

such as AgJOBS, which will provide critically needed workers for farms in Vermont and across the Nation. The bill would permanently extend the EB-5 Regional Center program, which generates investment capital and creates jobs. The Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act also includes one of my top civil rights priorities, the Uniting American Families Act, and a bill I have long supported, the DREAM Act. And, the bill includes measures from my bill, the Refugee Protection Act. Improving protections for refugees will honor the American tradition of offering safety to victims of persecution.

There is bipartisan agreement that immigration reform is needed. I hope that the bill we introduce today will gain support from both sides of the aisle. I strongly believe that Congress is capable of finding a realistic solution to our immigration problems. Our friend the late Senator Ted Kennedy believed that, President Bush believed that, and I know President Obama believes that.

I commend Senator MENENDEZ for his leadership and urge all Senators to join us in supporting the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2010.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 663—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD CONTINUE TO RAISE AWARENESS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN THE UNITED STATES AND ITS DEVASTATING EFFECTS ON FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES, AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. KOHL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 663

Whereas National Domestic Violence Awareness Month will be observed during October 2010;

Whereas domestic violence affects people of all ages and all racial, ethnic, gender, economic, and religious backgrounds;

Whereas females are disproportionately victims of domestic violence, and 1 in 4 women will experience domestic violence at some point in her life;

Whereas, on average, more than 3 women are murdered by their husbands or boyfriends in the United States every day;

Whereas, in 2007, 1,640 women were murdered by an intimate partner, and were the victims of 70 percent of all intimate partner homicides that year;

Whereas women from 16 to 24 years of age experience the highest rates, per capita, of intimate partner violence;

Whereas 1 out of 3 Native American women will be raped and 6 out of 10 will be physically assaulted in their lifetimes;

Whereas, in 2003, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that the costs of intimate partner violence exceeded \$8,300,000,000, including the cost of medical care, mental health services, and lost productivity;

Whereas $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of domestic violence victims report that they have lost a job due, at least in part, to domestic violence;

Whereas the annual cost of lost productivity due to domestic violence is estimated at \$727,800,000 with more than 7,900,000 paid workdays lost per year;

Whereas some landlords deny housing to victims of domestic violence who have protection orders or evict victims of domestic violence who seek help after a domestic violence incident, such as by calling 911, or who have other indications that they are domestic violence victims;

Whereas 92 percent of homeless women experience severe physical or sexual abuse at some point in their lifetimes;

Whereas approximately 40 to 60 percent of men who abuse women also abuse children;

Whereas it is critical to ensure that children who are exposed to domestic violence are placed in the protective care of a responsible and loving parent or guardian;

Whereas a study of over 17,000 adults by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Kaiser Permanente found that children who live with their abusers are at high risk for grave medical, psychological, and behavioral disorders and even death;

Whereas approximately 15,500,000 children are exposed to domestic violence every year;

Whereas children exposed to domestic violence are more likely to attempt suicide, abuse drugs and alcohol, run away from home, and engage in teenage prostitution;

Whereas one large study found that men exposed to physical abuse, sexual abuse, and adult domestic violence as children were almost 4 times more likely than other men to have perpetrated domestic violence as adults;

Whereas nearly 1,500,000 high school students nationwide experienced physical abuse from a dating partner in a single year;

Whereas 13 percent of teenage girls who have been in a relationship report being hit or hurt by their partners and 1 in 4 teenage girls has been in a relationship in which she was pressured by her partner into performing sexual acts;

Whereas adolescent girls who reported dating violence were 60 percent more likely to report one or more suicide attempts in the past year;

Whereas there is a need for middle schools, secondary schools, and post-secondary schools to educate students about the issues of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking;

Whereas 88 percent of men in a national poll reported that they think that our society should do more to respect women and girls;

Whereas a multi-State study shows conclusively that the domestic violence shelters in the United States are addressing urgent and long-term needs of victims and are helping victims protect themselves and their children;

Whereas a 2009 National Census Survey reported that 65,321 adults and children were served by domestic violence shelters and programs around the United States in a single day and those same understaffed programs were unable to meet 9,280 requests for help on that same day;

Whereas there is a need to support programs aimed at intervening and preventing domestic violence in the United States; and

Whereas individuals and organizations that are dedicated to preventing and ending domestic violence should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Domestic Violence Awareness Month; and

(2) expresses the sense of the Senate that Congress should continue to raise awareness of domestic violence in the United States and its devastating effects on families and communities, and support programs designed to end domestic violence.

SENATE RESOLUTION 664—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN OPPOSITION TO PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY, RAISING THE RETIREMENT AGE, OR OTHER SIMILAR CUTS TO BENEFITS UNDER TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. AKAKA, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. LAUTENBERG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 664

Whereas Social Security is America's most successful and reliable retirement program and continues to serve Americans well;

Whereas Social Security is not in crisis or going bankrupt and has been running surpluses for the last quarter-century;

Whereas Social Security, which currently has a \$2,600,000,000,000 surplus, has not contributed a dime to the Federal budget deficit or national debt, and benefit cuts should not be proposed as a solution to reducing the Federal deficit;

Whereas for 75 years, through good times and bad, Social Security has succeeded in protecting working persons and their families from precipitous drops in household income because of lost wages;

Whereas Social Security has kept millions of Americans out of poverty, including senior citizens, widows, and disabled and dependent children whose parents have died, become disabled, or retired;

Whereas before President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law on August 14, 1935, approximately half of the senior citizens in America lived in poverty, while less than 10 percent of seniors presently live in poverty;

Whereas more than 53,000,000 Americans receive Social Security benefits, including 36,500,000 retirees and their spouses, 8,200,000 disabled persons and their spouses, 4,500,000 surviving spouses of deceased workers, and 4,300,000 dependent children;

Whereas according to the Congressional Budget Office, even if no changes are made to the Social Security program, full benefits will still be available to every recipient until 2039, with enough funding remaining after that date to pay about 80 percent of promised benefits;

Whereas seniors have put in a lifetime of hard work, helping to make our economy grow and make our Nation great, and they deserve a dignified and secure retirement;

Whereas Social Security provides the majority of income for two-thirds of the elderly population in the United States, with approximately one-third of elderly individuals receiving nearly all of their income from Social Security;

Whereas proposals to privatize Social Security would jeopardize the retirement security of millions of Americans by relying on the ups-and-downs of the volatile stock market to provide benefits;

Whereas Social Security benefits have already been cut by 13 percent, as the Normal Retirement Age was raised in 1983 from 65 years of age to 67 years of age by 2022;

Whereas the physical demands of a job differ from industry to industry and, on average, the longevity of the lives of individuals differ significantly according to their level of income, education, and access to health care;

Whereas 45 percent of workers who are 58 years of age or older are in jobs that are physically demanding or have difficult working conditions;

Whereas raising the retirement age is especially burdensome to African-American, Latino, and older low-income workers;

Whereas according to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in April 2010, the job market for Americans 55 years of age and older was one of the worst on record;

Whereas Social Security benefits for retirees currently average a modest \$14,000 a year, with the average for women receiving benefits being less than \$12,000 per year; and

Whereas according to the Social Security Administration, raising the retirement age for future retirees would reduce benefits by 6 percent to 7 percent for each year that the Normal Retirement Age is raised under Social Security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate to reaffirm our commitment to the Social Security program, one of the greatest legislative accomplishments in the history of our Nation, without privatizing Social Security, raising the Normal Retirement Age, or other similar cuts to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act.

SENATE RESOLUTION 665—TO REQUIRE A WITNESS BEFORE A COMMITTEE HEARING TO FILE A DISCLOSURE FORM IDENTIFYING SUBSTANTIAL FINANCIAL INTERESTS OR COMPENSATION FROM AN ORGANIZATION OR COMPANY DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT OF A HEARING

Mr. GRASSLEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 665

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “Witness Sunshine Resolution”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO THE STANDING RULES.

Paragraph 4(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by—

- (1) inserting “(1)” after “(b)”;
- and
- (2) inserting at the end the following:

“(2)(A) Each committee (including the Committee on Appropriations) shall require each witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing to file with the clerk of the committee, at least 1 day before the date of the appearance of that witness, a disclosure form identifying any arrangement, affiliation, relationship, or substantial financial interest the witness has with any organization, company, private, or government entity directly related to the subject of the hearing as well as the nature of the relationship disclosed, unless the committee chairman and the ranking minority member determine that there is good cause for non-compliance.

“(B) For any witness who at the time of the hearing is employed by the Federal Government, submission of his or her Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report may fulfill the requirements of this clause at the discretion of the Chairman and the Ranking Member so long as the completed form is up to date and discloses all relevant arrangements, affiliations, relationships, and substantial financial interests.

“(C) If so requested by the committee, the staff of the committee shall prepare for the use of the members of the committee before each day of hearing before the committee a digest of the disclosure forms which have been filed under this clause by witnesses who are to appear before the committee on that day. In addition, the disclosure forms shall be made part of the committee record.”.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, so far during the 111th Congress, the Finance Committee, of which I serve as the ranking Republican member, has held over 50 hearings. At those hearings, around 200 witnesses offered their testimony and answered members' questions. The witnesses who testify at our hearings are considered to be some of the most qualified experts in their field and their participation is critical to the legislative process. Because of their influence on legislation, it is important that Congress knows to what extent the witness' testimony is objective and if the witness has any significant interest in the outcome of potential legislation.

Three of the hearings held by the Finance Committee this Congress were roundtable discussions on health care reform. These discussions brought 41 witnesses, including industry stakeholders and academic leaders, before the committee to share their expert knowledge on policy options for health reform.

At one of these roundtables, Dr. Jonathan Gruber, a health care economist and professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, testified before the committee on health care reform. I thought he was an unbiased expert, but was later disappointed to hear that he had been paid over \$400,000 by the administration to help advance the president's health care proposals. At the very least, he should have been straightforward with the committee and disclosed this financial interest.

In addition to his testimony before the Finance Committee, Dr. Gruber testified in front of the HELP Committee and was also a high-profile supporter of the administration's health care reform effort in the media. In only a handful of his many articles on health care reform did he disclose his financial conflict of interest.

While the propriety of Dr. Gruber advocating for administration positions in the media and other venues while failing to disclose his financial ties to the administration has been called into question, I am especially concerned about his advocacy before the U.S. Congress. When an academic leader comes before Congress to advocate a position, Congress should have confidence that the witness is both independent and objective and not being

paid to assist the administration, or any other organization, in its efforts.

Equally troubling is the Department of Health and Human Services, which has been unresponsive to efforts by Senator ENZI and myself to learn more about their practice of hiring consultants to advance the President's agenda.

The fact that this expert was paid by the administration—and hid that fact from Congress—really taints everything this particular advocate told the committees. If Congress had been aware of his arrangement with HHS prior to his testimony, we would have had the opportunity to clarify that relationship with Dr. Gruber before considering his opinions and ideas. Unfortunately, when we learn about it after the fact, it completely discredits the information he presented.

To follow up on this alarming news, Senator ENZI and I sent a letter to Dr. Gruber on January 26, 2010, asking him for details of any other government contracts he might have or might have had over the last 5 years and for details on whether he disclosed his government ties during media interviews, speaking engagements and written works on health care reform.

Dr. Gruber's response failed to answer any of the questions posed in the letter. Instead, the response barely exceeded one page in length, was dismissive of any concern about the lack of disclosure and attempted to excuse his failure to disclose and to explain away the need for any detailed response. Furthermore, Dr. Gruber did not even commit to providing any such disclosure of the financial relationship with the Administration in the future.

Unfortunately, Dr. Gruber's failure to answer our questions came as no surprise. In my 30 years serving in the United States Congress, I have found that chasing answers on the back end is much more difficult than requiring clarity and transparency from the start. And many of my colleagues might be surprised to find out that although many witnesses voluntarily disclose their affiliations or relationships so that they can explain them, no Senate committee currently requires witnesses to disclose potential conflicts of interest.

Dr. Gruber even highlighted this point when he said in his February 23 letter that, “to the best of my recollection, during the course of my health care reform work with Congress, no Member or staffer ever asked me whether I held any government contracts.”

In retrospect, if we were to have asked Dr. Gruber to disclose his agreements with the administration up front, we would have had the ability to ask him questions in-person, and he would have been given a chance to explain the relationship before testifying, so that his testimony could be given its proper weight. Our failure as an institution to ask for transparency in testimony is a problem that has a simple