

As someone who has always worked hard to build relationships with Democrats, I knew I could always rely on BOB to find out the pulse of Democrats on an issue. And Democrats could turn to him too. Here is what Senator REID once said about BOB: "There is no more honorable Member of this body than BOB BENNETT."

BOB and I have found common cause over the years, among other things, in our defense of the First Amendment. I remember being in the trenches together over the flag-burning amendment, which we both opposed. Both of us, of course, also strongly oppose any desecration of the flag. But we agreed that an amendment to the Constitution was not the way to go. And in the end, we prevailed. We thought it was worth the fight to ensure that Congress didn't place any qualifiers on the First Amendment.

Over this time, BOB became one of my most trusted colleagues, and that is why, when I was elected Republican leader, I asked him if he would serve as one of my advisers. He is smart and level-headed, a proven leader, a successful entrepreneur, and when he speaks everyone listens. In addition, he has a remarkable gift of persuasion. Far from the floor is where BOB does his best work. It is a trait he learned from his dad.

As BOB once put it, "Building a consensus, building relationships where people will trust and do things for you is the hardest work of the Senate, and when it comes to fruition . . . it's also the most rewarding work in the Senate."

BOB decided long ago to do his best to stay out of the nasty political fights that occur from time to time in Washington. That is one of the reasons you don't ever see him on the Sunday shows. BOB knows that most of the time the media is just looking for that gotcha moment. He is more interested in spending his time focusing on what is best for his constituents, whether it is in this Chamber, in committee, or back home.

In addition to BOB's role in leadership, he served as the ranking member of the Rules and Administration Committee, as the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, as the senior member of the Senate Banking Committee, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and on the Senate Appropriations Committee. He has been involved in nearly every major issue that has come through this Chamber over the past two decades. He has worked hard to fix our economy and health care system, simplify the tax code, reform entitlement programs, and strengthen America's national security at home and abroad.

But BOB will tell you his most important job is being a husband. And of course today we also pay tribute to Joyce, who has played such an active role in the life of the Senate family over the years. We will miss them both.

Together, they have raised six children and in nearly 50 years of marriage, they have certainly seen a lot.

When asked about his legacy, BOB has pointed out that it was always his hope to live up to his own father's example of integrity and hard work. And BOB, we know that if your dad were here today, he would be so proud of all you have accomplished not only in this Chamber and for our country, but also as a devoted husband, father and grandfather. So it is with a sense of gratitude for all that he has meant to the Senate and to me personally, that I pay tribute to BOB BENNETT. It has been an honor to serve with him, and most importantly to call him a friend. And on behalf of the entire Senate family, I want to thank BOB for his service. He will be missed, and we wish him all the best in the next chapter of his life.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I too want to say a couple of words about BOB BENNETT. We are deeply impressed with his sense of integrity and his commitment to working for basic, sound principles. I might say he made a big impression on me when he came to my office—I think on his own, but maybe he was appointed to do so—to help find a way to make the Senate more relevant and to find ways to change the Senate rules to address some of the frustration a lot of Senators have. People who are watching may wonder, gosh, why do Senators think they are not relevant? I must say that a lot of Senators feel they want to get something done quickly and they are sometimes frustrated with the actions of another Senator who doesn't quite have the same idea. I was impressed with BOB's attitude. He talked to me and asked, "What can be done, Max? What ideas do you have?" It was very refreshing. I remember thinking at the time that this will be difficult, and I told him it would be difficult. I didn't tell him how difficult I thought it would be. But I was impressed with his freshness and his desire to help adjust the Senate rules.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume the consideration of House message to accompany H.R. 4853, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorization for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

time until 3 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Reid/McConnell amendment No. 4753 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), in the nature of a substitute.

Reid amendment No. 4754 (to amendment No. 4753), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions.

Reid amendment No. 4755, to provide for a study.

Reid amendment No. 4756 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 4755), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 4757 (to amendment No. 4756), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff be allowed on the floor for the duration of the debate on the tax bill: Michael Grant, Kane Ossorio, Jack McGillis, Nicole Marchman, Manishi Rodrigo, Will Kellogg, Danielle Dellerson, Mary Baker, Greg Sullivan, Andrew Fishburn, and James Baker.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, about 2 years ago, our economy was on the brink. One of the first things we did with our new President was to enact the American Recovery and Investment Act. We did so to jump-start our economy, and we did so to create jobs.

In the 2 years since, our economy has created and sustained more than 3.5 million jobs—3.5 million more than would have been available had we not taken that action. The economy is now starting to move in the right direction, but we still have a long way to go.

The positive momentum in the economy is fragile. We need to work tirelessly to protect it. Our first priority must be to create more jobs.

The lower tax rates enacted in 2001 and 2003, along with a number of other tax provisions, are set to expire at the end of this year. If we do not act, taxes will go up.

In addition, last month, the emergency Federal unemployment insurance programs expired. If we don't act, then by the end of next month 2 million Americans will be without the critical assistance they will need. That is help they will need to put food on the table and keep a roof over their head. The tax cuts and unemployment insurance both have a critical effect on the middle-class families, our economy, and on jobs.

A little more than a week ago, the Senate voted on two amendments that would have extended these tax cuts for the middle class and unemployment insurance. Our amendments would have

effective ways to create jobs. The amendments we voted on last Saturday would have given critical relief to middle-class families. They would have provided unemployment insurance to millions of Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own. These two amendments—the Baucus amendment and the Schumer amendment—would have extended tax cuts that would have benefited all taxpayers.

Those amendments would have extended critical tax cuts such as the college tuition tax deduction. They would have made the child tax credit permanent, and they would have cut taxes for employers, freeing up cash for them to expand and hire new workers.

Those amendments focused on providing middle-class families the tax relief they need. They focused on creating the jobs our economy needs, and they focused on getting the biggest bang for our buck in creating those jobs.

Cutting taxes for middle-class families and extending unemployment insurance stimulates our economy. They do so because the families who benefit from those policies are the families most likely to spend that extra money. Spending that money injects it directly back into our economy, and that helps the economy to grow and create jobs.

The best way to extend these expiring tax provisions is to focus on the middle class. That is what my amendment did, and that remains my strong preference.

There are some in this body, however, who want to extend tax breaks for the wealthiest as well. These folks have held tax cuts for the middle class hostage to get these tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires.

Tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires are not the best way to create jobs. The Nation's wealthiest are more likely to save their money, rather than spend it and put it back into the economy.

Permanently extending tax cuts for the richest Americans would cost our economy \$700 billion over the next 10 years. That is too great a cost for a budget already burdened by deficits and debt. But despite this disagreement, creating jobs needs to be our first priority.

If we do not extend unemployment insurance, then by the end of the next month, 2 million Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own would lose their unemployment benefits. If we allow those benefits to expire, families who currently receive them would lose much of their income. Emergency unemployment insurance has benefitted about 40 million people. That has included, I might add, 10½ million children.

Emergency unemployment benefits particularly help middle-class families. Middle-class families receive 70 percent of total UI benefits. These are folks with a work history. They lost their jobs through no fault of their own. Un-

employment benefits are the only lifeline many workers in Montana and across the Nation have left in this tough economy. These benefits support Americans who have worked, who are looking for work, and who will work again.

If we do not extend unemployment insurance, we take some of the most stimulative dollars out of the economy. That will just hurt the economy's ability to create jobs. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says unemployment benefits have one of the largest effects of economic output in unemployment per dollar spent of any policy. The Department of Labor reports that for every \$1 spent on unemployment insurance, \$2 are reinvested in the economy. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that as of September, emergency unemployment insurance benefits have increased the level of employment by nearly 800,000. That is just since September.

Unemployment insurance goes to people who will spend it immediately. That increases economic demand. It is critical to extend unemployment insurance to support a fragile economic recovery and to help create jobs.

If we don't extend lower tax rates enacted in 2001 and 2003 and the other tax provisions expiring, at the present, the end of this year, millions of middle-class families will pay higher taxes next year. Middle-class families are the backbone of our economy and this recession has hit middle-class families hardest. Too many middle-class folks who have worked hard all their lives have been knocked off their feet by this great recession. Too many middle-class families are still struggling. If we don't act, individual taxes will go up. If we don't act, the child tax credit will shrink and the college tuition tax deduction will end. So will the State and local property tax deduction and the property tax deduction itself and a host of other tax breaks critical to middle-class families. Now is certainly not the time to raise taxes on middle-class families.

If we don't act, taxes will go up on employers. Taxes will go up on employers engaged in critical research and development. That is R&D our economy needs to stay competitive in the global market, to grow and to create jobs. If we don't act, taxes will go up on employers working to develop new types of sustainable energy resources, such as wind power. Sustainable energy is the industry that could create hundreds of thousands of jobs. Now is not the time to raise taxes on employers with potential to create jobs we need.

So we must act, because if we fail to extend these critical provisions, we place our economy at risk. If we fail to act, we place middle-class families at risk. So while I strongly prefer acting in a way that focuses more on the middle class, that focuses on getting more jobs and gets us the biggest bang for our buck, inaction is clearly not an option. For that reason, I will support the

bipartisan compromise the President has proposed.

Plain and simple, this bipartisan compromise is about creating jobs, extending middle-class tax cuts will help create jobs. Not extending them would cost jobs, and we cannot afford to lose jobs. Job creation needs to be our No. 1 priority. Our economy has come a long way in the last 2 years, but the growth is still fragile. Let us keep the focus on creating jobs, let us keep moving our economy forward, let us pass this important legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I think it is very clear the vote today will result in a significant majority vote for the pending legislation—the so-called tax extenders—and I will be one of those who will be voting for it as well. But I must say, in the brief time I have, there is almost an Orwellian experience on the floor of the Senate as compared with the rest of America. Here we are, about to pass these necessary tax extenders—necessary to give some kind of certainty to businesses across America, small and large, and to give tax breaks to people in these most difficult times, including my home State of Arizona. But rather than just extending the tax breaks, which is what a majority of Americans want, we have engaged in the continuing practice—a practice that has alienated the majority of American people—of loading up with unneeded, unnecessary, unwanted sweeteners in order to, I guess, get votes or satisfy special interests.

The Wall Street Journal, this morning, had an article entitled “The Hawk-eye Handouts,” stating the tax bill is becoming a “favor festival,” starting with ethanol. It goes on to talk about the ethanol extension being the bipartisan handiwork of people who direct subsidies and trade protectionism plus mandates that force consumers to buy ethanol. This is a trifecta of government support and for an industry that is 30 years old and that even Al Gore now admits serves none of its advertised environmental purposes.

I would like to quote for my colleagues on this side of the aisle what the Wall Street Journal says:

The greater political risk is for Republicans, who should worry that the tax bill is turning into a special interest spectacle. The bill revives a \$1 a gallon biodiesel tax credit at a cost of nearly \$2 billion, and there is \$202 million for “incentives for alternate fuel,” \$331 million for a 50 percent tax credit for maintaining railroad tracks, and so on. These credits are a form of special interest spending via the tax code, which is precisely the business-as-usual behavior that Republicans told tea party voters they wouldn't engage in. These business subsidies are grease for Senate votes in favor of the deal, so the only chance to remove them would be the kind of public outcry that attacked the Cornhusker Kickback and other ObamaCare

fiascoes. Call these ethanol favors the Hawkeye Handouts.

That is what this bill is all about. I say to my colleagues, I will vote for it, but it is not what the people said they wanted done on November 2.

I understand that unless online gaming, poker playing, gambling legalization comes up, we will probably go to an omnibus bill, and that omnibus bill will be loaded down with earmarks and porkbarrel spending, which is a direct—a direct—betrayal of the majority of the voters on November 2 who said stop the earmarking, stop the spending, stop the outrageous porkbarrel projects.

If this omnibus bill comes up loaded down with porkbarrel spending, we owe it to the American people to stop it. What we owe the American people is a clean continuing resolution, with no additional spending on it, that would be good for 45 days so the new Congress, in response to the American people, will act in a responsible fashion.

This bill we are going to pass contributes to the debt and the deficit, it contributes to the mortgaging of our children's futures. I say to my colleagues, we should rise against any Omnibus appropriations bill, and we should only enact a continuing resolution. To my colleagues on this side of the aisle who may not have gotten the message of November 2, vote to have a clean continuing resolution. That is what the American people have said they want and that is what they deserve. The American people deserve to be heard. Let us reconnect Washington and the American people.

I thank my colleague from Iowa for the time, and I yield whatever remaining time I have.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the bill in front of us today, and I wish to start out by saying that, in addition to all the many challenges facing our Nation, a massive budget deficit and a crippling debt may prove to be the most difficult challenge we face as a country.

A deep structural defect, such as the one our government has accumulated because of these debt levels, not only threatens our long-term economic stability, it darkens the horizon in a way that discourages the innovation investment we need to spur American jobs today.

Moreover, our apparent inability to squarely address the problem in a bipartisan way is a signal to the American people—as if they needed more proof—that our democracy is not working, and that is as dangerous as any attack on our country. It is a timebomb in our midst, the ticking of which we cannot ignore unless we are comfortable knowing it will eventually and inevitably blow up on our children.

Just last week, a bipartisan group appointed by the President confirmed the seriousness of a threat with a dif-

ferent metaphor but one equally apt. The President's fiscal commission called our national debt a cancer that is threatening our country from within. Whether a timebomb or a cancer, the threat is real, and the Commission confirmed it in the starkest possible terms.

The chairman's recommendations on how to respond were sobering. But in a way, they were also like a strong cup of coffee after a serious drinking binge. Americans sat up and listened, and for a few days between the release of the Commission's report and the vote of the full Commission the following Friday, it looked like we might be able to set aside the ideological differences that have poisoned our politics and address this problem. It looked like we might be able to follow the old adage when you are in a hole, stop digging.

However, the next week, the President announced a plan that he negotiated with Republican leaders to extend the Bush tax cuts across the board—a plan that would add \$900 billion to our national debt over the next 2 years. What is staggering to me is, it took just 4 days to switch the conversation from reducing the debt to adding to it. Just 4 days after the most substantive conversation we have had about addressing the debt, we start arguing about the wisdom of extending tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires that alone will cost \$700 billion over the next decade. That is \$700 billion in additional debt the people of the United States will owe to China and our other creditors around the world. To paraphrase one of my colleagues, I feel like we are operating in some kind of a parallel universe.

Now, as the debate over the last several days has exhibited, Senators in this body—and the American people themselves—have a diverse set of views on tax policy and how to get our economy back on track.

Central to these questions about tax policy is how to find mechanisms that will get our skyrocketing national deficit and total debt under control. Despite disagreements—our disagreements here and in the other body—I believe we owe it to the American people and to one another to be pragmatic and truthful about the fiscal challenges confronting us. It's the way that Coloradans like to operate, and I believe it's the way that most Americans want their elected official to behave. So I respect and even applaud the President's efforts to reach a compromise based on political pragmatism. But what I respectfully disagree with is the notion this compromise is based on anything approaching fiscal reality or truth in accounting, which is the point I believe the chairmen of the President's fiscal commission—Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson—were making.

If I might, I would remind my colleagues of the history of the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. Those tax cuts were passed after we experienced one of the strongest eco-

nomic environments in our history. Those who supported tax cuts for the wealthy believed that because we had begun to reduce our long-term debt, we could afford them. They believed those tax cuts would stimulate our economy further and create millions of new jobs. In the words of then-Vice President Cheney, it was a time when “deficits don't matter.”

I did not support the tax cuts for the wealthy in 2001 or 2003, for much the same reason I don't support them today. I voted against them as a Member of the House of Representatives. In fact, I'll remind this body that the extension of the Bush tax cuts in 2003 was only possible because Republicans pushed them through on a reconciliation vote, which requires only a simple majority. It took Vice President Cheney to break the tie vote. I sincerely wish those tax cuts had effectively spurred sustained job growth. I do. But unfortunately, the next decade saw a decline in our economy such as we haven't seen since the Great Depression—banks failed, foreclosures reached a crisis point, we were forced to bail out financial institutions, an insurance giant, and the auto companies to keep the economy from crashing further. During that time, real income for average households decreased and the unemployment rate nearly doubled, as millions of workers were laid off.

If tax cuts for the wealthy among us were an efficient way to spur innovation and investment, I have to believe economists would be telling us to continue them. But here is what they are actually saying: Economists of all stripes are telling us extending tax cuts for the wealthy is one of the least effective ways to create jobs and build the economy. Even some of America's most successful businessmen, Bill Gates and Warren Buffett, among those who stand to gain dramatically from the bill before us, have urged us to prioritize seniors, long-term economic growth, and job creation instead. They know what recent history has shown—that tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires do not help our economy, and it certainly doesn't help our national debt.

Just over 1 week ago I stood here with all of my colleagues and voted to support a proposal that would have followed the advice of economists, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett and extended relief to middle-class families. Most importantly, that plan would have heeded the overwhelming wishes of Coloradans—and Americans across our country, who do not believe it makes common sense to extend tax cuts for the rich. Americans understand, maybe better than many of us in Washington, DC, that middle-class tax relief is the way to spur our economy. To a family making \$50,000 a year, an \$800 tax cut could make the difference between paying for daycare or health insurance or a second car so both parents could work.

As more and more Americans become the first in their families to stand in an

unemployment line, I find it hard to explain or justify last week's filibuster preventing middle-class tax relief so millionaires and billionaires can get an extra six-figure check from the Federal Government.

We have heard all kinds of arguments for extending tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, and we have been told this bill represents the best deal we could get in order to bring further tax relief to middle-class Americans. But, again, those arguments are based on political pragmatism not a truthful or objectively measured analysis of the actual impact on our budget deficit. That is why the cochair of the President's deficit commission, Erskine Bowles, a university president who knows the impact our budget crisis has had on our States, on education, and on families, has spoken out against this irresponsible tax deal for wealthy Americans. He said:

I'm deeply disappointed that we have this short-term deal and it's not linked to long-term fiscal restraint.

I think that hits the nail on the head.

I take no pleasure in opposing most of my colleagues today. I have long held the view that by working together, we can bridge divides and find solutions that are both pragmatic, collaborative and factually sound.

I regret that the bill before us speaks more to our failure as an institution than it does as an example of effective compromise. This deal is about politics and a President backed into a terrible corner by a looming deadline when this Congress must adjourn and a new one will take its place.

The bill we are considering today is where the negotiations should have started—not where they ended. We should be voting on a plan that would allow us to extend tax relief for working families and put the \$700 billion we would save over a decade toward our deficit, unemployment insurance, tax credits for low-income Americans, and other ways to get our economy growing.

We should be voting on a plan—a compromise negotiated in good faith and based on the realities of our economy and not a date on the calendar—whose economic and fiscal impacts can be verified.

That is what I wish had been negotiated. And I would prefer to stay here in Washington, through the holidays if necessary, to work out a better deal for the Coloradans I represent, and for the American people.

Mr. President, I sincerely fear that the bad choices made in the last decade will haunt us through the next decade. For these reasons, the legislation before us today is a step too far, and that is why I oppose it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization and Job Creation Act. I realize that this legislation has stoked intense passions both among Members of this

body and the public at large, and I would like to take a few moments to explain my thoughts regarding this legislation and my vote here today.

I have served in this Chamber for nearly 30 years now. And during that time, I have frequently been confronted with the extremely difficult necessity of voting for legislation that, while deeply flawed, includes provisions that are incredibly important for the well-being of the American people. Today is no exception.

Indeed, to say that the tax legislation we are voting on today leaves much to be desired is a vast understatement. There is quite a bit about this legislation that I find extremely objectionable.

By extending tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, including the top 3 percent in our country for 2 additional years, what we are ultimately doing is driving our country deeper into debt with foreign creditors, forcing damaging funding cuts during already tight budgetary times, and increasing the burden of paying for our excess on our children and grandchildren.

This legislation would also create generous new parameters for the estate tax, raising the exemption level to \$10 million for couples and reducing the top tax rate to 35 percent—providing millions of dollars in tax breaks to the 39,000 wealthiest Americans. Indeed, in my own State, it is likely that fewer than 100 estates will actually be subject to any tax under the estate tax provision included in this bill.

And that is to say nothing of the fact that the agreement we are voting on today fails to extend numerous successful programs included in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, like the TANF emergency contingency fund and the COBRA premium subsidy, or that the provisions that will actually stimulate economic growth are only extended for a mere year.

But in spite of my strenuous objections to much of what is included in this bill, I believe it would be a grave mistake for us to defeat this measure today. Because while it would be incredibly easy to simply vote against this legislation and head home, the truth is that what is at stake here is far more than my opposition to tax breaks for our Nation's wealthiest families.

At the end of the day, this is about the well-being of the American people, far too many of whom are hurting during this period of continued economic turmoil and uncertainty. In Connecticut, nearly 9.1 percent of the State's workforce—some 172,400 men and women—were out of work in October alone. And nationally, the numbers are even worse.

So, while there is much in this legislation that merits indignation, the fact remains that there are many provisions that are far too important to all those Americans who have fallen on hard times over the last several years to warrant its defeat.

Besides extending tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, this legislation will also extend tax cuts for middle class families making under \$250,000 annually, putting additional cash in the pockets of working Americans and their families.

This legislation will also extend and expand two critically important tax credits for lower income families for 2 additional years—the \$1,000 child tax credit and the earned-income tax credit. Together, these provisions will benefit millions of working families and their children at a time when they need these benefits the most.

And perhaps most importantly, this legislation renews Federal emergency unemployment insurance through the end of 2011, preventing nearly 7 million Americans who have lost their jobs in the current recession—including nearly 80,000 in the State of Connecticut from prematurely losing their benefits next year as they look for work.

So, while my decision to vote in favor of this legislation today was incredibly difficult to make, I nevertheless believe it is the right one. Simply put, while it is a difficult pill to swallow, the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization and Job Creation Act—the Middle Class Tax Relief Act—represents the best chance we have right now to extend some critically important benefits for working families in this country. These are the people who have been hit the hardest by the current recession, and as their representatives, I believe we owe it to them to provide some relief, even if it does come in the form of the flawed legislation before us today.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I believe that before this Congress adjourns we must extend unemployment benefits that are so vital to the economic survival of many American families and to our economic recovery. I also believe we must ensure that working families are not hit with a tax increase that endangers our recovery. But the legislation before us exacts a high price, and it should be amended to accomplish those goals without giving unwarranted benefits to the wealthiest Americans. Unfortunately, the procedure under which it is intended for us to consider it will apparently give us no opportunity to correct its shortcomings.

The tax cuts included in this bill, while they would benefit working families, are too skewed toward the well-off, and would exacerbate a growing trend of income inequality in our country. Today, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans receive about one-quarter of total U.S. income. Thirty years ago, they earned only about 10 percent of total U.S. income. Not only have incomes for the wealthiest sector of the population continued to grow. Incomes for middle-class families have been stagnant and have actually fallen when adjusted for inflation.

This unconscionable inequality will only increase as a result of the estate

tax provisions in the bill before us. The pending legislation would exempt the first \$5 million of estates from any tax, and tax remaining amounts at 35 percent. This is far more generous to the wealthy than the \$3.5 million exemption and 45 percent tax that was law before this year. Just a few thousand Americans would benefit from this generous provision, but the cost to the treasury is huge.

Now, our Republican colleagues have argued that all of that inequality is a necessity, because only if we extend these enormous benefits for our wealthiest citizens will our economy continue its recovery. But, we know that this is not true. We know, in fact, that tax breaks for the wealthy have little impact on the economy as a whole.

As independent experts from the Congressional Budget Office and Congressional Research Service, from the Federal Reserve and the National Bureau of Economic Research, from academia and the private sector have all demonstrated, tax cuts for the wealthy do a great deal to add to their savings, but do not stimulate the economy. Economist Mark Zandi, who has advised members of both parties, estimates that in terms of bang for the buck, extending the tax cuts expiring at the end of this year will boost the economy by just 29 cents for every dollar they cost. Compare that to Mr. Zandi's estimate that we would get \$1.64 worth of economic boost for every dollar of enhanced unemployment benefits.

In fact, there are few people other than our Republican colleagues who believe that tax cuts have a large positive effect on the economy. Bruce Bartlett, a conservative economist, summed up what is nearly a consensus view among economists this way:

The truth is that there is virtually no evidence in support of the Bush tax cuts as an economic elixir. To the extent that they had any positive effect on growth, it was very, very modest. Their main effect was simply to reduce the government's revenue, thereby increasing the budget deficit, which all Republicans claim to abhor.

This legislation does include some very important measures that will help working American families, boost the economy and increase employment. First among them is the extension of unemployment benefits, which, I remind my colleagues, does not provide additional weeks of benefits beyond the current 99-week maximum, but does continue the current emergency benefits that have helped millions of families. As I mentioned before, these benefits are a valuable tool in building the economic recovery. As Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf has testified:

The largest effect on the economy per dollar of budgetary cost would arise from a temporary increase in aid to the unemployed.

But beyond the positive effect on the economy, extending these benefits is the right thing to do. The Americans who depend on these benefits to put

food on the table and shelter overhead did not throw the economy into crisis. They did not profit from the recklessness that brought so much profit to so few. Helping the jobless is simply the right thing to do.

Indeed, it is outrageous that our Republican colleagues have insisted that we can only help those in great need if we also provide enormous benefits to the wealthiest among us. They hold hostage aid to those in need unless we include tax cuts for those who have no such need. I know there were some Republicans who objected when President Obama used this same language in describing their position on this issue. I would say to them that if people do not want to be called hostage takers, they should not take hostages.

And we cannot forget that the result of these tax cuts for the wealthiest among us is the addition of billions upon billions of dollars to the deficit. Our Republican colleagues, who have called so loudly for government to live within its means, seem to live in a world of magical accounting, where the impact on the deficit of tax cuts for the well-off can be ignored. Over the next two years, the measures in this legislation that Republicans have set as the price for tax cuts for the middle class and aid to the jobless will add more than \$100 billion to the deficit. At a time when Washington is awash in deficit-reduction plans that would impose draconian cuts to important Federal programs, we simply cannot afford to do that.

Now, there is a traditional solution to the problems with this bill. That solution is debate and amendment. There is no reason why those of us who oppose portions of this legislation should not have the opportunity to air our objections, propose remedies to them and place them before the Senate. But the procedure under which the Senate will consider this bill will apparently not allow us to do so.

While the problems in this legislation are significant, the apparent inability for Senators to offer improvements amendments also affects my thinking on the cloture motion before us. Even an abbreviated amendment process would provide the chance to make the case for a more equitable bill. While efforts to amend the bill might not be successful, it is unacceptable to me that we would not even have the chance. Under those circumstances, I cannot agree to this motion. If we defeat this cloture motion, hopefully we would be able to take up a better bill and debate it. I believe we must fight harder and fight longer, to the end of December if necessary, for a bill that extends unemployment benefits and takes other steps that are essential to the hopes of working families, a bill that is more fiscally prudent, a bill that does not extract the high price that this bill extracts.

If given the chance to address its flaws, I believe the Senate can produce sounder legislation. I hope we will re-

ject this motion for cloture so that we can consider legislation that provides tax relief to middle-income families and aid to those in need without handing billions in unneeded and deficit-increasing benefits to the wealthiest among us.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Tax Relief, Unemployment Insurance Reauthorization, and Job Creation Act of 2010, which will prevent tax increases on middle-class Americans, provide targeted investments in American businesses, and continue much-needed relief for the unemployed.

After wrestling with my concerns about upper-class tax rates and the estate tax provision, I have come to the conclusion that this bill is necessary in order to preserve and promote our economic recovery.

Between the extension of tax rates for the middle class, the patch for the alternative minimum tax, and several extensions of previous tax policy, almost \$500 billion goes toward preventing a substantial tax increase on working Americans.

A tax increase on that scale would significantly hamper the economy and place further strain on families struggling to stay afloat during uncertain economic times.

The words spoken by former President Clinton last week underscore a strong point made by a man who knows something about how to forge legislation necessary to move our Nation forward.

He said:

The agreement taken as a whole is, I believe, the best bipartisan agreement we can reach to help the largest number of Americans, and to maximize the chances that the economic recovery will accelerate and create more jobs . . .

That is what we must do: focus as much effort as possible on creating jobs and supporting industry in the United States. We must adapt to the changing contours of the global economy and ensure we retain our competitive position as the world's greatest economic power.

I was very pleased to hear that the Treasury grant provision was included in this package. It illustrates the kind of policy necessary to encourage the industries of the future.

The Treasury grant program is responsible for \$18.2 billion in renewable energy development in just the past 2 years. That is 1,465 projects around the country.

With the program extended, California alone could see at least 141 more projects break ground next year. That would mean an additional 27,000 megawatts of energy and tens of thousands of jobs in high-unemployment counties.

High-tech companies in California and across the country will also benefit from a 2-year extension of a key research-and-development tax credit.

And the president of the National Association of Manufacturers called this

provision “key to manufacturers’ competitiveness and ability to create jobs.”

In the end, that is the bottom line. Will the economy be substantially better off if this bill passes? If the answer is yes, then there is simply no other option.

In the past few days I have spoken to a number of prominent economists about what this bill would mean for our economic recovery. With unemployment levels at 9.8 percent nationally and 12.4 percent in California, it is crucial that the economy start growing at a fast enough rate to create more jobs.

The consensus is that the provisions before us will immediately hasten the pace of the recovery, creating enough momentum to get us to the point of self-sustaining economic growth.

However, we must follow this bill with measures that address tax reform in order to create a simplified system that addresses the inequalities that have become apparent over the last decade.

From 2003 to 2007, income for families in the top 5 percent of taxpayers increased by 7 percent, while 95 percent of taxpayers’ incomes remained stagnant.

The average income of the top 1 percent of earners increased by 10 times as much as that for the bottom 90 percent.

During the expansion of 2002 to 2007, families saw their medium income drop by \$2,000, the first time Americans have seen their incomes drop during a period of economic growth.

In 2007, the top 10 percent took home almost half of the country’s total earnings, the highest level of income inequality in our Nation’s history.

Clearly, our current Tax Code does not work for most Americans. As we get back on our feet, we must shift our focus to economic policies that promote opportunity and allow for the continued pursuit of the American dream.

The point today is that we have two options. We can swallow our distaste for a few of the provisions included in this package for the sake of struggling Americans everywhere.

Or we can take a big risk with the economic recovery by allowing tax rates to reset to 1990s levels. The people that would hurt the most are the very same people we are trying to help.

I choose to do what is absolutely necessary for the benefit of the Americans that need help most, and that is why I will support this bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, while this proposal contains a number of provisions I support, including an extension of desperately needed unemployment benefits as well as a 2-year extension of the middle-class tax cuts, it fails in at least one critical respect. Rather than include a combination of responsible spending cuts and revenue increases to offset its projected cost of nearly \$900 billion, the proposal instead

just adds its cost to our already massive national debt. This measure adds more to our national debt than either the stimulus bill, which I supported, or the Wall Street bailout, which I opposed. There may be good arguments to postpone fully paying for these tax cuts or, alternatively, for offsetting their cost over a number of years to avoid undermining the fragile economic recovery. But, like the Baucus and Schumer proposals I opposed earlier this month, the measure before us fails to make even the most modest effort to pay for these tax cuts. Instead, it heaps \$900 billion onto an already mountainous level of debt that we are asking our children and grandchildren to bear. And much of this money will go toward unjustified tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, how much time is on our side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 12½ minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this bill is about stopping the biggest tax increase in the history of the country that will happen if we do not pass something between now and the end of the year. That happens because the 2001 tax law, the present tax policy, was only good for 10 years, and it sunsets. So you go back to the big tax policy we had, the high tax policy we had in the year 2000.

We are passing this now because of a simple rule of economics: you should not increase taxes during an economic recession. With nearly 10 percent unemployment, we are still, obviously, in a recession.

Some on the other side supported the President’s earlier proposal when he wanted to maintain the existing tax policy just for those below a \$200,000-a-year income. The Senate did not support that proposal, and it is clear that proposal could not pass. I know that can be a difficult thing. Over the years I have seen proposals I thought were good and just and that I cared passionately about defeated in the Senate. But you just move on, so that is what our President has done. He has moved on in a pragmatic spirit. He has put forward another proposal to prevent the biggest tax increase in the history of the country from happening. He doesn’t view it as ideal, and few on my side of the aisle do as well.

For all of us, it is a balancing act. We want to stay true to our ideals. We also want to deliver practical results to our constituents.

I submit this bill does not increase taxes, it does not cut anybody’s taxes, and that happens to be the right balance for the vast majority of us. But it also happens to be what is right for the economy now that we are in a recession.

Just 10 days ago, the unemployment rate ticked up to 9.8 percent. In July it was at 9.5 percent. The trend is in the wrong direction. We are in a fragile sit-

uation. The economy is clearly telling Congress: handle with extreme care. The majority of the economists surveyed by CNN Money says preventing the 2011 tax hikes is the No. 1 thing that Congress can do right now to help the economy. The survey results are on a chart, showing that 60 percent of the economists said preventing tax hikes on every American was the best course of action to take at this particular time; that the economy is in a fragile situation.

We have the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office saying GDP growth will be far less if we let the biggest tax increase in the history of the country happen without Congress intervening. If the tax relief doesn’t maintain at the present level, the economy would grow .3 percent less than if we do it the way the President originally wanted to do it, just for those people under \$200,000 a year income.

In other words, the economy will grow at 1.4 percent if we leave the tax policy of the last 10 years in place as opposed to taxing people who make over \$200,000 a year at a higher level. Then the economy would only grow at 1.1 percent.

Given the recession, given the high unemployment rate, given business’s reluctance to invest and grow, we need to be especially sensitive to GDP growth. If it were just a matter of either the government got the money or the private sector, that would be one thing, as the government does have a deficit problem. But in this case it is a matter of money simply not being there because of the hit to the gross domestic product. We are talking about dead-weight loss.

For those who think taxing people more will bring in more revenue, I would put up a chart that expresses tax policy and the result of it over the last 50 years. We can see the red line that says there is an average of about 18.2 percent of all the wealth. We can see the red line shows for a 50-year average, about 18.2 percent of the gross national product has come to the Congress to spend, regardless of what the high marginal tax rates were—going back to 1993 and the Eisenhower administration, going down to 70 in the Kennedy administration, going down to 50 in the Reagan administration, going down to 26 in the Reagan administration, back up 40—almost 40 percent in H.W. Bush’s administration, and then down to 35 percent where they are now. They could go back up to 40 percent if we do not intervene right now.

What this ought to tell everybody is, marginal tax rates do not make a difference, a big difference, in how much money comes into the Federal Treasury. The people of this country decided about how much they are going to give to us in Congress to spend out of the entire national income. It is about 18.2 percent regardless of where the marginal tax rates are.

It tells me that people, if they do not want to work, if they do not want to

earn or if they want to hire people to legally avoid taxes, are going to do it, and we are only going to get so much.

Here is what the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation says about this:

We anticipate that taxpayers would respond to the increased marginal rate by utilizing tax-planning and tax-avoidance strategies that will decrease the amount of income subject to taxation.

That chart proves exactly what the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxes has said.

We have known about these looming tax hikes for a decade now. We should have acted many years ago. Now we have only 19 days to go before the tax hikes take effect. We are down to the wire, and we need to act. We need to act because it is what it takes to turn this economy around. The time to dither is over. The National Federation of Independent Business, the voice of small business, had this to say recently. Because of no action on expiring tax rates there is a "cloud of uncertainty, larger and darker. In response, consumer sentiment fell and owner optimism remained anchored solidly in recession territory. Thus, spending stayed in 'maintenance mode,' deterioration of jobs continues, and capital spending remains at historically low rates. Owners won't make spending commitments when sales prospects remain weak and important decisions such as tax rates and labor costs remain so uncertain."

That is the end of the quote from small business.

Uncertainty is the issue we have to deal with here. Passing this bill so the biggest tax hike in the history of the country will not happen is one thing that will bring some certainty, and maybe more certainty than anything else, to our economy.

The bottom line, as evidenced by this chart, is stop the tax hikes. It is time to leave the tax policy of the last 10 years in place so at least for the next 2 years people know they can hire and expand this economy and expand theirs.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

How many minutes do I have?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 2½ minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I think, Mr. President, I am going to take 2½ minutes to address what the Senator from Arizona said about some of the provisions in this bill. We keep having ethanol referred to as a subsidy.

Let me tell you about some of the subsidies that are in this bill because you might think that ethanol is the only one. Think in terms of the research and development tax credit. That is subsidy for big business that has been around for 30 years. Think about the Indian employment tax credit, the subsidy for new market tax credits, the subsidy for railroad track maintenance credit, mine rescue team training credit, the subsidy for employer wage credit for employees who

are on Active Duty in the uniformed services, the subsidy for 15-year straight line cost recovery for qualified leaseholder improvements, the subsidy for the 7-year recovery period for motor sports entertainment complexes.

I don't quite understand, when there are 72 provisions in this bill that expired on December 31, 2009, and they are just being continued as some of them have been for 30 years, how somebody today is going to say that is bad tax policy and they did not say it over the last 30 years, particularly when it comes to a time when we know we need a balanced alternative energy program—balanced for whatever can be alternative energy because God only made so much fossil fuel. Obviously, we ought to be using petroleum. But should we import more petroleum from the 10 percent of the fuel used in motor vehicles coming from ethanol? Do you believe we ought to have a good national security program that is less based upon the requirements of imported oil?

I think we ought to look at this balanced program as being one of fossil fuel, one of alternative energy, and one of conservation and ethanol and biodiesel and wind and solar and all that is part of a balanced program, and they all have tax incentives.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853, the Middle Class Tax Relief Act, with an amendment No. 4753.

Max Baucus, Joseph I. Lieberman, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Byron L. Dorgan, John F. Kerry, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark L. Pryor, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Mark R. Warner, Jeanne Shaheen, Ben Nelson, Evan Bayh, Christopher J. Dodd, Kent Conrad, Jim Webb, Bill Nelson, Amy Klobuchar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4853, the Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act of 2010, with amendment No. 4753, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. MANCHIN assumed the chair.)

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Akaka	Durbin	McConnell
Alexander	Enzi	Menendez
Barrasso	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Franken	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Begich	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Bennet	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Harkin	Pryor
Bond	Hatch	Reed
Boxer	Hutchison	Reid
Brown (MA)	Inhofe	Risch
Brownback	Inouye	Roberts
Bunning	Isakson	Rockefeller
Burr	Johanns	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kerry	Shelby
Carper	Kirk	Snowe
Casey	Klobuchar	Specter
Chambliss	Kohl	Stabenow
Cochran	Kyl	Tester
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Conrad	LeMieux	Udall (NM)
Coons	Lieberman	Vitter
Corker	Lincoln	Warner
Cornyn	Lugar	Webb
Crapo	Manchin	Whitehouse
Dodd	McCaIn	Wicker
Dorgan	McCaskill	

NAYS—15

Bingaman	Feingold	Levin
Brown (OH)	Gillibrand	Sanders
Coburn	Hagan	Sessions
DeMint	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Ensign	Leahy	Voinovich

NOT VOTING—2

Merkley Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 15. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I voted today to move forward with the tax package because I did not want to block the Senate from considering this legislation. But I do not support the bill in its current form, and I will not support it on final passage if there are not additional improvements made to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 4753

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Reid-McConnell amendment, No. 4753, in the motion to concur with respect to the House message on H.R. 4853, be modified with the technical change which is at the desk.

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

The modification is as follows:

donor died as of the end of the calendar year, reduced by".

(2) Section 2631(c) is amended by striking "the applicable exclusion amount" and inserting "the basic exclusion amount".

(3) Section 6018(a)(1) is amended by striking "applicable exclusion amount" and inserting "basic exclusion amount".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to estates of decedents dying and gifts made after December 31, 2010.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFERS.—The amendment made by subsection (b)(2) shall apply to generation-skipping transfers after December 31, 2010.

SEC. 304. APPLICATION OF EGTRRA SUNSET TO THIS TITLE.

Section 901 of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall apply to the amendments made by this title.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING RANDY SMITH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to draw attention to the life and legacy of a good friend of mine, who sadly lost his battle with cancer. Randy Smith, the longtime executive director of the London-Laurel County Chamber of Commerce, died on November 19, 2010, at the age of 52 years old. For almost 17 years, Randy led the chamber and the entire community toward a stronger, fast-growing future. More than promoting the local businesses in the area, Randy dedicated his professional life to advancing the untapped potential and unique splendor of his community. He had the skills, personality, and intelligence to accomplish nearly everything he undertook—from creating some of the best civic events and festivals in the Commonwealth, to building a stronger chamber membership at a time when many small businesses are struggling.

There is no doubt that Randy's good humor will be deeply missed by all who knew him. But let there also be no doubt that Randy's record of accomplishment and legacy in Laurel County will never fade. The tenacity with which he fought his cancer for more than a year displayed the same trademark character that I have seen in him during our friendship of over a decade. No matter the issue, Randy Smith could be counted on to handle the challenge with the utmost integrity.

It is with a saddened heart that I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life and accomplishments of one of the Commonwealth's true unsung heroes. I would further ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest sympathies to his wife Kim and their children Logan, Cameron, and Brianna. I would also like to share my sympathies with Randy's parents, Earl and Rosie Smith, as well as his brothers and sister, Phil and Eddie Smith and Sharon Benge.

The Sentinel Echo recently published a story remembering the life of Randy Smith and I ask unanimous consent that the text of that article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Sentinel Echo, Dec. 3, 2010]

RANDY SMITH LOSES BATTLE WITH CANCER

(By Nita Johnson/Staff Writer)

LAUREL COUNTY, Ky.—Long-time London-Laurel County Chamber of Commerce Executive Director Randy Smith lost his battle with cancer Friday morning, leaving a legacy of dedication to his community.

Ironically, Smith died the day of the 2010 Christmas on Main events—a celebration he was instrumental in starting in 1994, the first year he was named the Chamber's executive director.

According to his brother Phil, Smith died just after noon on Friday. He had been undergoing treatment for cancer at M.D. Anderson Cancer Center at the University of Texas in Houston since Nov. 2.

"There was a medical team there waiting for him to undergo radiation three days after we got here," Phil Smith said. "The treatments were to be completed Nov. 18 and Randy did OK. He was getting around on a walker, went outside and was doing well."

But on Nov. 17, things took a turn for the worse.

"Randy had a lung biopsy on Nov. 17 and it was very challenging to him physically," Phil added. "We were going to come home on Nov. 18, with our reservations to fly out at 2:20 p.m. Randy was ready to roll but around lunchtime he started having some shortness of breath. By that afternoon he was in ICU (Intensive Care Unit) and diagnosed with aspiration pneumonia. He was really struggling. He spent two weeks and a day in ICU but his cancer was advanced and with the pneumonia and becoming septic while in ICU, it was more than his body could handle."

Randy Smith's wife, Kim, children, parents, two brothers and their families were with him on Friday. Most of them had been there since Thanksgiving.

Randy Smith began having health complications in the spring of 2009. In August 2009 he was diagnosed with lung cancer and later on, with bone cancer. But his fighting spirit prevailed throughout his illness—a trait that Phil Smith said enabled his brother to fight the disease as long as he did.

"Randy was a battler with his condition. He's always been competitive and up for a challenge," Phil said. "I guess he saw the finish line God offered more rewarding than the finish line here."

His competitiveness is what many attribute to Smith's success with the Chamber of Commerce, said Holbert Hodges, who was president of the Chamber when Smith became a board member.

"I asked Randy to become a director and that's how he became involved with the Chamber, as a board member/director," Hodges said. "He was the heart and soul of the Chamber. He did a lot of things for this community and for people, a lot that he didn't want people to know about. He was dedicated, a hard worker, a good family man. When help was needed, Randy was always the first in line. He had all the traits necessary to represent the Chamber and was the steady force behind its success."

Hodges said hearing of Smith's passing caused many memories to surface.

"I'm just sitting here having memories of Randy," Hodges said from his office on Friday afternoon. "We worked together through many good and bad times and he was the steady force. His energy level amazed me. He's going to be missed."

Hodges said Smith was the driving force behind the annual Christmas on Main celebration.

"We wanted it to be more than just a parade and we came up with the idea to set up bleachers in front of the courthouse for cho-

rus and choirs and to involve the schools and churches," Hodges said. "We wanted it so kids and grandparents and parents and aunts and uncles could come out. It was very successful."

Under Smith's leadership, the Chamber of Commerce sponsored many other events. The annual Red, White and Boom Independence Day celebration was instituted under Smith's helm at the Chamber. The annual Chamber banquet, which honored a local teacher from the elementary, middle and high school levels along with local business people, received great acclaim.

The Chamber also sponsored job fairs, career fairs, and most recently, the "Women in Business" awards. Though some of those programs have changed or are now under management by the Chamber's Ambassador Club and the London Downtown organization, Smith was the man who pushed these events to success.

Willie Sawyers, Sentinel-Echo publisher and Chamber of Commerce board member, knew Smith since elementary school and worked on various committees involved with the Chamber of Commerce.

"Randy and I are the same age. We went to school together, played basketball for many years and served on the Chamber together," Sawyers said. "We had a lot of personal conversations about dreams and goals for our community. I will greatly miss those conversations with him."

"Many of the good things happening right now in London and Laurel County are directly attributable to Randy's dedication and enthusiasm."

This sentiment was seconded by London City Mayor Troy Rudder, who tearfully praised Smith and his contributions to the city and county.

"We are extremely sad for the loss of Randy," Rudder said. "He has been very influential in the growth and prosperity of this city. Randy was one who was always willing to work or volunteer. When it came to this community, Randy was always the first one in line."

"My heart goes out to his family and this city is deeply saddened," he added.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete, and will be announced later.

RECOGNIZING UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to honor the remarkable accomplishments of the University of Louisville men's soccer team. Led by their coach, Ken Lolla, these young student athletes made it to the championship game of the NCAA Division I tournament. In a close competition against the University of Akron they suffered their first defeat by one goal as the score was one to zero. This team spent most of the season ranked number one over the rest of their opponents. Becoming NCAA men's soccer runners-up is an accomplishment that has brought a lot of positive energy to the university as well as the entire city of Louisville. The team has made their university, city, Commonwealth and this Senator very proud. The Louisville Courier-Journal recently published an article describing the team's accomplishments. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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