

Elevated on High Pole Hill, this granite tower is emblematic of much more than the sacrifices of the Mayflower passengers and the values they brought to the new land. The Monument is a memorial to the story of each American—for we are a unique country of immigrants, carrying with us our own passion for freedom, self determination and justice.

Since the first inception in 1892, the dramatic significance of the Cape Cod Pilgrim Memorial Association and the Monument they were dedicated to build was well-understood. President Theodore Roosevelt insisted on participating in the ceremonies associated with the laying the cornerstone of the Monument's foundation in an elaborate Masonic ceremony. The President sailed into Provincetown Harbor on his presidential yacht—named the Mayflower—and spoke of the significance of the First Landing to all Americans.

And now, nearly four hundred years after their cross-seas journey led them to the shores of Provincetown, we gather once again in celebration of the passengers of the Mayflower and the Monument constructed one century ago in their honor.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ANNETTE YOUNG

##### HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Annette Young for her service to the Brooklyn community.

Annette Young received degree from the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University and earned her Bachelor's Degree at the College of New Rochelle.

She worked in business as an Executive Assistant to the Vice President of International Banking of JP Morgan Chase.

Annette is a long time member of the Democratic Party and has worked on numerous campaigns. She has received recognition from the Vanguard Political Club, Brooklyn CORE, and the Brooklyn Chapter of the National Organization for Women. Additionally, she was presented the Unity Music and Arts Award for Outstanding Professional Achievement as an actress by the Unity Democratic Club.

She has contributed countless hours of community service work throughout the borough of Brooklyn. She has been a leader in block associations for many years, and is involved in numerous local civic associations. Additionally, she currently enjoys working as a jewelry maker.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the achievements of Annette Young.

#### INTRODUCTION OF H.R.—, THE “VOLUNTARY INCENTIVE AUCTIONS ACT OF 2010”

##### HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 2010

Mr. BOUCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of the introduction of

the “Voluntary Incentive Auctions Act of 2010.” This measure will give the Federal Communications Commission the authority to implement a crucial aspect of the National Broadband Plan. It will help ensure that new spectrum can be made available for commercial wireless services by permitting the Commission to conduct incentive-based spectrum auctions in which a spectrum holder voluntarily relinquishes its spectrum in return for a portion of the auction proceeds.

Wireless communications services are rapidly growing. Each year, millions of users graduate from basic cell phones to smart phones that employ a range of data services. Those services require far greater bandwidth than traditional cell phones. And the data services offered through smart phones are becoming ever more sophisticated, often employing full motion video.

The combination of greater smart phone use and far more elaborate applications is placing unprecedented demands on our limited wireless spectrum availability. To meet these growing demands, the National Broadband Plan calls for making 500 MHz of spectrum newly available for broadband use within the next 10 years.

That is a worthy goal, though attaining it may not be easy. The National Broadband Plan identifies some potential spectrum candidates, including spectrum in the Wireless Communications Service (WCS) band, the Advanced Wireless Services (AWS) bands and the Mobile Satellite Spectrum (MSS).

The National Broadband Plan also suggests that the Federal Communications Commission initiate a rulemaking to reallocate 120 MHz of spectrum currently in the hands of television stations from television broadcast to wireless broadband use. The Plan suggests that the Commission, among other things:

Update its rules on television service areas and distance separations to ensure the most efficient allocation of channels to broadcasters, including packing broadcast channels more tightly together.

Increase the efficiency of spectrum use in the television broadcast bands, including by setting a deadline for low-power stations to transition to digital and addressing poor VHF-reception issues.

Establish a licensing framework that would allow two or more stations to share a single 6 MHz broadcast channel.

Determine rules for auctioning broadcast spectrum reclaimed through repacking and voluntary channel sharing or channel surrender, including a way for stations to receive a share of the proceeds for spectrum they contribute to the auction.

The National Broadband Plan's recommendation concerning incentive-based auctions, with broadcasters sharing in the proceeds from the auction of spectrum they voluntarily return to the Federal Communications Commission, requires legislation. Today, my colleague CLIFF STEARNS, Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet, and I are introducing the requisite legislative measure.

Our goal is to ensure that any incentive auctions the Federal Communications Commission conducts are truly voluntary. Only in instances in which television broadcasters or other spectrum holders willingly enter into agreements with the FCC for the surrender of their spectrum in return for a portion of the

auction revenues would the transaction be deemed to be voluntary. And “truly voluntary” means neither directly nor constructively involuntary. For example, an effort by the FCC to impose a spectrum fee that would make some licensees financially unable to keep their spectrum would make the spectrum surrender constructively involuntary and would be impermissible under the terms of our legislation.

The Voluntary Incentive Auctions Act takes the right approach to incentive-based spectrum auctions. The right approach is for the FCC to work with television broadcasters and other licensees to identify the spectrum they now hold that on a purely consensual basis could be repurposed for commercial wireless use. Licensees who surrender spectrum would receive compensation in exchange for a voluntary spectrum transfer. I do not support, nor would the Voluntary Incentive Auctions Act of 2010 permit, any action by the FCC requiring broadcast stations or others to give up spectrum involuntarily.

The right approach is the one specified in this legislation—enter into conversations with broadcasters and others about surrendering a portion of their spectrum on a voluntary basis, determine rules for incentive-based auctions that are truly voluntary and conduct the auctions in accordance with the agreement.

It is also important that the Commission treat broadcasters that are required to relocate due to repacking fairly. Broadcasters just over one year ago completed the highly successful transition to digital television. That transition freed up substantial amounts of spectrum in the 700 MHz band for commercial wireless use.

To complete the digital television transition successfully, many broadcasters made significant investments in new equipment, including antennas and other items that are tailored to their current channel assignments. Therefore, broadcasters that are required to relocate as part of a repacking plan deserve fair compensation for the costs of that relocation. It is also important that the Commission ensure that broadcasters that relocate due to repacking do not lose over-the-air viewers as a result of that move.

Madam Speaker, again, I am pleased to join with my colleague Mr. STEARNS in offering this important measure to make available more spectrum for innovative wireless broadband services while assuring fair treatment for existing spectrum holders that facilitate that process by voluntarily returning some or all of their spectrum.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF BURBANK

##### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 29, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of the First United Methodist Church of Burbank, California.

In 1883, when Burbank was a rural area with a population of a few scattered families, the community needed a place for worship, so a Sunday School was organized in the Providencia School House. One year later, on September 14, 1884, a church, located at Empire Avenue and Lincoln Street, was dedicated. After four years of use, the church was

sold to a congregation member and a new church was erected in 1888, one year after the establishment of the City of Burbank. The church was established as the Providencia Church, and eventually merged with the First Methodist Episcopal Church, taking the latter's name. In 1919, construction began on a new church at Olive Avenue and Third Street, which was completed and dedicated in October of 1922.

After World War II, the church membership grew to 1,000 parishioners, signaling the need for a new church building. In 1944, a building fund campaign began and property was purchased on Glenoaks Boulevard. In 1949, another fundraising campaign was launched to construct a new church on the Glenoaks property, and one year later, construction began on the new church, which became known as the First Methodist Church of Burbank. On May 25, 1952, the first official services were held in the First Methodist Church of Burbank and Consecration Sunday was held on September 14 later that year. The full construction plan was realized in 1956 with the completion of the Education Building. In 1968, when the Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren Church merged, and the entire denomination changed its name, First Methodist Church of Burbank became known as the First United Methodist Church of Burbank.

First United Methodist Church of Burbank offers a wide variety of programs and ministries to the Burbank community. The church hosts multiple Girl Scout troops, Boy Scout Troop #209, Cub Scout Pack #225, and offers opportunities for youth that include the Partners with the Parents Program and the Youth in Performing Arts Ministry. Other programs include the We Care Committee, which supports members of the congregation when they need assistance with meals, transportation and other services, as well as active chapters of the United Methodist Women and United Methodist Men organizations. In addition, members of the congregation volunteer on a regular basis at Burbank Temporary Aid Center and actively support our military by periodically sending care packages of personal items, telephone cards, books and other items to our troops overseas.

I consider it a great privilege to recognize First United Methodist Church of Burbank and I invite all Members to join me in congratulating the congregation for 125 years of service to the community.

#### ON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE BRING JOBS BACK TO AMERICA ACT

**HON. FRANK R. WOLF**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 29, 2010*

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I am introducing today the Bring Jobs Back to America Act, which would start the process of bringing real jobs back to America that have gone overseas during the last two decades.

My legislation will build on language I included earlier this year in the fiscal year 2011 Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill directing the Commerce Department to launch a job repatriation initiative to bring those jobs back home.

I believe that a strong manufacturing and technology development base is critical to job creation and the economic competitiveness of the United States.

Something has happened in our country. We're making fewer and fewer things. Today, everything seems to be labeled: "Made in China."

If you have ever taken the train from Washington, DC, to New York and looked out the window, you can see our empty factories. You pass through my old neighborhood in Philadelphia.

GE's switchgear factory used to be one block from my home. Now there's nothing there but an empty, littered field.

You pass through Trenton, New Jersey, and can see the famous bridge sign that reads: "Trenton Makes, the World Takes." Trenton doesn't make anything anymore.

Last year, General Electric CEO Jeffrey Immelt noted that in recent years in the United States, "Real engineering was traded for financial engineering." Immelt called on the U.S. to grow manufacturing jobs to comprise at least 20 percent of American jobs—nearly double the current level.

In this era of intense global competition, we must work aggressively to bring jobs that have gone overseas back home to the U.S. to immediately start growing the percentage of these jobs, as Immelt called for.

It's not enough to talk about creating jobs. We have to take immediate steps to create jobs.

I have been, and remain, a staunch supporter of free trade. Free trade has yielded benefits to the American people and our economy.

However, we have been far too slow in responding to our international economic competitors in this era of global markets and competition.

The irony is that as much as American firms have offshored manufacturing and development jobs, they remain reliant on America for support. And with American unemployment hovering around 10 percent, it's time for some of these American firms to come home.

When an American plant manager in Mexico is kidnapped, the firm doesn't call the Mexican Federal Police, they call the FBI.

When the Chinese steal an American firm's intellectual property, the firm calls the U.S. Commerce Department.

It's time to bring some of these jobs home because America can be competitive in this global economy and it's the right thing to do. My legislation will start this process.

Overall, I believe that my bill helps to refocus the United States to be more proactive and a smarter competitor in the global economy—both in the short term and long term.

Specifically, this bill requires the Secretary of Commerce to set targets for job repatriation and creates multi-agency "Repatriation Task Forces" to identify American companies manufacturing abroad and work with states to bring jobs back to the U.S.

The goal is to bring back real jobs from overseas to the United States—jobs that are already created and an American could immediately fill.

This bill would require the Commerce Department to survey all American firms with significant manufacturing facilities in foreign countries, allowing the Repatriation Task Forces to proactively identify all firms inter-

ested in working with state and local governments to facilitate a mutually beneficial repatriation of jobs.

The bill would also comprehensively align federal resources in support of repatriation efforts. It allows state and local governments to use a variety of federal funding—at no new cost—to support job repatriation initiatives by state and local governments.

For example, my bill aligns Economic Development Agency (EDA) and National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST) grants to allow state and local governments to use this funding for repatriation.

It would also direct the Secretary of Commerce and the IRS to quickly study and report on the merits of a new federal tax incentive to encourage repatriation.

In addition to repatriating jobs today, we must redouble our efforts to foster emerging technologies to create our manufacturing base of tomorrow.

For too long, the U.S. has failed to strategically monitor emerging opportunities and threats in our competitive global economy. We are starting to see the ramifications of this failure in the rise of China as an economic power.

My bill would reconstitute President Reagan's "Project Socrates" as an independent "American Economic Security Commission" to identify and monitor emerging technologies and global economic threats.

Project Socrates was initiated during the Reagan Administration to address America's competitiveness challenge and determine the source of the nation's declining competitiveness and develop programs to address the source of the problem.

Our Commission—composed of 12 business leaders and economists appointed by the majority and minority leaders—will similarly take a comprehensive and unbiased look at all of our global economic competitors—both strengths and weaknesses—and help inform the Congress on how to bolster American economic security.

This will ensure that we have an independent mechanism to monitor new opportunities and threats to ensure that America can capitalize on revolutionary technologies and create new jobs in the U.S.

The bill also provides stronger protections for American intellectual property and helps to expedite the patent process for cutting-edge new technologies developed by universities.

The faster we can secure our innovations and move them to market, the more jobs we can create in this country.

We can no longer afford to ride the coattails of yesterday's innovations; we have to identify and support the emerging technologies of tomorrow that will create American jobs.

The Chinese, Indians and other international competitors are actively monitoring new technologies and trends to support their firms. To date, we have not.

Are Americans willing to continue to sit idly by and allow the Chinese to dominate new industries at our expense?

Norm Augustine, the former chairman and CEO of Lockheed Martin, best captured the situation we now find ourselves in when he said:

In the technology-driven economy in which we live, Americans have come to accept leadership as the natural and enduring state of affairs. But leadership is highly perishable. It must be constantly re-earned.