovation among American employers. As an attorney, his dedication to and understanding of the law has been the hallmark of his service.

Jim's quick wit and powerful intellect have served members of the Education and Labor Committee well. He has proven to be a deft negotiator able to put principle above party and craft legislation in the best interest of the nation. Jim's contributions to the House are many, and we wish him well as he enters the next phase of a career dedicated to upholding, interpreting, and improving the laws that affect American workers and employers.

ACKNOWLEDGING SANDRA JAKOVljeVIC

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and acknowledge Sandra Jakovljevic.

Sandra has been a valued district staff member of mine for the past 3 years, specializing in outreach to the Bosnian community and providing excellent customer service to my constituents.

The Bosnian community is a significant part of my district. More than 30,000 have decided to make the St. Louis area their new home, and Sandra has been an excellent liaison to my Bosnian-American constituents. Sandra has assisted many with questions about immigration processes and procedures, and has been able to help them make St. Louis and America feel more like home.

I have received many accolades from citizens all across my district who received critical assistance outstanding service from Sandra. From visa issues to emergency passport problems, Sandra went the extra mile to help resolve their problem in the most professional and timely manner possible. Many times, she came to the office very early or stayed very late to make calls across different international time zones to help bring resolution to problems, something my constituents have come to truly appreciate.

I admire Sandra for the many challenges she has overcome in her lifetime. My staff and I have learned much from Sandra, and I hope she has learned from her experience with my office as well. May Sandra enjoy success and peace with her new husband-to-be Bernard, and we wish her well as she begins this new chapter in her life. I, along with all of my staff, will miss her very much.

IN HONOR OF GEORGE AND CLARA ZABOROWSKI ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR 65TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of George and Clara Zaborowski, as they celebrate sixty-five years of marriage and devotion to one another. On this special day, they also celebrate their family and many friends throughout the community.

George Zaborowski grew up on Cleveland's eastside and worked at White Motor Company for nearly forty years. Clara Sokolowski grew up in the Tremont neighborhood in the apartment above her parents' restaurant, the Sokolowski's University Inn. Established in 1923, the Sokolowski's University Inn remains one of Cleveland's most beloved culinary landmarks. Mr. Zaborowski joined the Marines and served his nation during World War II.

George and Clara, both of Polish heritage and fluent in Polish, met in 1941. On June 23, 1945, they wed at St. John Cantius Church in Cleveland, Ohio. Together, they lovingly raised their children—Thomas and Christine. Their shared love for each other has extended through each new generation. Their family continues to be the center of their lives, as they are close to their grandchildren, Lisa, Maureen, Kim and Jessica, as well as their great-grandchildren, Joshua, Craig, Kyle, Malcom, Cassy, Alex, Spencer and Henry.

To this day, Mr. and Mrs. Zaborowski continue to honor Polish traditions and customs, especially during the holiday season. They have instilled within their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren a sense of their family heritage.

Madam Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Mr. and

Mrs. Zaborowski, as they celebrate sixty-five years of marriage. I wish Mr. and Mrs. Zaborowski an abundance of health, happiness and peace in all of their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE COMMUNITY
ACTIVISM OF MR. MICHAEL
SLAYMAKER

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding public service of Mr. Michael Slaymaker, president of the Orlando Youth Alliance, in honor of Gay & Lesbian Pride Month. Under the direction of Mr. Slaymaker, the Orlando Youth Alliance serves to educate parents, academia, health care workers, and others about the development and diversity of sexual identity and make them more attention to the concerns and needs of gay, lesbian, bi-sexual and transgendered youth.

Mr. Slaymaker moved to Central Florida in 1995 from Iowa. He graduated from Central College, Pella, Iowa, in 1983 with a bachelor of arts degree in Communications & Theatre and minor degrees in Business Management and German. In 1999, he earned his master of arts degree in Human Resources at Rollins College in Winter Park, Florida.

Mr. Slaymaker has worked with numerous non-profit organizations that have contributed greatly to the Central Florida community. From 1983 through 1993, he worked for the American Heart Association, first at a field representative, then as the Special Events Director, and finally as the Director of Field Services. He successfully designed a major gifts program and increased the annual revenue generation by \$1 million and he was recognized nationally for his exceptional work. From 1995 to 1996, he served at the Executive Director for the Hope and Help Center in Central Florida, whose mission is to treat and prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS. Mr. Slaymaker's outstanding service continued there as he initiated many programs to benefit the people of Florida and repaired the financially troubled state of the organization. In 1998, he joined the Orlando Gay Chorus as a volunteer singer and was quickly recruited to help with fundraising. For 10 years, he served as the Development Director for the Orlando Gay Chorus, increasing their budget by more than \$150,000. In 2000, he founded the Orlando Anti-Discrimination Ordinance Committee to fight local discrimination, and has been the driving force behind this highly successful volunteer group ever since. From 2001 to 2010, he was the Human Resources & Development Director of the La Amistad Foundation, Inc., where his innovations helped enhance the quality of life for adults with chronic mental illnesses.

Currently, Mr. Slaymaker is the President of the Orlando Youth Alliance, a non-profit organization which has the vital purpose in the Central Florida community to provide a safe and nurturing environment for LGBT youth between the ages of 13 and 20. The Orlando Youth Alliance was formed in 1990 under the name "Delta Youth Alliance" as a support

group to help struggling LGBT youth. The group gathers every week to talk about their concerns and discuss issues that are important to them. Through the years, this organization has lent a hand to hundreds of Central Florida's youth and has expanded its outreach into the Orlando community. Mr. Slaymaker's exceptional efforts have helped make our Central Florida safer, our community more dynamic, and our people more conscientious. He has inspired our youth and empowered them to be proud of who they are.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Mr. Michael Slaymaker for his outstanding work and leadership both in the Gay & Lesbian community and in our Florida community as a whole. He is a fantastic community activist and a source of pride to Florida.

AGC RECOGNIZES THE BEST IN
THE INDUSTRY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the Magazine of the Associated General Contractors of America proudly recognizes the new Margot and Bill Winspear Opera House and the AT&T Performing Arts Center Dee and Charles Wyly Theatre in Dallas, TX. Both buildings received an Aon Build America Award for their pioneering projects, commitment to safety, and community outreach. The one-of-a-kind 80,000-sq-ft AT&T Performing Arts Center Dee and Charles Wyly Theatre wins in the "Building New" category. Complimentary, the Margot and Bill Winspear Opera House is the grand award winner for "Construction Management New."

The eye-catching opera house is built in the center of Dallas' arts district which anchors the AT&T Performing Arts Center Dee and Charles Wyly Theatre. The complexity and stunning aesthetics of the Dallas Opera House, constructed by Linbeck Group, received AGC's highest award. This European style opera house, built at \$197 million, includes a performance hall that accommodates opera, musical theater, ballet, and many other dance forms.

One of the most visually stunning elements in the theater is the red glass wall panels that encase the performance hall. This red curtain wall is made up of a shocking 1,100 glass panels. It includes a great feature that allows three operable sections to be lowered opening the building to the outdoors.

For more than two decades these impressive awards were given to projects selected by a panel of tough critics and contractors. Now, Dallas can cheerfully accept this award and relish in their "job well done!"

IN HONOR OF THE STRONGSVILLE
VFW, POST 3345 ON THE OCCA-
SION OF THEIR 75TH ANNIVER-
SARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the veteran and auxiliary

members of Strongsville Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 3345, as they celebrate the Post's 75th anniversary and dedicate a Veterans Memorial on June 19, 2010.

Strongsville VFW Post 3345 was chartered on June 22, 1935 with only three members in attendance. Today, it is one of the largest VFW posts in the state with nearly 1,200 members.

Strongsville VFW Post 3345 has a legacy of community outreach and volunteer service throughout the western communities of Greater Cleveland. The members of Post 3345 have reached out to veterans and the families of military personnel, providing support and assistance wherever possible. Post 3345 provides numerous college scholarships and sponsors an annual Teacher of the Year Award. Members also volunteer thousands of hours annually for charity and at local Veterans Administration hospitals.

Members of VFW Post 3345 raised funds to construct a Veterans Memorial to publicly honor and commemorate the lives of all American soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our nation.

Madam Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honoring the members of Strongsville VFW Post 3345 and all veterans for their contributions to community and country.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SAC-
RIFICE OF UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE SENIOR AIRMAN BEN-
JAMIN D. WHITE

HON. GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Air Force Senior Airman Benjamin D. White, who was killed in action on June 9, 2010.

Benjamin grew up in Johnson City, Tennessee and graduated from Science Hill High School in 2004. He attended East Tennessee State University before entering the Air Force in July 2006.

A Pararescueman assigned to the 48th Rescue Squadron at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Benjamin belonged to a highly regarded and specialized unit known throughout the military for their skills and willingness to risk their lives to save others.

The motto of Pararescue units, "That Others May Live", speaks to the dedication that Benjamin and his brothers in arms share. He perished doing what he loved, alongside other Air Force Rescue personnel, on a mission to save a British Soldier's life.

We remember Senior Airman White and offer our deepest condolences and sincerest prayers to his family. My words cannot effectively convey the feeling of great loss, nor can they offer adequate consolation. However, it is my hope that in future days, his family may take some comfort in knowing that Benjamin made a difference in the lives of many others and serves as an example of a competent and caring leader and friend that will live on in the hearts and minds of all those he touched.

Senior Airman White is survived by his mother Brenda, father Tony and brother Mark.

This body and this country owe Benjamin and his family our deepest gratitude, and we

will today and forevermore honor and remember him and his service to our country.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly support the right of Israel to act in self-defense, which requires the inspection of cargo going into area controlled by the terrorist organization Hamas surrounding the Gaza territory. The inspections are vital because Hamas has smuggled in thousands of rockets to attack and terrorize Israeli civilians. Hamas has clearly stated its goal is the destruction of the State of Israel and the leaders of the Gaza flotilla, particularly those on the Mavi Marmara, set out to intentionally use force to confront the blockade. If the blockade were to be broken, it would be impossible to tell which vessels were carrying humanitarian supplies and which were carrying deadly rockets.

As a sovereign nation, Israel has the right to protect its people from the threat of terrorism. Israel warned the boats that they were in violation of a lawful blockade and offered them an alternative where the humanitarian aid would be off-loaded and delivered to Gaza. The flotilla, however, insisted on attempting to circumvent the blockade because their primary motivation was confrontation.

Israel is a long-standing democratic ally of the United States. We must stand with Israel and defend their right to defend the Israeli people.

RECOGNIZING THE ONE YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

HON. TODD RUSSELL PLATTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. PLATTS. Madam Speaker, today marks the one year anniversary of the enactment of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. I was proud to have partnered with Representative HENRY WAXMAN in introducing this bill and seeing its passage through the House of Representatives.

The Family Smoking Prevention and Control Act took important steps to educate the American public about the harmful effects of tobacco-use. The law provides the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) with the authority to regulate tobacco products and ensures that these products are not advertised or sold to children.

While many of the provisions of this law are still being implemented by the FDA, a number of important changes have already taken place. For example, a ban on flavored cigarettes is now being enforced. Cigarettes with flavors such as strawberry and lemon were clearly marketed toward children and lured young adults into trying their first cigarette.

In addition, tobacco companies are now prohibited from sponsoring athletic and cultural

events, which are widely attended and viewed by millions of children each year. No longer will a child's favorite race car driver be covered in tobacco ads nor will a favorite baseball player hit a homerun over a large cigarette banner.

The FDA has also begun enforcing the prohibition of vending machines that sell tobacco products in settings in which children are present. Vending machines served as an easy way for minors to access tobacco products since no age verification is present. Because the vast majority of all smokers try their first cigarette between the ages of twelve and twenty, these important changes will go a long way toward preventing children from trying their first cigarette, and becoming smokers as adults.

Thus far, the FDA has moved expeditiously in their implementation of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act. I hope that they will continue their efforts to discourage our nation's young people from smoking and educate them of the harmful effects of tobacco use. For too long tobacco companies have targeted our nation's children through cartoon ads, event sponsorship, and free merchandise. I am confident that the continued implementation of this law will lead to generations of fewer tobacco-addicted youth.

HONORING ATHLETE AND HUMANITARIAN MANUTE BOL

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Sudanese athlete and humanitarian Manute Bol, who sadly passed away on June 19, 2010, at the age of 47.

Seven-foot 7-inches tall, Manute Bol joined the National Basketball Association (NBA) in 1985 with the Washington Bullets, after catching the eye of an American basketball coach working in Sudan. When he arrived in the United States, he didn't speak any English and hadn't completed any schooling beyond a basic elementary level. His exceptional height and shot blocking ability made him an instant hit in the NBA, and, in addition to two stints with Washington, his 10-year career took him to Golden State, Philadelphia and Miami. He twice led the league in the number of blocked shots per game and shares the record as the tallest person to ever play in the NBA.

While many undoubtedly knew Mr. Bol due to his prowess on the basketball court, he was perhaps most proud of the humanitarian work he did to help his native Sudan. In 2007, after relocating to Olathe, Kansas, Mr. Bol partnered with a Kansas-based relief organization, Sudan Sunrise, to help educate and improve living conditions for children in Sudan. He pledged money and support to help construct a school in his native Turalei, Sudan, which was partially completed in January 2010, and now serves 300 children a day.

Ravaged by prolonged civil wars, Sudan lacks many of the basic services that you and I take for granted. Eighty-five percent of the population in Southern Sudan is illiterate. Only about seven percent of teachers in the southern part of the country have any professional

training, and it is not uncommon to visit a school where the teachers themselves have not been educated beyond fourth grade. Drawing from his own experiences and struggles due to a lack of basic education as a young man, Mr. Bol came to place a high value on learning. He felt that one of the keys to peace in Sudan is education for its children, and dedicated his life to improving the educational opportunities in his native country.

While Mr. Bol was helping Sudan make significant strides forward in its education system, it is clear that there is still much work to be done. It is my hope that we in Congress, and others across the globe, are inspired by the work of Manute Bol to help children in Sudan and that together, we continue the mission he has begun.

IN RECOGNITION OF BUD AND SHERRY GRINSTEAD'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a very special occasion today—the 50th wedding anniversary of Bud and Sherry Grinstead.

Bud Grinstead of Gary, IN, and Sherry Ryzenga of Holland, MI, met at Bryan University in Dayton, TN. In September of 1959, the couple transferred to Tennessee Temple University in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

On June 4, 1960, Bud and Sherry were married at Rose Park Baptist Church in Sherry's hometown by Revs. Garland Cofield and James Gurley. After college graduation in June of 1962, the couple moved to Jacksonville, Florida to serve at Victory Baptist Church where their first two children were born. On May 26, 1965, Bud was ordained as a Baptist minister.

The family relocated to Oxford, Alabama in 1969 where Bud served as minister of music and taught the young adult class at Trinity Baptist Church. Their third child was born in 1970. That same year, Bud started Trinity Christian Academy (TCA). The school added a grade each year until their first graduating class graduated in 1979. Bud also started a radio broadcast in 1979. During their time at Trinity, Sherry taught piano lessons and a music class.

In 1975, the family joined the Tom Williams Evangelistic Team and traveled from church to church ministering to all. In 1978, they moved back to Oxford to serve at Trinity Baptist Church and in 1980, Bud accepted the position of pastor. The radio station, WTBJ, aired for the first time in 1994. Bud has ministered in every continent of the world except Antarctica and Sherry has taught full time at TCA for 28 years and is retiring this year.

Bud and Sherry have three children: Debbie, Darryl and Dawn and nine grandchildren. A reception in their honor will be held on June 26th at Trinity Baptist Church.

I salute my friends, Bud and Sherry, on the 50th year of their life together and join their family in honoring them on this special occasion.

IN HONOR AND RECOGNITION OF
KARL ERTL

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Karl Ertle, whose dedication has helped improve the education and opportunities for hundreds of young women and men throughout southeast Cleveland, Ohio, and beyond.

Mr. Ertle has been the President and Principal of Cleveland Central Catholic High School, an urban high school located in the Slavic Village neighborhood, since 2004. He has turned the school around, managing a \$13 million capital improvement program and overseeing an increase in enrolment of more than forty percent.

Mr. Ertle grew up in the Cleveland area. He studied at St. Ignatius High School and then later began his teaching career there. He earned a bachelor's degree in English from Borromeo College and a master's degree in religious studies from John Carroll University. Between 1983 and 2004 he performed a number of different roles at St. Ignatius, including theology teacher, director of admissions, assistant principal for student services, and vice president of the Mission of St. Ignatius.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in honor and recognition of Karl Ertle on the occasion of his retirement. He has continuously and unstintingly served the young people of Cleveland, displaying integrity, kindness, and an unwavering commitment to bettering the lives of countless students. I wish Mr. Ertle, his wife Carol, and his children: Tim, Katie, Mary, Annie, Danny and Joe, health, peace and happiness.

CONGRATULATING THE
NEEDVILLE LADY BLUE JAYS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Needville Lady Blue Jays on an outstanding season. The Lady Blue Jays fought hard giving it everything they had, but lost a heartbreaking game in the bottom of the 11th inning in the Texas 3A semifinal matchup.

Although they did not clinch the title, these athletes have shown they have the dedication, determination, and drive to reach their goals. I know these ladies are the pride of their school and community. The Needville Lady Blue Jays' demonstrate excellence in both academics and athletics, and I applaud them on a great season.

HONORING DANIELLE FUENTES

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Danielle

Fuentes, the Award of Achievement Winner for the 4th Congressional District's high school art competition, "An Artistic Discovery." An Artistic Discovery recognizes and encourages the artistic talent in the nation, as well as in each congressional district. The Congressional Art Competition began in 1982 to provide an opportunity for Members of Congress to encourage and recognize the artistic talents of their young constituents. Since then, over 650,000 high school students have been involved with the nationwide competition.

Danielle Fuentes, a resident of the 4th Congressional District, is currently a senior at Oceanside High School in Oceanside, New York. Ms. Fuentes offered her piece called "Dead Ringer", which was a pencil still life. Danielle's eye for beauty and shadowing skills are certainly a testament to her achievement.

The contest in the 4th Congressional District continues to flourish and I owe it to all of the talented students like Danielle from our high schools that submitted their art to be displayed in this distinguished contest. It is essential for art programs and curricula to remain in our schools and communities. I believe that having a forum for our young people to express themselves in a creative way is extraordinarily important and I will continue to work in Congress to ensure that the arts are preserved.

The future of this country depends on the hopes and dreams of its children. Our community, and our nation, is enhanced by the contributions of students like Danielle Fuentes. Additionally, I would like to recognize the work of the teachers and administrators at Oceanside High School who dedicate their lives to their students. The staff is the backbone of the students' success and I thank them for all that they do on a daily basis.

Madam Speaker, it is with pride and admiration I offer my thanks and recognition to Danielle Fuentes.

TRIBUTE TO SCAPPOOSE HIGH
SCHOOL

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Scappoose High School on winning the Oregon School Activities Association's, OSAA, 4A boys baseball championship. Scappoose finished their season with 22 wins and six losses, beating top-ranked Astoria High School 2-1 in eight innings on June 5, 2010, to capture their first State championship since 1982.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Principal Eric Clendenin, Athletic Director Jim Jones, Head Coach Robert Medley, Assistant Coaches Joe Girres, Matt Bailey, and Neal Lordos, and all of the Scappoose Indians—Cody Backus, Brandon Bernardi, Dillion Davidson, Aaron Egger, Austin Egger, Willy Fouts, Cory Honeydyx, Torin Huff, Nathan Kranyak, DJ Maloney, Tanner Meyer, Brad Morrison, Chris Neifert, Nick Paxton, Paul Revis, Jason Sawyer, Max Updike, and Jacob Watt—for winning the OSAA 4A boys baseball championship.

INTRODUCING A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution honoring National Pollinator Week, which takes place from June 21 to 27, 2010. It is my pleasure to announce that with the leadership of the Pollinator Partnership, a majority of States as well as a number of federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, have officially recognized the occasion to reflect upon the importance of and challenges facing these species vital to our ecosystem and agriculture.

Responsible for almost \$20 billion worth of products in the United States alone, an estimated one-third of all food and beverages is derived from pollinators. With 75 percent of all flowering plant species relying on animals like birds, bees, bats, and butterflies as the vehicle for transferring pollen for fertilization, there is no escaping the fact that pollinators are essential not just for plants, but for the sustainability and security of our food supply.

Because new threats are emerging against these animals all the time, we should use National Pollinator Week to learn about how to help protect and encourage pollinators' growth and survival. There are many things we can do. For example, we can plant a garden with native flowering plants supplying pollinators with nectar, pollen and homes as well as work to minimize pollution and use of chemicals that contaminate their habitats. We can also educate our friends on the importance of pollinators and can learn even more from the Pollinator Partnership's Web site, which can be found at www.pollinator.org.

Madam Speaker, National Pollinator Week provides us an opportunity to recognize how important pollinators are to the sustainability of our environment. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
DOROTHY MANN

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dorothy Mann and celebrate her retirement after 33 years as the bold and visionary Executive Director of the Family Planning Council in Philadelphia.

The Family Planning Council administers all public funds for family planning services in the five-country Philadelphia region. Under Dorothy's leadership, the Council worked to prevent teen pregnancy, HIV infection and other STDs; to provide care to HIV positive women, children and families; and to provide breast and cervical cancer screening programs for uninsured women and so much more. In 2008, the Council served 145,000 patients, and in 2009 was the 6th largest provider of Title X family planning services in the nation.

Dorothy has worked tirelessly to improve reproductive health care for women and men in the United States. Beginning as a family planning outreach worker in California, she went on to play a key role in the development of groundbreaking research paving the way for the Title X Family Planning program we know today.

Arriving in Pennsylvania in the early 1970's, Ms. Mann was instrumental in opening the first federally funded family planning programs in the Commonwealth. A tenacious advocate, Dorothy Mann took her leadership to a national level where she testified before Congress and served on two Institute of Medicine panels about the importance of preventing STIs and the perinatal transmission of HIV. In addition, Ms. Mann is a founding member and former Board President of National Family Planning & Reproductive Health Association (NFPFRA) and the AIDS Alliance for Children, Youth & Families.

On personal note, I am grateful to be among those with the honor of calling Dorothy Mann a colleague and a friend. We have spent many years working closely together, and I am very proud of our work.

Today we recognize the achievements of Dorothy Mann and her preeminent career in the field of public health. She has done vital work to advance the Title X Family Planning Program and promote the critical link between preventive health care and opportunity for women are the hallmarks of her career.

COMMENDING THE HOLLYWOOD
WALK OF FAME ON ITS 50TH AN-
NIVERSARY

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2010

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H. Res 1357, a resolution congratulating the Hollywood Walk of Fame on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The star-studded sidewalks at Hollywood Boulevard and Vine Street are an iconic symbol of the American entertainment industry. First envisioned by former Hollywood Chamber of Commerce President E.M. Stuart, the Hollywood Walk of Fame today prominently fulfills its mission to maintain "the glory of a community whose name means glamour and excitement in the four corners of the world."

Since its inception in 1960, over 2,000 individuals have been awarded stars on the walk in the categories of motion picture, television, music, radio broadcasting, and theater. Individually, these stars honor the talents and extraordinary achievements of artists as varied as Sidney Poitier, Carol Burnett, Elvis Presley, Gloria Estefan and Bob Hope. Collectively, the Hollywood Walk of Fame celebrates an entertainment industry that is an engine of creativity and ingenuity and an emblem of American culture at home and abroad.

Today, our Nation is proud to honor the Hollywood Walk of Fame, which attracts an estimated 10 million visitors a year, and its development as a lively hub for tourism and a thriving monument. It is most certainly a destination worth visiting and commemorating.

HONORING DR. JAMES "JEFF"
KIMPEL

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, it is unusual that America has an opportunity to thank an individual citizen for his contributions to protecting lives and property of our citizens, but in the case of Dr. James "Jeff" Kimpel, the Director of NOAA's Severe Storms Laboratory in Norman, Oklahoma, we have just this kind of individual tirelessly dedicated to improving the research and development of weather and meteorology programs, Jeff Kimpel is now retiring on June 18 to spend more time with his 5 children and 2 grandchildren in Norman, Oklahoma.

During his last 13 years of federal service Jeff Kimpel has served the nation by working to improve the lead-time and accuracy of severe weather forecasts and weather warnings in order to save the lives of many Americans and to save property from being destroyed. In the state of Oklahoma, severe weather is a massive problem, and accurate estimates of the true threats from severe weather are especially of interest to not just our state, but to a wide range of users. This includes weather forecasters, the insurance industry, emergency management communities and the general public. Dr. Kimpel has worked with the NSSL and was able to establish strong programs that have helped speed up the construction of the National Weather Center building, which is shared with the National Weather Service (NWS), and the University of Oklahoma Meteorology Program.

Dr. Kimpel has been a pioneer in the field of technology and meteorology. The NSSL has been able to expound on many programs to enhance their technology, all under the watch of Dr. Kimpel. The NSSL has performed research that has led to the upgrade of NEXRADs (NEXt generation weather RADar) from propriety to open systems, which also added super resolution capability and designed dual polarization upgrades.

As a long serving member of the House of Science and Technology Committee, I commend the work of Dr. Jeff Kimpel and recognize his outstanding science related positions including President of the American Meteorological Society, National Science Foundation positions, Department of Energy, and a participant in major decision making policy in the environmental, and meteorological and atmospheric areas for NOAA and other government agencies. Dr. Kimpel was instrumental in establishing support for NSSL that led to the construction of a magnificent national weather center building shared with the National Weather Service and the University of Oklahoma's meteorology program. He is truly one of the world's foremost authorities on severe weather including tornados, thunderstorms, hail, strong winds, heavy rainfall, ice storms, flooding and winter storms who has explored new technologies during his career for using weather information to assist government forecasters and federal, university, and private sector partners.

Today we would like to thank you for your service and dedication, and for all the work

that you have put in. Thank you and best of luck with all your future undertakings.

HONORING SERGEANT DONALD
LAMAR, USMC

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a United States Marine who serves as an example of courage and patriotism to us all. Sergeant Donald J. Lamar II, of the United States Marine Corps, recently gave the last full measure of devotion and sacrifice for our beloved nation while supporting combat operations in the Helmand Province of Afghanistan. Men such as Sergeant Lamar epitomize the core value of selfless service that we all hold so dear in the United States, and especially in the United States Marine Corps.

Sergeant Lamar grew up in Stafford County, Virginia, and graduated from Stafford High School in 2004. There, he was known by his teachers, coaches, and friends as a well-rounded leader who excelled in sports, particularly wrestling and football. After graduation, Sergeant Lamar joined the Marine Corps and was assigned to the First Battalion, Second Marine Regiment, Second Marine Division, of the Second Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. Although already among America's elite fighting force as an infantryman, Sergeant Lamar chose to be part of an even more exclusive group—Marine Sniper. He stood out at every opportunity and always gave his utmost.

Sergeant Lamar's awards at the time of his deployment included the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, and Afghanistan Campaign Medal. To add to his list of accolades, he was recently meritoriously promoted to Sergeant, a unique and fitting distinction for a combat-proven leader of Sergeant Lamar's caliber.

A man of character and fortitude, Sergeant Lamar bravely served two combat tours in Iraq. He was most recently serving his third combat tour in the Helmand Province of Afghanistan, where fierce fighting was taking place daily during 2010. Tragically, on May 12th, 2010, Sergeant Lamar exhibited the ultimate sacrifice for his country, family, and friends while engaged in combat operations there. His leadership in the Marine Corps and his local community will not be forgotten.

I extend to Sergeant Lamar's entire family my sincere condolences and deep appreciation for their sacrifices and service to our nation. He is survived by his wife, Stephanie Lamar, and daughter, Madison; his parents, Don and Coleen Lamar; and two younger brothers. The liberties and freedoms we enjoy here in the United States are in place because of brave and courageous men such as Sergeant Lamar who routinely answer the call to duty and place sacrifice above self. We are eternally grateful to him and his family for their service to our nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MAKING
WORK AND MARRIAGE PAY ACT

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, today, I am introducing the Making Work and Marriage Pay Act of 2010. This legislation will establish a bipartisan commission to study the negative impact that high effective marginal rates can have on families as they attempt to improve their circumstances through work or marriage. The National Commission on Effective Marginal Tax Rates for Low-Income Families would provide an important opportunity for removing the disincentives that hold many back, in spite of their personal efforts to get ahead.

Federal and state governments provide financial assistance to low-income families through many means-tested programs and a variety of income tax credits. Each of these benefits is income-based, and as income rises benefits are reduced through phase-outs. These reductions occur at various earnings levels and on differing schedules.

While it is appropriate for benefits to be withdrawn as family income increases, little thought has been given to the combined impact on behavior of these multiple phase-outs. Different programs are created within separate Congressional committees and are implemented by assorted federal and state agencies. No one entity has the authority to consider our vast system as a whole. The Commission established under this Act would be given this task and charged with the responsibility to propose a legislative package to remove the disincentives to work and marriage that these high effective marginal rates impose.

Marginal rates matter. Economists have long contended that high tax rates affect the investment decisions of affluent individuals. People at all income levels, however, respond rationally to economic incentives and disincentives. If we want people to work their way into the middle class, we need to change a system which says that if you're poor and you struggle to earn a higher income, you won't be able to keep enough of it to make it all seem really worthwhile.

I have looked at the impact these marginal rates have on a typical single mother with two children living in Wisconsin. From \$17,000 to \$40,000 in earnings, this single parent would experience combined effective marginal tax rates in excess of 50 percent—averaging 59 percent between \$24,000 and \$41,000. At lower income levels, she even approaches a rate of 100 percent. Putting this into perspective, the U.S. corporate tax rate is 35 percent (one of the highest in the industrialized world). The highest U.S. income tax rate for individuals is also 35 percent.

Thus, for every dollar of new income earned by increased effort or the acquisition of new skills, this single mother finds herself only incrementally ahead and, perhaps, wondering whether her hard work is being justly rewarded. Despite the good intentions, these programs, in effect, offer no incentive to get ahead. Rather, the incentives are backwards and low-income workers often are encouraged to stay where they are.

The same dynamic can also affect an individual's decision whether to marry. Experts

from across the political divide agree that marriage is good. Government policy, however, as enacted in this assortment of programs and phase-outs actually discourages marriage among low-income couples.

Varying benefit levels across the fifty states produce different results, but in Wisconsin, for a married couple with two children, the marriage penalty starts rising from about zero at \$19,000 of combined income to \$7,000 in after-tax income at \$28,000 of combined earnings, which is what you get if two people earn minimum wage. At \$42,000, the cost of being married reaches \$8,154. That's a high price for a marriage license.

This penalty results from the high effective marginal tax rates produced by taxes and the phaseout of various benefit programs. As income rises, taxes go up and benefits go down. The couple that has combined their lives and their income sees a steeper loss of income than does the comparable couple that has remained unmarried. If marriage is a recognized good for both society and the individual couples, then government policy should not stand in the way of people choosing to marry.

It's time that Congress rationalizes this web of programs to ensure that hard work brings rewards by removing the punishingly high effective marginal tax rates faced by low-income individuals and families.

This is why I am introducing the Making Work and Marriage Pay Act.

My bill would authorize a Commission made up of Cabinet Secretaries, Governors, and recognized policy experts to recommend solutions for the problems posed by these high effective marginal tax rates. The Commission would be constructed to achieve partisan balance, input from states offering a varying level of income support, and expert participation from government and private sector experts.

The Commission would be charged with seeking a solution along certain policy lines, but would have full authority to offer additional policy recommendations. The Commission's recommendations would be in the form of a legislative blueprint to ease consideration of its comprehensive solution by the wide range of Congressional committees.

For too long, Congress has neglected to clean up the mess of uncoordinated federal benefit programs. The Making Work and Marriage Pay Act is the first step toward a benefit structure that rewards work and effort and reflects our shared belief that marriage is the basis of stable communities. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

HONORING TIMBERLY DINGLAS

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Timberly Dinglas, the Award of Achievement Winner for the 4th Congressional District's high school art competition, "An Artistic Discovery." An Artistic Discovery recognizes and encourages the artistic talent in the nation, as well as in each congressional district. The Congressional Art Competition began in 1982 to provide an opportunity for Members of Congress to encour-

age and recognize the artistic talents of their young constituents. Since then, over 650,000 high school students have been involved with the nationwide competition.

Timberly Dinglas, a resident of the 4th Congressional District, is currently a junior at Valley Stream South High School in Valley Stream, New York. Ms. Dinglas offered her piece called "The Black Eye", which was a colored pencil portrait of a young man with a black eye. Timberly's eye for color and blending skills are evident in this piece and are certainly a testament to her achievement.

The contest in the 4th Congressional District continues to flourish and I owe it to all of the talented students like Timberly from our high schools that submitted their art to be displayed in this distinguished contest. It is essential for art programs and curricula to remain in our schools and communities. I believe that having a forum for our young people to express themselves in a creative way is extraordinarily important and I will continue to work in Congress to ensure that the arts are preserved.

The future of this country depends on the hopes and dreams of its children. Our community, and our nation, are enhanced by the contributions of students like Timberly Dinglas. Additionally, I would like to recognize the work of the teachers and administrators at Valley Stream South High School who dedicate their lives to their students. The staff is the backbone of the students' success and I thank them for all that they do on a daily basis.

Madam Speaker, it is with pride and admiration I offer my thanks and recognition to Timberly Dinglas.

CONGRATULATING THE CLEMENTS
RANGERS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Clements Rangers Baseball team on an outstanding season. They were the Region 3 Champions which qualified them for 5A Texas finals.

I congratulate their coach, Israel De Los Santos, for his steering the team to this successful season. The Rangers made their community and school very proud through their play. I wish their seniors Brian Heathcoat, Dillon Huff, Ryan Berger, Kenny Hutchison, Tyler Kruse, Andrew Riddle, Matthew Sugar, Scott Ballard, John Stanford, and Mike Garcia the best of luck in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF
RICHARD BURTON

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Richard Allyn Burton and the contributions he has made to our nation. Mr. Burton, born to Clarence and Fern Burton in Pleasant Hill, Missouri, is a shining example for future generations to follow.

Mr. Burton came to California during the Great Depression with his four brothers and

mother in search of work. Denied access at the state line, they made the arduous journey back to Missouri, yet upon their return they received word that Richard's uncle had found work for them in Escondido, California. After making the trip once again, the Burton family settled down in Escondido.

Upon the United States' entry into World War II, the Burtons answered the call to service and all four brothers enlisted in the military. After completing basic training and 16 weeks of "A" School to become an Electrician's Mate, Mr. Burton served with Task Forces 92 and 94 in the North Pacific supporting offensive operations against the Japanese. He then passed through the Panama Canal and supported operations in the Caribbean. Upon his separation from the military, Mr. Burton had been awarded the Combat Action Ribbon, the Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal (with a bronze star), the American Campaign Medal and the World War II Victory Medal.

After returning from the war, Richard married Ms. Eloise Flanders of Escondido, and the two enjoyed 53 years of marriage. They raised two children, two grandchildren, and a great-grandchild.

Mr. Burton is the epitome of what we now refer to as the "Greatest Generation." He served his country well in her time of need, and he has exemplified the hard work and determination that makes America great.

HONORING SUZANNE M.
OVERDORF

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Suzanne "Sue" Overdorf for her years of service as a devoted teacher, wife, mother and influential community member. Sue deserves the utmost admiration for her service as a dedicated mentor and role model to the youth of the community. As Sue's friend, I am honored to recognize her many achievements.

Suzanne Mae Fox was born on April 11, 1943 in South Buffalo, New York. She began her education at St. Thomas Aquinas elementary school, later graduating from Mount Mercy Academy in 1960. Sue went on to study at Buffalo State College for two years before beginning her teaching career at St. Bonaventure Elementary School. Sue continued on the path toward teaching excellence when she pursued her degree in education at St. Rose College in Albany, graduating *summa cum laude* in 1979.

Sue married her high school sweetheart Ted "Ozzie" Overdorf 46 years ago. While living in Lansing, Michigan they began their family which continued to grow when they relocated to Albany. In 1979 Sue, Ted and their six children moved back to their hometown of Hamburg, New York where Sue taught and coordinated CCD at St. Peter and Paul Parish and Nativity Parish in Orchard Park. The Overdorf family grew with the addition of 2 more children and in 1993, now the mother of eight, Sue continued her teaching career at Mount Mercy Academy and Bishop Timon St. Jude High School. Sue demonstrated great love and dedication to her roots by teaching the

young men and women in the neighborhood where she was raised. One year later, Sue became a religion instructor and senior class moderator at Bishop Timon St. Jude High School. Sue was a beloved and respected teacher who served as a role model and spiritual guide for her students. She retired on December 1, 2009, after 16 years of devotion.

Sue continually went above and beyond the norm during her teaching career. She found time while raising a family of eight children to found the Peace Club and the Thanksgiving for Others and Christmas for Others programs at Bishop Timon St. Jude High School. There, she was also awarded the Franciscan award twice and was received into the Franciscan Order Holy Name Province as an affiliate.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize Sue Overdorf for her service as a devoted teacher, counselor, friend, wife and mother, excelling in all areas. Sue was a guide as a religious educator to her students, and also showed her values through her charitable and extracurricular activities. Her involvement in community life benefitted everyone around her. It is my honor to congratulate Sue Overdorf, a woman I am pleased to call my friend, for a career filled with such accomplishments.

HONORING THE AIR FORCE
THUNDERBIRDS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the long and dedicated service of the United States Air Force Thunderbirds Aerial Demonstration Team and to commend its latest of many visits to Duluth, Minnesota, in my Congressional District.

The theme for the 2010 Duluth Air Show is "Generations"—the generations of aircraft and American men and women who have flown them for more than a century. No other unit reflects this theme more than the Thunderbirds, who have captivating audiences with their precise, intricate aerial performances for half of a century. The Air Force Thunderbirds truly span generations, with thousands of pilots and many different aircraft, from the F-84 Thunderstreak to the current F-16 Fighting Falcon. Since 1953, the pilots and support crew of the Thunderbirds have displayed unparalleled professionalism, dedication, patriotism and ability. Their commitment to the communities they visit is unmatched. Whether on the ground or in the air, the Thunderbirds bring great credit to themselves, the Air Force and the United States.

On behalf of the millions of people who have witnessed the Thunderbirds' extraordinary flight demonstrations, I wish to offer my hearty thank you to the men and women in the unit and acknowledge their service to our great nation.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE TERRY D.
LEWIS OF FORT WORTH, TEXAS

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I proudly rise today to honor the memory of one of Fort Worth's most respected and active community leaders, Judge Terry D. Lewis. Judge Lewis worked his entire life supporting his family, serving God and the Fort Worth community for which he cared so deeply.

Terry D. Lewis was the 4th child of 10, graduating from Dunbar High School in 1969, where he was an Honor Student, receiving the National Merit Achievement Award at graduation. While he was there, he was a member of the Charles L. Scott Jazz Band, on the debate team, four-year letterman in football, and Vice President of the Student Council. He was recruited to go to the University of Chicago by a former Dunbar student, Dr. Calvin Lee Dixon. He attended the University of Chicago for four years and graduated in 1973 with a bachelor's degree in Political Science. While at the University of Chicago, he was a member of the school wrestling team, and developed a passion for the martial arts. From there, he became a commissioned officer in the U.S. Marine Corps, where he was twice promoted before leaving active duty in 1976. While serving as a Marine Corps Officer, he participated in the evacuations of both Saigon and Cambodia.

After leaving the Marine Corps, Terry went to work in the business world. He worked for Johnson & Johnson, Xerox, and Jewel Food Stores prior to finding his calling of working with juvenile delinquents and emotionally disturbed teenagers in Chicago.

In 1987, while holding a full-time position and raising a family, he attended Chicago-Kent School of Law and served on the Law Review Committee, receiving his Doctor of Jurisprudence in 1991, and being honored with the Golden Gavel Award from his graduating law class for his publications and volunteerism while in law school. He was then employed by the Office of Cook County Public Defender, where he specialized in law concerning the abuse and neglect of children.

Upon moving home to Fort Worth in 1995, he acquired his license to practice law in the State of Texas, and worked with his brother, the Honorable Glenn Lewis and the Tarrant County District Attorney's Office. At the time of his death, he was serving as a Municipal Court Judge with the City of Fort Worth, where he was perhaps most proud of his efforts to match homeless people who appeared before him with social service programs. As recently as June 4, 2010, he is said to have written in an email to his colleagues:

Some people share the socio-political philosophy that government should not or cannot afford to help those on the lower economic rungs of our social ladder . . . Then there are those of us who believe that government cannot afford to neglect them. We all share this City whether our income is considerable or nil. Fort Worth Star-Telegram (June 16, 2010).

Madam Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to remember Judge Terry Lewis for his legacy and service to the city of Fort Worth and specifically the community in which

he was raised. Judge Lewis' indomitable spirit will always live here among those whom he has touched. We have been honored to have had the grace of his presence in our lives. As we stand today to celebrate the extraordinary life of this extraordinary man, I am proud to have represented such an outstanding citizen from the 26th District of Texas in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING JORGE J. LAMBRINOS FOR MORE THAN 38 YEARS OF SERVICE ON BEHALF OF OLDER AMERICANS AND ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ROYBAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Jorge J. Lambrinos, founding director of the University of Southern California (USC) Roybal Institute on Aging, who is retiring this month after more than 38 years of working in and out of government on behalf of older Americans.

Jorge was born in Panama City, Panama and arrived to this country at the age of 11 speaking no English. He fondly recalls his first job, at age 12, shining shoes in the barber-shop where his father worked. From then on, Jorge's strong work ethic and love for our country motivated him on a non-stop mission in pursuit of the American Dream—not only for himself but for our nation's elderly as well.

Jorge first got involved in advocating for seniors as Director of Latin Americans for Social and Economic Development. There, he was instrumental in getting the City of Detroit to establish a senior center in the Latino community of southwest Detroit. Jorge's leadership in his adopted hometown led to a prestigious fellowship opportunity in our nation's capital. As one of 10 national Health, Education, and Welfare Fellows, Jorge worked under Arthur S. Flemming, the U.S. Commissioner on Aging at the Administration on Aging.

After his one-year fellowship ended, Jorge became director of the U.S. Administration on Aging's Executive Secretariat and Special Assistant to the Commissioner on Aging. During that time, as an advisor to Commissioner Flemming, Jorge played a key role in the establishment of four national minority aging organizations. He also worked to ensure that minority communities had a voice in the emerging field of gerontology.

Building on this area of expertise, in 1977, Jorge joined my father, Congressman Edward R. Roybal, as Director of the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests of the House Select Committee on Aging. During that time, Jorge guided the development of the Congregate Housing Services legislation signed into law by President Jimmy Carter, which authorizes all Sec. 202 senior housing to provide temporary supportive services to ailing residents. When my father became chair of the full Committee on Aging, Jorge served as the full committee's staff director—becoming one of the first Latino staffers to hold such a position.

Several years later, Jorge then moved on to become my father's Chief of Staff. Together, they worked to address many critical priorities for older Americans, including the availability of congregate meals and stepping up research initiatives into the aging process as well as Alzheimer's disease and diabetes. Jorge is particularly proud of his work with my father to strengthen the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Jorge was integral in the formation of the Roybal Institute on Applied Gerontology. In my father's last few years in office, seniors from East Los Angeles petitioned California State University Los Angeles to establish an endowed chair in Congressman Roybal's name. Jorge's strategic recommendations resulted in the establishment of the Edward R. Roybal Foundation and the creation of the Institute.

After my father's retirement in 1993, Jorge joined him at Cal State Los Angeles and became the first full time director of the Roybal Institute. He was responsible for the management of several health promotion and disease prevention projects, including a collaborative research project with the CDC to determine the levels of older adult vaccinations in the Latino community of East Los Angeles. He also collaborated with USC's Alzheimer's Disease Research Center to translate findings from its clinical trials research to community application. In addition, Jorge was the Principal Investigator of a project funded by the Association of Teachers of Preventive Medicine to develop interventions to reduce the incidence of falls and injuries among older adults. Jorge moved with the center from Cal State LA to its new home at the University of Southern California in 2006.

Jorge Lambrinos has received numerous awards and appointments, including being named as one of the "Top 100 Most Influential Hispanics in the U.S." by Hispanic Business Magazine. He has served as a member of the National Advisory Council of the National Institute on Aging, the California Commission on Aging and the Executive Council of AARP California, where he continues to serve as health policy advisor.

In addition to his work in public service, Jorge's dedication to our country is also evident through his distinguished military service. A graduate of the U.S. Army War College and a decorated Bronze Star Gulf War veteran, Jorge retired as a Lt. Colonel after 27 years of military service.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognizing Jorge's long record of service to our country. His significant contributions have made life healthier and more just for older Americans from all walks of life and I wish him many more years of fulfillment and success in retirement.

SALUTING ELDER GOLDWIRE MCLENDON, PHILADELPHIA'S PREMIER GOSPEL SINGER

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Speaker, an incredibly talented Gospel singer from Philadelphia has been sharing his gift with a national audience through "Sunday Best," the BET network's closely watched gospel singing competition.

The results were announced this Sunday, and our own Elder Goldwire McLendon was selected as runner-up to a young lady from Florida, LeAndria Johnson. Elder McLendon's many, many fans in Philadelphia and across the nation may be mildly disappointed, but they are immensely proud of the man, his powerful voice and his faith.

Annette John-Hall, a talented writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, captured the drama and the impact of this remarkable man and his quest, in her column in today's newspaper. I share her column and extend my congratulations to this Philadelphia Gospel superstar.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 22, 2010]

AT 79, ELDER MCLENDON SHARES THE GIFT OF HIS VOICE

(By Annette John-Hall)

All you have to do is watch the audience react to Elder Goldwire McLendon every time he sings to understand the profound impact he has.

People get choked up. Some weep outright. Heck, just watching him perform on YouTube puts a lump in your throat.

See, McLendon sings gospel. And he has for, oh, 70 years, ever since he was 9 and singing in Sunday school in Jacksonville, Fla., his hometown.

He has sung in prisons, in concert halls, and at his own place of worship, Mount Olive Baptist Church in Philadelphia, where he has ministered for 40 years.

But it wasn't until McLendon decided to audition for Sunday Best, BET's gospel singing competition, that the whole nation understood just how remarkable his gift was.

At 79, McLendon was easily the oldest contestant by at least 30 years. And yes, he'd sometimes forget the lyrics.

But his life experience came through whenever he hit the stage. After a typically moving performance early in the competition, judge Tina Campbell of Mary Mary, the gospel sister duo, told McLendon: "You got a standing ovation from God. He's all over you."

Outsinging a field of 20, McLendon made it all the way to Sunday's finals before losing to 27-year-old powerhouse LeAndria Johnson.

But it didn't matter. What matters is that now, in the winter of his life, McLendon's season is finally here.

GIFT FROM GOD

Call it what you want. Wisdom. Talent. Showmanship.

McLendon chooses to credit his gift and the effect it has to a higher power.

"The Lord set me up and used me," he said before performing in concert with other Sunday Best contestants at New Covenant Church of Philadelphia Saturday.

He almost didn't allow himself to be used. "Do you know how old I am?" he'd ask his children when they'd urge him to audition.

Never comfortable in a crowd, McLendon could easily have taken one look at the hundreds of hopefuls at the Convention Center audition on that cold March morning and said, "I don't want to be bothered with all of those people," says his daughter-in-law, Karen McLendon, 56. But she says he stuck it out because of "the prodding from the Lord."

Possessing a silky smooth tenor reminiscent of Sam Cooke, with a smidgen of James Cleveland's thunder thrown in, McLendon sang as a soloist in the Savettes Choral Ensemble and the Brockington Choral Ensemble in the '60s and '70s. He was ordained as a minister in 1978 and pastored St. James Holy Church in Tennille, Ga., for 16 years before reuniting with his family—five children, 15 grands and 14 great-grands—in Philly.

They all sing, but Pops, as his family lovingly calls him, is arguably the best. There's just something about him.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION

"Not only is he anointed, but his [life] experience has to do with his being anointed," says Orlando Wright, who placed third in the competition. "All these years, he's been faithful—not perfect—but faithful, and God has to honor that."

McLendon is enjoying a national recognition he had never known before. He's in the midst of a 40-city tour featuring Sunday Best contestants, where he's the headliner. He gets fan mail every day from viewers inspired to go back to church or pursue a passion late in life because of him.

McLendon's only regret is that Ruth, his wife of 59 years, is in the final stages of Alzheimer's disease and cannot enjoy his season with him. He has cared for her since 2003.

"Beautiful high soprano," he says of his wife's voice. "She wrote music, and we used to harmonize all the time. . . . I'm trying to control myself talking about her."

Still, despite personal heartache, there's much to enjoy—and be thankful for.

"It ain't over," he says, "till God says it's over."

LA-Z-BOY SOUTH COMMEMORATES
50TH ANNIVERSARY**HON. GREGG HARPER**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, on June 16, 2010, employees, retirees and the company leadership of La-Z-Boy South celebrated 50 years of production. La-Z-Boy founders, Edward M. Knabusch and Edwin J. Shoemaker opened the Newton, Mississippi plant in 1960 when they were seeking to expand production. The Newton facility has grown to 800,000 square feet from the original 60,000 when the plant officially opened. The company credits this half century of success to the men and women of the La-Z-Boy family and to the support they have received from the Newton community.

Founded in Monroe, Michigan, Newton, Mississippi was selected as the first out-of-state plant because of the friendly people and the city's access to raw materials. The first recliner was produced on June 6, 1960, and was raffled off during the opening of a local supermarket. Since that time, La-Z-Boy South has celebrated many milestones including the December 9, 1980 production of its three-millionth chair and the September 17, 2003 production of its 10-millionth chair. Now employing 600 Newton-area residents, the Mississippi facility produces over one hundred different styles of furniture and custom-builds 1,100 pieces every day.

This facility has spurred economic growth in Mississippi outside of the Newton community. From manufacturing to shipping to management, the economy has blossomed as Lay-Z-Boy's business has increased nationally. In appreciation to the community, La-Z-Boy South has made contributions to many local businesses and organizations, as well as numerous charities and youth programs.

In today's struggling economy, La-Z-Boy has maintained a skilled workforce providing optimism for many hard-working Mississippians. As our nation continues to recover from

the economic slide, our state will rely on successful companies like La-Z-Boy to provide work for jobless Mississippians. I congratulate La-Z-Boy for 50 years of manufacturing excellence and for their involvement in the Newton community and the state of Mississippi.

RECOGNIZING WORLD REFUGEE
DAY**HON. JIM McDERMOTT**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June 20, 2010 as World Refugee Day. There are more than 42 million people in the world—16 million of them refugees—who have fled their homes due to war, political conflict, or persecution in their country. We have the responsibility to support these men, women and children, many of whom have struggled in the face of unfathomable violence. Despite the trauma refugees experience, these are people who remain hopeful that one day their lives will return to normal and they will once again be safe from harm.

Today is not the time to dwell on the daunting number of people who are fleeing from their home country, but rather to celebrate the will to live, demonstrated daily by the millions of refugees who attempt to find a better place to call home. We should learn a lesson from those who have lost or given up so much and we must find that kind of courage to support our refugee communities here at home and abroad.

Although much has been done to assist newly arrived refugees, our challenge is far from over. I would like to thank my community organizations who work directly with newly arrived refugees into Washington State. They are the ones who rise to the occasion and should be commended for the great work they have accomplished. Organizations such as The Lutheran Community Services Northwest, The International Rescue Committee, the Refugee Women's Alliance, the Coalition for Refugees from Burma, and the Southwest Youth and Family Services are only a few of the many whose constant advocacy has been a tremendous asset in the lives of my constituents. Community organizations are not the only ones to be recognized. I would be remiss if I didn't recognize the hard work of community individuals who volunteer their time and resources to assist newly arrived refugees to Washington State, many of whom arrived to the US as refugees themselves.

World Refugee Day is a time to come together and spread the word to the global community about a sometimes forgotten population so that we can ensure that we remember our responsibility to aid those whose spirits have not broken and optimism has never wavered. Let us recognize World Refugee Day and honor the millions of refugees worldwide who must daily persevere through hardship and adversity.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. FRANCES
K. KOCHAN**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to the professional teaching career of Dr. Frances K. Kochan.

Dr. Kochan received a degree in elementary education from the State University of New York at Fredonia in June 1962, and began teaching English as a second language on the Island of Yap in September of 1963. After returning to the United States, she served as an adult teacher at the Retarded Citizens Center in Medina, New York, then as an elementary school teacher in the Mannford County School District in Oklahoma.

In the summer of 1970, Dr. Kochan resumed her international teaching career in Guam, where she taught for four years. While overseas, Dr. Kochan received a master's degree in reading education from the University of Guam in 1974.

After returning from Guam, Dr. Kochan began her career with Wakulla County Schools in Crawfordville, Florida, where she served as a reading specialist, reading and language arts projects director, principal and finally as assistant superintendent and curriculum director.

In 1985, Dr. Kochan began her work in higher education at Florida State University, and received her Ph.D. in Adult Education and Policy Studies in 1994. She served there nine years before beginning at Auburn University.

In 1994, Dr. Kochan began at Auburn University serving as an associate professor, and then later becoming the Director of the Truman Pierce Institute. She began working as a full professor in November of 1999, served as Associate Dean of Administration and Research and finally became Dean of the School of Education in July of 2005, where she will serve until stepping down this summer.

Dr. Kochan has a received a number of awards throughout her career, including the 2002 Distinguished Educator Award from Florida State University and the Wayne T. Smith Distinguished Professor Award from Auburn University.

A celebration of her teaching career will be held July 22 at Auburn University. I congratulate Dr. Frances Kochan for her 47 years of service as an educator and join her friends and family in honoring her on this special occasion.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE TECHNICAL SERGEANT
MICHAEL PAUL FLORES**HON. GABRIELLE GIFFORDS**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Air Force Technical Sergeant Michael Paul Flores, who was killed in action on June 9, 2010.

Michael was a decorated 12-year Air Force veteran. During his eight deployments to Iraq

and Afghanistan, he earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and twelve Air Medals. He grew up in San Antonio, Texas, where he graduated from John Marshall High School before enlisting in 1997.

A Pararescue Non-Commissioned Officer assigned to the 48th Rescue Squadron at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Michael belonged to a highly regarded and specialized unit known throughout the military for their skills and willingness to risk their lives to save others.

The motto of Pararescue units, "That Others May Live", speaks to the dedication that Michael and his brothers in arms share. He perished doing what he loved alongside other Air Force Rescue personnel, on a mission to save a British Soldier's life.

We remember Tech Sergeant Flores and offer our deepest condolences and sincerest prayers to his family. My words cannot effectively convey the feeling of great loss, nor can they offer adequate consolation. However, it is my hope that in future days, his family may take some comfort in knowing that Michael made a difference in the lives of many others and serves as an example of a competent and caring leader and friend that will live on in the hearts and minds of all those he touched.

Technical Sergeant Flores is survived by his wife Marisa, daughter Eliana and son Michael.

This body and this country owe Michael and his family our deepest gratitude, and we will today and forevermore honor and remember him and his service to our country.

ONGOING HUMANITARIAN CRISIS
IN KYRGYZSTAN

HON. RUSS CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, I wanted to call attention to the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Kyrgyzstan.

Since the ousting of former President Kurmanbek Bakiyev's government on April 7, 2010, the southern Kyrgyzstan region along the Uzbekistan border has been plagued with ethnic violence. Instability and waves of violence have continued in Osh and Jalal-Abad, resulting in killings, rapes, beatings, and widespread pillaging and destruction of homes and communities. Moreover, there are reportedly at least 400,000 displaced persons, of which many are ethnic Uzbeks seeking refuge in Uzbekistan. Those remaining in Osh are isolated and living in fear of the next violent clash. Meanwhile, the Kyrgyzstan interim government continues to struggle to stabilize the region.

I am encouraged by recent actions taken by the U.S. Government and the international community in response to the humanitarian crisis. Last week, the State Department announced \$32.267 million in aid programs for humanitarian relief, reconstruction, and community stabilization. I look forward to working with the Administration to help ensure that taxpayer resources are spent efficiently, transparently, and effectively to help those Kyrgyz and Uzbeks most in need and establish lasting stability.

Additionally last week, the UN Human Rights Council condemned the ethnic violence in Kyrgyzstan and called on its interim government to conduct a complete and transparent investigation into the events of April 7 that led to the ouster of the previous government, as well as the ongoing ethnic violence.

Healing the wounds of ethnic violence and achieving long-term stability will not be easy in a region with such burgeoning ethnic tensions. It is important that the international community, including the United States, remains committed to addressing the humanitarian needs and achieving meaningful and sustainable progress in Kyrgyzstan.

TRIBUTE TO MILDRED DAVIS OF
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a resident of Kansas' Third Congressional District who will shortly celebrate her hundredth birthday—a goal that many aspire to, but few achieve. Mildred Davis of Kansas City, Kansas, will celebrate her hundredth birthday on June 30th. I know that you and all House Members join with me in wishing Mildred Davis many happy returns of the day, and I am pleased to place in the RECORD a short biography of her, which was written by her friend, Joyce Dickens:

Ava Mildred Finnie Davis was born June 30, 1910, to Lillie Dedman Finnie and Lewis Finnie in Commerce, Texas. She was the youngest of five children—three brothers and a sister. Her parents and all brothers and sister have preceded her in death. Though her given name is Ava, she soon became known to all as Mildred.

She accepted Christ at an early age and was united with the New Hope Baptist Church of Greenville, Texas, before moving to Kansas City, Kansas, and uniting with Olivet Institutional Baptist Church where she has been a faithful and loyal member and worker for over 50 years. She served dutifully in the Women's Missionary Department, Baptist Training Union and the Sunday School for many years. She has encouraged and counseled many young people spiritually.

Mildred attended prep school and two years of college at Langston University in Langston, Oklahoma. In those days you could teach school in Texas with two years of college and she taught school at a small country school. She married Grady L. Davis (now deceased) in Paris, Texas, and they moved to Kansas City in the early 1940s. She worked at the old munitions plant in the Fairfax Industrial District during the war and after the war she began to work for well-to-do families in Johnson County cleaning and cooking. They soon discovered she was a superior cook and began to use her skills in the kitchen for their entertaining. In 1945 she and Grady bought their first home, at 615 Freeman Avenue, where she resided for over 60 years. She was childless and when my large family moved next door to her in 1954 she befriended me and took me under her wings making me clothes and encouraging me in my endeavors. I was only 12 years old and I loved going next door where she would regale me with stories of her youth and life. She was not only a fun person but also a wise mentor.

In the late 1950s Mildred began to work for the Internal Revenue Service during tax season. Eventually she was hired full time at the Social Security Administration where she retired after over 20 years of service.

She belonged to several community organizations including the Turtle Hill Homeowners Association, which was organized in her living room. This organization was instrumental in the redevelopment of the Turtle Hill area, which now has many new homes. She was also a long-time member of the now inactive L'Esprit Social Club and when meetings were held in her home, all members attended mainly because they knew the food and company would be excellent.

Mildred Davis is now a resident at Medicalodge Post Acute Care and continues to be loved and admired by many friends, associates and a foster daughter.

RECOGNIZING THE 145TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH AND THE 17TH CELEBRATION OF THE JUNETEENTH FREEDOM & HERITAGE FESTIVAL IN MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize June 19, 2010 as the 145th anniversary of the observance of Juneteenth in the United States and the 17th celebration in Memphis, Tennessee. While the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by President Abraham Lincoln in September 1862, it was not until June 19, 1865 that Union Soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger proclaimed freedom to the last slaves in the far corners of the South in Galveston, Texas. To commemorate this day in our history and the political contributions of many African-Americans to our nation, the Memphis Juneteenth Freedom and Heritage Festival has chosen the theme, "A Tribute to African-Americans in Politics from Reconstruction to Present."

Hiram R. Revels of Mississippi, the first African-American to serve by appointment in the U.S. Senate in 1870 and Joseph Hayne Rainey of South Carolina, the first African-American elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1871, made tremendous political strides by paving the way for other African-Americans. Jefferson Long, although the shortest serving African-American in the U.S. House of Representatives, was the first to speak on the floor in 1870. Blanche Bruce of Mississippi was the first African American and only former slave to preside over the U.S. Senate in 1979 and William Dawson of Illinois was the first to chair a standing Congressional committee in 1949. Shirley Chisholm of New York was the first African-American woman elected to Congress in 1968. From my home of Memphis, Harold Ford, Sr. was the first African-American from Tennessee to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. His son, Harold Ford, Jr., was the first African-American Member to succeed his father. Today, we all have our first African-American President, Barack Obama.

From Reconstruction to the Sanitation Workers Union Strike in 1968, Memphis has been

at the center of the movement for racial equality. Memphis is home to many prominent political figures including Robert R. Church, Jr., a political leader and founder of the first Tennessee chapter of the NAACP in 1917, and in 1964, A. W. Willis became the first African-American elected to the Tennessee General Assembly after Reconstruction.

Dr. Benjamin L. Hooks, former Executive Director/CEO of the NAACP and Dr. Vasco Smith, the first African-American elected to the Shelby County Commission and influential in the founding of The MED, both resided in Memphis until their recent deaths. Former Tennessee State Senator and civil rights judge Russell Sugarmon currently resides in Memphis and is still politically active. I am privileged to have worked alongside these men and to call them friends.

Since 1865, communities have gathered to celebrate Juneteenth through readings of the Emancipation Proclamation, singing of spirituals, and large gatherings of family and friends. For the past 17 years in Memphis, Juneteenth has been held in the historic Douglass Community, named after Frederick Douglass. The land on which the community sits was once owned by Reverend William Rush-Plummer, the son of a slave from Africa and a slave owner.

Madam Speaker, it is in the spirit of these great men and women and countless others that I ask my colleagues to join me in observing our nation's 145th anniversary of Juneteenth and the celebrations in Memphis. This is a time to reflect upon the end of slavery in America and to recognize the many contributions from African-Americans. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, the Emancipation Proclamation "came as a joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity."

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, one of the surest ways government can help generate economic activity, innovation, and job growth is by cutting taxes on small businesses, which are the backbone of the U.S. economy and employ more than half of all American workers.

I have voted for and cosponsored a number of small business tax cut bills during the 111th Congress and was pleased to vote last week in support of H.R. 5486, the Small Business Jobs Tax Relief Act. Among other things, this bill would cut capital gains taxes for small businesses and would quadruple the tax deduction for business start-up expenses from \$5,000 to \$20,000. H.R. 5486 is common sense legislation and ought to be quickly enacted.

Another way to stimulate business activity and create jobs is to help America's community banks lend money to small businesses. Business owners in Missouri tell me they want to expand but cannot because of a lack of financing. A second bill considered in the House last week, H.R. 5297, would allow small banks to tap into a \$30 billion fund at the Treasury Department so they can issue

loans to healthy small businesses thirsting for capital to expand operations and hire workers. These funds would bypass Wall Street and go directly to Missouri communities where they can do the most good for small businesses.

Because the creation of this small bank lending fund is so important to economic development and job creation, it is supported by America's home town banks, small businesses, Realtors, and home builders, among others. I was pleased to support H.R. 5297 and encouraged that it passed the House with bipartisan support. I urge prompt action in the Senate.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF DERRYL ALBERT DUMERMUTH

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and public service of retired teacher Derryl Albert Dumermuth. Derryl was an inspiration to all those who knew him, impacting the lives of his students and the surrounding community.

Derryl Dumermuth was the fifth of six children, growing up on his family farm in Fayette, Iowa. He attended Upper Iowa University and Iowa State College until he enlisted in the Marine Corps early in 1944. After World War II, he earned his bachelor's of science degree from Upper Iowa University and in 1955 he received the master of arts degree at Northern Arizona University. When the huge influx of students studying on the G.I. Bill threatened to swamp the faculty at Upper Iowa University, Derryl was hired to teach mathematics; the start of a successful career in public education.

In 1962, Derryl brought his family to my hometown of Tulare, California. Here he served as Tulare Union High School Math Department Chairman for 28 years, retiring in 1990. Derryl taught the first class of computer programming ever offered in the city of Tulare and developed the first Advanced Placement course for Tulare county schools, AP Calculus. High school yearbooks were dedicated to Mr. Dumermuth in 1952 and in 1981, he was chosen as the "Outstanding Math/Science Teacher in Tulare/Kings Counties," and was chosen as a mentor teacher for two consecutive years.

In addition to his devotion to education, Derryl was an active member of the community. He was the coordinator of the Docent Program at the Tulare City Historical Museum and church historian for the United Methodist Church of Tulare. He was also an active member of several organizations including the Tulare High School CTA and the Kiwanis Club of Greater Tulare. In 2001, Derryl wrote "A Town Called Tulare" as a fundraiser for the Tulare Historical Museum and two years later published "Tulare Legends and Trivia from A to Z."

Derryl was someone who I knew personally. He was a dedicated teacher and mentor, inspiring everyone he taught. His life's values and commitment to education will live on through his family, friends, and community.

HONORING REVEREND MARY MARGARET ECKHARDT

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor and acknowledge Reverend Mary Margaret Eckhardt, Pastor of St. Matthew's United Methodist Church in Livonia, Michigan, upon her retirement after more than 30 years of service in ministry.

Reverend Eckhardt became an ordained minister in 1979 after having obtained her bachelor of science and master of science degrees from the University of Tennessee, going on to pursue her Master of Divinity from United Theological Seminary in Ohio. Reverend Eckhardt has served in four United Methodist Churches in Michigan, spending the last 8 years at St. Matthew's as an exceptional preacher, adult Bible Study leader and mission trip leader. She serves on the UMC district level as a Hunger Coordinator and at the conference level as an UMCOR Disaster Coordinator.

Serving her church as well as her community, Reverend Eckhardt has been an active supporter and member of the Rotary Club of Livonia and currently holds the position of Secretary. She avidly enjoys the outdoors as a hiker and bicyclist. Reverend Eckhardt has proven to be a woman of dedicated and irreplaceable service. She will be missed by the members of her congregation as she pursues the next chapter of her life.

Madam Speaker, for more than 30 years Reverend Mary Margaret Eckhardt has faithfully served her congregation, her church, her community and her Lord. As she enters the next phase of her life, she leaves behind a legacy of dedication, integrity, and excellence. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Reverend Mary Margaret Eckhardt upon her retirement and recognizing her years of loyal service to our community and country.

TRIBUTE TO KARA GORMLEY

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a popular television personality in Columbia, South Carolina as she leaves her post as a morning news anchor on Tuesday, June 22, 2010. Kara Gormley is a familiar face to Columbians who have watched her professionally report the news at WIS-TV for more than a decade. Her presence on the Sunrise program will be sorely missed.

Kara Gormley is a native of Carthage, New York, and is the daughter of the late Barbara and Robert Gormley. After graduating from Providence College in Rhode Island, Kara took her first broadcast journalism job in Wausau, Wisconsin. Midlands viewers first came to know Kara when she joined WIS News 10 in 1996 as co-host of the Sunrise program. She later took an assignment to anchor the evening news at 5:00 p.m., and serve as a featured health reporter.

In 2000, she was lured away from WIS, and became the morning news anchor at the NBC

sister station in Raleigh, North Carolina. Her heart remained in Columbia, and Kara married Banks Meador, a native of Chester, in 2002, which led to her return to WIS. Back in Columbia, she anchored the weekend news and served as a weekday reporter. Later she rejoined the Sunrise program, where her journey at WIS began.

Kara has been recognized for her journalism talent by the Associated Press and the South Carolina Broadcasters Association. She has also earned the prestigious Edward R. Murrow Award of Excellence.

She has been very active in the Midlands community. Kara has generously donated her time and her talents to the National Alliance of the Mentally Ill, Special Olympics South Carolina, Project Pet, Sistercare, Camp Kemo, the Children's Miracle Network and Palmetto Health Children's Hospital. She is also an active supporter of Winston's Wish, a foundation of autistic children, and the national Safety Council's "Alive at 25" program, which promotes safe driving habits among drivers under 25.

Kara takes great pride in her contribution to Faces of Freedom, a book that profiles fallen heroes who lost their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan. The proceeds of the book go to charities that benefit military families.

As a former competitive swimmer and scholarship athlete, Kara is dedicated to promoting physical fitness. She helped create and build Limitless Sports, an organization that helps wheelchair-bound children and adults participate in athletics.

Kara and her husband will remain in Columbia, where she will focus on raising their three young sons—Dalton, Evan and Cooper.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me on congratulating Kara Gormley for her contributions to the field of broadcast journalism and to her dedication to making her community a better place to live. She has enriched the lives of so many during her years at WIS-TV, and I wish her all the best as she pursues other endeavors.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is \$13,040,053,515,762.18.

On January 6th, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was \$10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by \$2,401,627,769,468.38 so far this Congress.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE
PATRICIA B. SUTHERLAND

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Representative Patricia B. Sutherland and congratulate her on her pending retirement from the Maine Legislature.

Currently serving her second term in the Maine Legislature, Representative Sutherland has shown a continued dedication to serving the people of Maine and has been a tireless advocate for education and economic development in the state.

After receiving a bachelor's degree in English from Saint Joseph's College, Pat began her career teaching high school English, and a little over twenty years ago, Northern Maine Community College in Presque Isle, then Northern Maine Technical College, was fortunate enough to bring her on as their director of development and community relations. While Pat's retirement from that role was cause for some sadness, it provided an occasion to show her dedication to increasing Maine students' opportunities for higher learning. As the House Chair of the Maine Education and Cultural Affairs Committee, Pat has worked hard to improve education for all Maine students.

Pat is also a champion of economic development in Maine. Her commitment to economic development is exemplified by her contributions to Aroostook County's economic development initiatives, including the critical Aroostook County Empowerment Zone. Pat also chairs the Northern Maine Empowerment Council and is a board member of the Northern Maine Development Commission and the Leaders Encouraging Aroostook Development program. In addition, she is a member of the Presque Isle Kiwanis Club and is on the Town of Chapman's board of selectmen.

Patricia Sutherland continues to leave lasting marks on Maine. I am confident that she will continue to find ways to express her passion for educational and economic development during this new and exciting chapter in her life. On behalf of the people of Maine, it is with pride that I congratulate Representative Sutherland for her excellent work.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring Representative Patricia B. Sutherland for her continued dedication to serving the people of Maine.

TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR LOUIS
ANTONELLI

**HON. GREGORIO KILI CAMACHO
SABLAN**

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man truly blessed by his Creator: a man who is religious, honest, faithful, devoted, and obedient to his calling. The man to whom I refer is the Reverend Monsignor Louis Antonelli, the pastor of San Isidro Church on the island of Rota.

Monsignor Antonelli was born on September 23, 1918, in Sheppron, Pennsylvania. He began his studies for the priesthood at the Stigmatine Minor Seminary in Waltham, Massachusetts in 1931, at the tender age of 13 years. He continued his studies at the Stigmatine Major Seminary in Wellesley, Massachusetts until he was ordained a priest on June 11, 1949, and immediately became an assistant pastor at the Sacred Heart Church, in Milford, Massachusetts.

Four years later in 1953, he was assigned to the U.S. territory of Guam, where he taught at Father Duenas Memorial School, a Catholic high school, until being reassigned to the mainland United States in 1959.

In 1970 he returned to Guam, this time as Assistant Pastor at the Agana Cathedral and San Vicente Church. He also served as Director of the Permanent Diaconate Program on Guam.

In 1973, he was sent to the Northern Mariana Islands, first for two weeks on Tinian, then to the permanent position of Pastor of San Francisco De Borja Church in Songsong, Rota. There he served until 1991, when he initiated and built the Rota San Isidro Mission at Sinapalu on Rota, becoming its Pastor and serving at the Mission up to the present day.

In his ministry, Monsignor Antonelli presided over countless masses, baptisms, catechism classes, counseling sessions, weddings and funerals. His daily work involves administering communion to hospital patients, prison inmates, the sick and the elderly.

In partnership with the Sisters of Mercy from Guam, he established the Escuelan San Francisco De Borja on Rota in 1985. Today, the school continues to provide grade school education to children on Rota. He is also directly responsible for the beautification and maintenance of the San Pedro Cemetery on Rota, which some have referred as a mini Arlington National Cemetery because of the care Pale Antonelli has given this ground.

While ministering to his flock, Monsignor Antonelli also has found time to breed and raise cattle and to experiment with a variety of grasses to use as feed. He has a herd of nearly 100 head of cattle on his small Rota ranch. Many would say that the Monsignor has bred the best cattle and maintains the best grazing lands on Rota.

Monsignor Antonelli's service and activities have won wide recognition. Among the honors he has received during his service on Rota is recognition as the "Conservationist of the Year" in 1990 by the Luta Soil and Water Conservation District; and in 1996, Pope John Paul II named him "Prelate of Honor", which gave him the title of Monsignor.

Monsignor Antonelli has been a priest for 61 years, 37 of which he ministered to the spiritual health of the people of Rota, volunteered as a high school teacher and assisted farmers and cattle ranchers. He has declared and affirmed that Rota is his home for the rest of his life and also where he wants to rest in peace.

On behalf of the people of the Northern Mariana Islands, I wish to express my gratitude to Monsignor Antonelli for all his exceptional service and wish him good health and much happiness as he continues his ministry to our people: We look forward to his 92nd birthday in September!

HONORING THE NAACP ON ITS
101ST ANNIVERSARY

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 2010

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 242, which honors and praises the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP, for its 101st year of service. H. Con. Res. 242 is an important resolution that commends an organization that has worked tirelessly to make our Nation a better place for all Americans.

I would like to thank Chairman CONYERS for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I also thank the sponsor of this legislation, Congressman GREEN, for taking the time to honor the NAACP and its crucial contributions to our Nation's social and moral progress.

Mr. Speaker, the NAACP has played a vital role in empowering our Nation's African-American community and ensuring that all Americans are equal before the law. As the oldest and largest civil rights organization in the United States, the NAACP has always been dedicated to achieving their goals through non-violence. One of the most famous moments in the history of the NAACP occurred in 1955, when an NAACP secretary refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white man. This bold and empowering decision by Rosa Parks started the Montgomery Bus Boycotts and was a pivotal moment in the Civil Rights Movement.

The NAACP was a driving force behind the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006, and the Fair Housing Act of 2006. On July 16, 2009, during the NAACP's centennial anniversary celebration in New York, members remembered progress made and reaffirmed their passion in the ongoing fight for equality. The keynote speaker at the anniversary celebration was the first black President of the United States, Barack H. Obama.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that we honor and express our national gratitude for the NAACP for 101 years of service, during which time it assisted millions of Americans and helped fight poverty, inequality, and social injustice. It is equally important that we express our full support for and solidarity with the NAACP as it continues in its second century of service and continues to address pressing national issues like political, educational, social, economic, and racial inequality. As one who has long been active in the Long Beach chapter of the NAACP, I can attest to the critical role that this organization continues to play in the communities across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 242.

HONORING MERTON WILLIAMS
MIDDLE SCHOOL OF HILTON,
NEW YORK, FOR BEING RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE TOP MIDDLE SCHOOLS IN THE COUNTRY

HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. LEE of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask that the House join me in recognizing Merton Williams Middle School of Hilton, NY, for being recognized as one of the top middle schools in the country.

The National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform recently recognized Merton Williams Middle School as a School to Watch. Only 90 of the nation's 21,000 public middle schools are honored each year, and only 17 of New York's 1,121 public middle schools are honored this year.

Until the establishment of Merton Williams Middle School in 1964, middle school students in Hilton attended six different area schools. Today, Merton Williams lives up to the motto of the Hilton School District: "Maximizing the Potential of the Individual Learner."

The teachers and staff of Merton Williams are truly to be commended for their hard work and service to their students. Credit is especially due to Principal Carol Stehm and Assistant Principal Suzanne Goff for their exceptional leadership. But most importantly, I would like to congratulate the students of Merton Williams. Through their hard work and devotion to their schoolwork and their community, they stood out as an exceptional group of young adults.

I ask that this House once again join with me in congratulating Merton Williams Middle School for receiving this commendation and serving as an example to middle schools and junior high schools everywhere.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTRAL
CATHOLIC SHAMROCKS

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. McCOTTER. Madam Speaker, today I rise to acknowledge the Division 1 State Champion Golf team from my alma mater, Detroit Catholic Central High School. On June 12, 2010 the Catholic Central Shamrocks raised the MHSAA championship trophy after besting defending champion Grand Rapids Forest Hills Central by 14 strokes.

Under the tutelage of Coach Bill Hayes, the Shamrocks tied for second place in the Catholic High School League and seemed to get stronger with every step toward the finals of the state tourney. After securing a place in Division 1 District 7 on May 28, CC moved on to regionals on June 3, finishing behind top ranked Birmingham Brother Rice and Hartland.

The 8th ranked Shamrocks took to the links after round one with a slim 4-shot lead over Grand Rapids Forest Hills Central and summarily set a new state final round record of 281. More impressive yet, CC set a new state tournament record of 569 besting the old

record by 13 strokes. Remarkably, all four starters broke par, a feat no veteran golf coach at the course could recall ever seeing in a state final.

This championship marked the 2nd state golf title of the decade for Catholic Central. Indeed a remarkable accomplishment for this close knit group of young men, the hard work and dedication it took epitomizes what it means to be a Shamrock. By the teaching of our Basilian Fathers through goodness, discipline and knowledge the entire Catholic Central family, including this alumnus, shares in this unprecedented 6th Division 1 Championship brought home to Catholic Central during the 2009-2010 school year.

Madam Speaker, the 2010 Catholic Central Shamrocks deserve to be recognized for their dedication, achievement and spirit and I am very proud of their determination and effort. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Shamrocks for obtaining yet another title as well as for their devotion to our community and country. Live and die for CC High!

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR ROBERT D.
COBLE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 2010

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and outstanding public servant, the Honorable Robert D. Coble. Mayor Coble is retiring from public life after 25 years of service, the last two decades as Mayor of Columbia, South Carolina. He has served as a tireless advocate for the city and its residents, and his tremendous leadership will be missed.

Mayor Bob, as he is affectionately known, is a native of Chesterfield, South Carolina, but came to live in the city he now leads as a child. He is a graduate of Dreher High School, and went on to earn a bachelor's degree from the University of South Carolina. At USC's School of Law, Mayor Bob distinguished himself as a member of the Order of the Wig and Robe and graduated with a Juris Doctor cum laude.

Today he is a partner in the law firm of Nexsen Pruet. He has dedicated his legal career to practicing in the areas of economic development, health care, regulatory law and governmental representation. This expertise is a reflection of the issues he is passionate about in his public service.

In 1985, Bob Coble won a seat on Richland County Council where he served for 5 years before being elected Mayor of Columbia in 1990. During his 20 years at the helm of the city, Mayor Bob has focused on revitalizing downtown and the neighborhoods that surround it. Today, the city that Mayor Coble manages is almost unrecognizable from the one he inherited. The once gritty industrial corridor, just blocks from the State Capitol, has been transformed into a vibrant commercial thoroughfare known as the Vista. A riverfront that was once dominated by the state's largest correctional facility is now home to a park, new residential developments and two popular museums. Former barrack-style public housing developments have been razed and replaced with affordable housing that families are proud

to call home. These are just a few examples of the tremendous changes that have taken place in Columbia under Mayor Bob leadership.

The name Mayor Bob exemplifies the affable way he approaches the office and the people he serves. No issue is too small and no person is too insignificant for this humble public servant. He has met Presidents and Popes, but has never lost the common touch. He treats everyone with respect and dignity no matter their status in life.

His style of governing is one I can appreciate—consensus-building. This style was born in part because of his natural disposition, but also because of his role as a who held no more voting power than any other member of City Council. Despite this weak mayor form of government, Mayor Bob was anything but weak. He led the way in setting the agenda for the city and ensuring that his vision was carried out. And his influence went beyond the City of Columbia.

Mayor Bob was a vocal opponent of the Confederate flag flying over the State Capitol. He was also an integral player in the fight to save Fort Jackson from closure during two rounds of the base realignment process. I feel certain that it was because of his and other community leaders making such a strong case for Fort Jackson that its mission grew as other facilities were being closed.

Personally, I will never forget being rocked by images of the suffering and chaos after Hurricane Katrina and picking up the phone to ask Mayor Bob to help me bring survivors of that disaster to Columbia. He didn't hesitate, and worked throughout the Labor Day weekend to set up a one-of-a-kind center to provide all the services evacuees would need. The City of Columbia ultimately became the destination for more than 2,000 New Orleans residents who had no place to call home, and thanks to Mayor Bob they found a community that welcomed them with open arms.

Outside of his work on the city's behalf, Mayor Bob has also been personally committed to improving the community in which he lives. He has served on numerous boards and commissions and volunteered countless hours of his time. He started the City of Columbia's Lunch Buddy program and has been a lunch buddy for 12 years. Mayor Bob and his wife, Beth, founded the "First Ladies Walk for Life" to raise funds for breast cancer research.

He has served as the President of the Municipal Association of South Carolina and Chairman of the Fighting Back Task Force for Alcohol and Drug Abuse. He was instrumental in creating the Central Midlands Regional Transit Authority and has been the fundraising chairman of the United Negro College Fund. Mayor Bob is also a former member of the advisory board for the Medical University of

South Carolina, the Council on Aging, the South Carolina Special Olympics and the Bethlehem Community Center. He is currently a board member with the River Alliance, Ingenuity, and the Central Carolina Economic Development Alliance.

Mayor Bob has received numerous awards during his 25 years of public service including the Chamber of Commerce's Ambassador of the Year (2004), Central Midlands Council of Governments Regional Leadership Award (2007), induction into Richland School District One's Hall of Fame (2007) and the Global Vision Award from the World Affairs Council (2008).

He is married to the former Beth McLeod and they are the proud parents of six children and two grandsons. They are members of Trenholm Road United Methodist Church, where he has taught Sunday school and was a Boy Scout leader for a number of years.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in thanking Bob Coble for his tremendous record of public service. Even though he is stepping aside to let a new leader take over the helm in Columbia, the city will forever reflect the many positive contributions Mayor Bob has made. He is a true leader and great example for anyone entering public service today to follow.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5217–S5282

Measures Introduced: Six bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3517–3522. **Page S5268**

Measures Reported:

S. 3104, to permanently authorize Radio Free Asia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 111–214) **Page S5268**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Sherry Glied, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Brian Hayes, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2012.

Mark Gaston Pearce, of New York, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring August 27, 2013.

Jim R. Esquea, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Benjamin B. Tucker, of New York, to be Deputy Director for State, Local, and Tribal Affairs, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mark R. Rosekind, of California, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2014.

John H. Laub, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the National Institute of Justice.

James P. Lynch, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Carolyn Hessler Radelet, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

Anthony R. Coscia, of New Jersey, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Albert DiClemente, of Delaware, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for the remainder of the term expiring July 26, 2011.

Arthur Allen Elkins, Jr., of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

Elizabeth L. Littlefield, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

Donald L. Cook, of Washington, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.

Judith Ann Stewart Stock, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

Patricia A. Hoffman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability).

Sharon E. Burke, of Maryland, to be Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs.

David T. Matsuda, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

Ari Ne'eman, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2012.

Marie Collins Johns, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Daniel J. Becker, of Utah, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

James R. Hannah, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Gayle A. Nachtigal, of Oregon, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2012.

John B. Nalbandian, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Michael F. Tillman, of California, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2011.

Daryl J. Boness, of Maine, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2010.

Earl F. Weener, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2010.

Jeffrey R. Moreland, of Texas, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Robert Wedgeworth, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013.

Carla D. Hayden, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2014.

John Coppola, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013.

Winston Tabb, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013.

Milton C. Lee, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Dana Katherine Bilyeu, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2011.

Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, to be a Member of Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2010.

Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, to be a Member of Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2014.

Dennis P. Walsh, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Special Panel on Appeals for a term of six years.

Cynthia Chavez Lamar, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2010.

JoAnn Lynn Balzer, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2012.

Marsha J. Rabiteau, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Hernán D. Vera, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2012.

Katherine Hammack, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Jeffrey A. Lane, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

Lana Pollack, of Michigan, to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

Daryl J. Boness, of Maine, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2013.

Adam Gamoran, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2011.

Deborah Loewenberg Ball, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National

Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2012.

Eduardo M. Ochoa, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

Margaret R. McLeod, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2012.

Bridget Terry Long, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2012.

Michael James Warren, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2011.

Michael J. McCord, of Virginia, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

James L. Taylor, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Labor.

David K. Mineta, of California, to be Deputy Director for Demand Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2014.

Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2015.

Lawrence J. Pijaux, Jr., of Alabama, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2014.

Elizabeth A. McGrath, of Virginia, to be Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

Thomas Edward Delahanty II, of Maine, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maine for the term of four years.

Wendy J. Olson, of Idaho, to be United States Attorney for the District of Idaho for the term of four years.

James A. Lewis, of Illinois, to be United States Attorney for the Central District of Illinois for the term of four years.

Todd E. Edelman, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Judith Anne Smith, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Donald J. Cazayoux, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Pamela Cothran Marsh, of Florida, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Florida for the term of four years.

Peter J. Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years.

Henry Lee Whitehorn, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Kevin Anthony Carr, of Wisconsin, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of four years.

Kevin Charles Harrison, of Louisiana, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Charles Gillen Dunne, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York for the term of four years.

Tracie Stevens, of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

Earl F. Weener, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2015.

A routine list in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. **Page S5217–19, S5281–82**

Nomination Discharged: The following nomination was discharged from further committee consideration and placed on the Executive Calendar:

Rafael Moure-Eraso, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years, which was sent to the Senate on March 24, 2010, from the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Page S5281

Executive Communications: **Pages S5267–68**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5268–70**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S5270–80

Additional Statements: **Pages S5264–67**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S5280**

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Pages S5280–81

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:51 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 23, 2010. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5281.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PREVENTING MILITARY SUICIDES

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the progress in preventing military suicides and challenges in detection and care of the invisible wounds of war, after receiving testimony from General Peter W. Chiarelli, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army, Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, General James F. Amos, Assistant Commandant, United States Marine Corps, and General Carrol H. Chandler, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, all of the Department of Defense; and Robert Jesse, Acting Principle Deputy Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health, Veterans Health Administration.

INNOVATION IN AMERICA

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Competitiveness, Innovation, and Export Promotion concluded a hearing to examine innovation in America, focusing on opportunities and obstacles, after receiving testimony from Ansh Chopra, Chief Technology Officer and Associate Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President; Robert D. Atkinson, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, and Stephen J. Ubl, Advanced Medical Technology Association (AdvaMed), both of Washington, D.C.; Rhys L. Williams, New World Angels, Boca Raton, Florida; and Andrew M. Weiss, CoAxia, Inc., Maple Grove, Minnesota.

PROMOTING ELECTRIC VEHICLES ACT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 3495, to promote the deployment of plug-in electric drive vehicles, focusing on reducing oil consumption, after receiving testimony from David B. Sandalow, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Policy and International Affairs; Frederick W. Smith, FedEx Corporation, Memphis, Tennessee; Kathryn Clay, Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Brian P. Wynne, Electric Drive Transportation Association (EDTA), and Alan T. Crane, The National Academies, all of Washington, D.C.; and David Friedman, Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), Oviedo, Florida.

SUPERFUND OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Superfund, Toxics and Environmental Health concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's Superfund program, after receiving testimony from Mathy

Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; John B. Stephenson, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; Mayor John E. Stumbo, Fort Valley, Georgia; Lois Marie Gibbs, Center for Health, Environment and Justice, Falls Church, Virginia; Helene M. Pierson, Heart of Camden, Inc., Camden, New Jersey; and J. Winston Porter, Waste Policy Center, Leesburg, Virginia.

IRAN POLICY AFTER U.N. SANCTIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Iran policy in the aftermath of U.N. sanctions, after receiving testimony from William J. Burns, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; and Stuart Levey, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Olmstead enforcement, focusing on ensuring community opportunities for individuals with disabilities, after receiving testimony from Thomas E. Perez, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; Cindy Mann, Deputy Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and Director, Center for Medicaid, CHIP, and Survey and Certification, Department of Health and Human Services; Robert Bernstein, Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, and Kelly Buckland, National Council on Independent Living, both of Washington, D.C.; Nancy Thaler, National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services, Alexandria, Virginia; and Jeffrey Knight, Maryland Money Follows the Person Program, Frederick.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 11 public bills, H.R. 5564–5574; and 10 resolutions, H. Res. 1457–1466, were introduced. **Pages H4676–77**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4677–78**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 4805, to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reduce the emissions of formaldehyde from composite wood products, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–509, Pt. 1). **Page H4676**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4639**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:32 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H4639**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Reverend Lane Bemebenek, Joy Lutheran Church, Moore, South Carolina. **Page H4639**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measures:

Supporting National Men's Health Week: H. Con. Res. 288, to support National Men's Health

Week, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 388 yeas with none voting "nay," Roll No. 376;

Pages H4640–43, H4651–52

Recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day: H. Res. 546, to recognize the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and to express the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 390 yeas with none voting "nay," Roll No. 377; and **Pages H4643–45, H4652**

Supporting the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week: H. Res. 1407, to support the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 371 yeas to 20 nays, Roll No. 378. **Pages H4647–49, H4652–53**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:58 p.m. and reconvened at 6 p.m. **Page H4651**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Recognizing the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month: H. Res. 1369, to recognize the significance of National Caribbean-American Heritage Month and **Pages H4645–47**

Supporting the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week: H. Res. 1388, to support the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week. **Pages H4649–51**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4640.

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 33 was held at the desk. **Page H4640**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4651–52, H4652, and H4652–53. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AFGHAN SUPPLY CHAIN PROTECTION PAYMENTS INVESTIGATION

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs held a hearing entitled “Investigation of Protection Payments for Safe Passage along the Afghan Supply Chain.” Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: LTG. William Phillips, USA, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary, Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, U.S. Army; Gary Motsek, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary, Program Support, Office of the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; and BG John Nicholson, Director, Pakistan/Afghanistan Coordination Cell, The Joint Staff; Moshe Schwartz, Specialist in Defense Acquisition, CRS, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

RESTORING AMERICAN FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.R. 4173, to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end “too big to fail”, to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices to examine Iran policy in the aftermath of U.N. sanctions but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Wednesday, June 23rd.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2010

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine outside witness statements, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings to examine Minerals Management Service reorganization, 11 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine the Food and Drug Administration’s review process for products to treat rare diseases and neglected tropical diseases, 2 p.m., SD–192.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the United States-China trade relationship, focusing on finding a new path forward, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine finding common ground with a rising China, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold joint hearings with the House Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia to examine customer and employee views on the future of the United States Postal Service, 2:30 p.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to resume hearings to examine the filibuster, focusing on silent filibusters, holds and the Senate confirmation process, 10 a.m., SR–301.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition and Forestry, hearing to review the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Education and Labor, hearing on Worker Health and Safety from the Oil Rig to the Shoreline, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “MedPAC’s June 2010 Report to Congress: Aligning Incentives in Medicare,” 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, to mark up the following measures: H.R. 5498, WMD Prevention and Preparedness Act of 2010; a measure To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to prohibit requiring the use of a specified percentage of a grant under the Urban Area Security Initiative and State Homeland Security Grant Program for specific purposes; and H.R. 5105, To establish a Chief Veterinary Officer in the Department Homeland Security, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following: H.R. 5503, Securing Protections for the Injured from Limitations on Liability Act; a motion to authorize issuance of subpoenas to BP America for documents regarding its claims process relating to the Gulf oil spill; H. Res. 1455, Directing the Attorney General to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of certain communications relating to certain recommendations regarding administration appointments; H.R. 5281, Removal Clarification Act of 2010; a measure Prohibiting Interstate Commerce in Crush Videos Act of 2010; H.R. 1020, Arbitration Fairness Act of 2009; and H.R. 1237, Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act of 2009, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, hearing on H.R. 5479, Coal Accountability and Retired Employee Act of 2010, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, hearing entitled “Treating Addiction as a Disease: The Promise of Medication Assisted Recovery,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Deepwater Drilling Technology, Research and Development, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Highways and Transit, hearing on Comprehensive Safety Analysis 2010: Understanding FMCSA’s

New System of Motor Carrier Oversight, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Emergency Preparedness: Evaluating the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs’ Fourth Mission, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, executive, briefing on Cybersecurity, 2 p.m., 304 HVC.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, briefing, Hot Spots, 1 p.m., 304 HVC.

Joint Meetings

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold joint hearings with the House Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Service, and the District of Columbia to examine customer and employee views on the future of the United States Postal Service, 2:30 p.m., SD-G50.

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 4173, to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end “too big to fail”, to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, 1 p.m., SD-106.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate expects to resume consideration of the House Message to accompany H.R. 4213, American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act, with roll call votes expected to occur throughout the day.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 23

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the following suspensions: (1) H.R. 5551—To require the Secretary of the Treasury to make a certification when making purchases under the Small Business Lending Fund Program; (2) H. Res. 1434—Recognizing National Homeownership Month and the importance of homeownership in the

United States; (3) S. 2865—Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act; (4) H. Con. Res. 285—Supporting the goals and ideals of designating 2010 as the Year of the Father; (5) H. Res. 1034—Expressing support for designation of July 2010 as “Braille Literacy Month”; (6) H. Res. 1373—Expressing support for “National Physical Education and Sport Week”; (7) H.R. 795—Dorothy I. Height and Whitney M. Young, Jr. Social Work Reinvestment Act; (8) H.R. 3993—Calling Card Consumer Protection Act; (9) H. Res. 1359—Calling for the immediate and unconditional release of Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit held captive by Hamas; (10) H. Res. _____—Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the conclusion of the United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and expressing appreciation to the Government of Japan and the Japanese people for enhancing peace, prosperity, and security in the Asia-Pacific region; (11) H. Res. _____—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the one-year anniversary of the Government of Iran’s manipulation of Iranian elections, on the Government of Iran’s continued denial of human rights and democracy to the people of Iran, and on the Government of Iran’s continued pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability; and (12) H. Res. 1350—Recognizing June 20, 2010, as World Refugee Day.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1157
 Bilbray, Brian P., Calif., E1160
 Boozman, John, Ark., E1155
 Brown-Waite, Ginny, Fla., E1153
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E1161
 Carnahan, Russ, Mo., E1155, E1164
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1165, E1167
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1166
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1164
 Dingell, John D., Mich., E1153
 Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E1162

Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1153
 Giffords, Gabrielle, Ariz., E1156, E1163
 Granger, Kay, Tex., E1154
 Grayson, Alan, Fla., E1156
 Harper, Gregg, Miss., E1163
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1158
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1161
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1156
 Kline, John, Minn., E1155
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E1154, E1155,
 E1155, E1156, E1158
 Lee, Christopher John, N.Y., E1167
 Lucas, Frank D., Okla., E1159

McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1154, E1158,
 E1160
 McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E1165,
 E1167
 McDermott, Jim, Wash., E1163
 Michaud, Michael H., Me., E1166
 Moore, Dennis, Kans., E1154, E1157,
 E1164
 Nunes, Devin, Calif., E1165
 Oberstar, James L., Minn., E1161
 Olson, Pete, Tex., E1158, E1160
 Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E1160
 Platts, Todd Russell, Pa., E1157

Richardson, Laura, Calif., E1167
 Rogers, Mike, Ala., E1157, E1163
 Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1162
 Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho,
 Northern Mariana Islands, E1166
 Schwartz, Allyson Y., Pa., E1158
 Skelton, Ike, Mo., E1165
 Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E1159
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1159
 Wu, David, Ore., E1158



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team’s hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.