

FMLA. However, only a small percentage of those workers entitled to the leave actually utilize it, and the number one reason why is that it is unpaid.

We lag far behind other countries in providing “family friendly” policies, such as paid leave, to our workers. That’s why in successive Congresses I have introduced H.R. 3047, The Balancing Act, which establishes a host of supports families need to balance their work and family lives.

President Obama recognizes the need for “family-friendly” supports, and I was also pleased to learn that his budget for Fiscal Year 2011 proposes \$50 million for a State Paid Leave Fund that will provide competitive grants to help states launch paid-leave programs. In May 2009, I introduced H.R. 2339, the Family Income to Respond to Significant Transitions (FIRST) Act, which provides \$1.5 billion to states to start or improve paid-leave programs

On this anniversary of the FMLA, it’s good to reflect on how far we have come. But with half of women in the workplace, we need to move forward and enact legislation that provides paid leave and other supports to working families.

“YOU CAN’T SUCCEED AT DEFICIT REDUCTION WITHOUT REALLY TRYING”

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 2010

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, there is wide agreement that we should be taking tough measures to reduce the budget deficit. There appears at present to be a powerful myth that this can be done without attacking the biggest single area of increase in the federal budget in recent years, the military budget.

The transition from the Clinton to the Bush administration, which meant a transition from a surplus to a deficit situation, had as its single most important cause a decision by President Bush to fight two wars with five tax cuts. While President Obama has not repeated that same pattern, his announcement that he is going to begin deficit reduction, while exempting the ever-increasing military budget from the same scrutiny that goes to other Federal expenditures, means either that deficit reduction in both the near and long term is either doomed to failure, or that devastating cuts will occur in virtually every Federal program that aims at improving the quality of our lives.

I intend to work with many others to make the case that over the next 10 years we can save substantial amounts of money—a trillion or more of currently proposed expenditures—by reexamining some of the fundamental premises of American military policy. Some of those are based on Cold War assumptions—the need for three separate delivery systems for several nuclear weapons, which was designed in an era of confrontation with the Soviet Union. We also must suggest the notion that America can be the world’s pacifier, policemen etc. Our security interest must be pro-

tected, and there are beleaguered nations threatened with hostile, foreign assaults where our support is justified. But our range of commitments goes far beyond that and must be scaled back.

There are also obviously places where the current military budget can be cut, even before we begin to reduce the level of commitments. In the very useful publication Congress Daily for Monday, February 1st a thoughtful and experienced journalist, who is an expert on the military budget, George C. Wilson, cogently rebuts the President’s assertion that military requirements mean that we cannot subject the huge and growing Pentagon budget to the kind of scrutiny that goes elsewhere. Note that Mr. Wilson is talking primarily about a budget aimed at the current level commitments. A serious review of those commitments, which should result in a reduction in their scope, would allow us to go much further in reduction, reaching the magnitude of savings that are needed for us to be able to have the military budget make a substantial contribution to deficit reduction.

Madam Speaker, no issue before us is more important than the need for people to include a realistic assessment of military spending in any effort to reduce the deficit much less this year, or over the next ten. I ask that George C. Wilson’s extremely well-argued article, which makes such an essential contribution in this debate, be printed here.

[From the *Forward Observer*, Feb. 1, 2010]

FATTEST LADY SINGING

(By George C. Wilson)

In declaring in his State of the Union address that he won’t cut the Pentagon budget, President Obama is like a trainer telling the fattest lady in his class that she need not do her exercises. Why didn’t Obama order the fat Defense Department to join the government-wide effort to reduce the deficit by killing off weapons that no longer make sense?

Two-thirds of our casualties in the Iraq War were inflicted by hidden bombs that the bad guys set off by cell phones or other simple devices available at Radio Shack. Neither our new aircraft carriers costing \$12 billion apiece nor our new F-22 fighter aircraft costing \$350 million a plane can keep our troops from being killed or wounded by cheap improvised explosive devices.

This doesn’t mean that deficit cutters should cancel such super weapons willy nilly. More conventional wars than the ones in Iraq and Afghanistan may well be in America’s future. But Obama and Congress should at least order Defense Secretary Gates and his deputies to justify every major weapon by explaining what red-hot threat out there justifies spending fresh billions on it.

The GAO drew a good road map for conducting such a review last year in its devastating report on Pentagon cost overruns. Entitled “Defense Acquisitions: Assessments of Selected Weapon Programs; the GAO studied 96 major weapons in 2008 and discovered that the contractors’ original price tag had nothing to do with reality.

The cost overruns on the weapons studied totaled \$296.4 billion. Just making the contractors, not the taxpayers, eat their own cost overruns would reduce the deficit by almost \$300 billion.

Instead of making such a demand, Obama last Wednesday gave defense contractors, their overseers in the Pentagon and Congress a pass: “Starting in 2011 we are prepared to

freeze government spending for three years. Spending related to our national security, Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security will not be affected. But all other discretionary government programs will.”

Where is Congress in this supposed war against the deficit that Obama just declared? The Founding Fathers in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution gave Congress the power to “provide for the common defense,” not the president.

When are the lawmakers going to start cutting Pentagon programs like outrageously expensive warships, planes that soar over the price tags contractors originally put on them and missile defenses that have a lot bigger flaws than Toyota’s stuck gas pedals?

“Never,” is the answer I get from some of the walking wounded who fought in past battles of the Pentagon budget. They say any weapons, whether justified by today’s threats or not, get protected by lawmakers as long as they provide jobs back home.

Congress, these vets contend, to reassert its constitutional right to provide for the common defense, should deny money to produce any weapon before it is thoroughly tested; forbid congressional add-ons to the Pentagon budget unless CBO and GAO have determined what the pet project would cost and, if deemed worthy, conduct an open competition to build it; forbid any congressional staffer from vaulting to a job in the Pentagon or defense industry.

Obama did take one step toward making congressional wheeling and dealing on add-ons more transparent by declaring in his address that “I’m calling on Congress to publish all earmark requests on a single Web site before there’s a vote so that the American people can see how their money is being spent.” That might help some but not much. Voters in the lawmaker’s district or state might not object to getting earmarked for goodies.

As one who has studied the military-industrial-political-intelligence complex for almost 50 years now from the front row seat a defense reporter gets, I think the deficit, unemployment, cost overruns on weapons that don’t work and/or have nothing to do with winning the war against terrorists—along with voter disgust with Washington’s spending binge—will eventually force the president and Congress to rein in their spending on dubious weapons.

The overseers will realize that real national security means fixing the national economy, not letting the Defense secretary and Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps continue to drive the taxpayers to the poor house in Cadillacs.

As one who spent seven and a half months on an aircraft carrier, let me fuel the eventual battle of the Pentagon budget by asking right here and now whether it makes sense in these economic times to build all three of the new carriers of the class named after the late President Gerald R. Ford.

In its latest Selected Acquisition Report, the Pentagon projects that three of these Ford class carriers will cost a total of \$35 billion, or almost \$12 billion each. A pilot who really knows carriers from taking off and landing on them thousands of times told me that the bad guys could disable the carrier flight deck with comparatively cheap missiles or do what our own Navy frogmen have already done: Sneak aboard a carrier at night undetected by climbing up its steel sides on magnetic shoes. “They can make it rain longer than we can swim; the pilot said of those bent on dethroning the queen of the Navy fleet.

CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT  
ACT OF 2009

SPEECH OF

## HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 2010

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes:

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 4061, the Cybersecurity Act of 2009.

I would like to thank Chairman GORDON, his staff, and Representative LIPINSKI for their leadership on a critical, bipartisan bill that will train the experts we need to tackle tomorrow's challenges and enable the United States to stay competitive in the realm of cybersecurity.

In a world of blogs and widgets, smart phones and e-mail, we are a global community growing ever closer and interconnected. The average citizen cannot help but be a part of an extended electronic family. Technological progress has enhanced our personal and work lives, regardless of our job or position.

As someone who has founded and run several small businesses, I can speak to the advantages of working in this age of e-commerce and how it has improved my ability to represent Colorado's Second Congressional District.

My amendment expands the proposed internship opportunities available to participants in the Federal Cyber Scholarship for Service Program to include placements in the private sector. I believe it will serve tomorrow's cybersecurity professionals and our national security interests to open up this program to a diversity of experience. For the future recipients of these scholarships, it will provide the occasion to serve not only in the Federal technology workforce, but also at the abundance of small, medium, and large businesses that help to make up our nation's economy.

My district provides a clear illustration of where institutions of higher education, small businesses, and the Federal Government can cooperate to benefit each other and the rest of the nation.

We have a thriving community of startups, lower than average unemployment, and a history of growing small businesses. With the collaboration of budding cybersecurity professionals from the University of Colorado, in Boulder, these companies can benefit from their education and, in turn, impart the practical knowledge that will build each student's portfolio of experiences.

Having gained and grown from these experiences, I am positive that their education in the private sector will help to provide unique solutions to daunting tasks during their time in the Federal Government. What originally seemed like a strategy only applicable to a small high-tech company in Boulder, can now serve as a useful tool when confronted with the task of fending off cyber attacks.

The state of cybersecurity is fast becoming one of the great challenges of the 21st century. It is apparent that despite increased spending on research and development, our technological infrastructure is still vulnerable.

China's recent intrusion into Google's operations should serve as a call to preparedness for both the private sector and the Federal Government.

This past May, President Obama's "Cyber-space Policy Review" highlighted the importance of developing partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector. We must heed his call to broaden the scope of our experience. The limits of cyber growth are constantly expanding and, consequently, so must our plans to address the plethora of issues that crop up.

As Secretary Clinton put it recently, "the Internet, though a blessing, can be a threat to those who would fall prey to cyber terrorism." It is our job as inventors and stewards of the Internet to ensure unhindered access to information and technology that enriches the lives of everyone. By boosting our training capabilities we are ensuring a safe and free Internet experience, informed by the latest discoveries and implemented by practiced professionals.

This amendment helps to guarantee that we are addressing the long-term challenges inherent to cyber security. It will create ties with the private sector and cultivate a workforce with a skill set that will serve in a variety of scenarios.

Madam Chair, this amendment and this bill are critical to protecting our nation's sensitive information, ensuring a competent cybersecurity workforce and boosting our economic competitiveness. I urge passage of this amendment and the underlying bill.

HONORING THE LIFE OF M.  
HOLLIS CURL

## HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 2010

Mr. BONNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deep personal sadness at the passing of M. Hollis Curl, a longtime friend, an award winning journalist, and perhaps Wilcox County, Alabama's greatest advocate.

Hollis, the editor and publisher of The Wilcox Progressive Era in my hometown of Camden, Alabama, passed away on February 2, 2010 at the age of 74.

It's been said that real newspapermen bleed ink. I have no doubt that Hollis would fit into that category. While he would downplay his life's work as mere "newspapering," no one could ever question that Hollis was a consummate professional born with a lifetime love for print journalism and a remarkable passion for his community.

Hollis began his "newspapering" career as a young man by hawking copies of his hometown paper, The Red Bay News, from a shoeshine stand. During World War II, his family moved to Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where he got a paper route carrying the Knoxville News Sentinel. Not satisfied with selling other people's papers, he soon started his own neighborhood publication—a single sheet which he sold for five cents a copy.

Hollis attended Ole Miss and following college, he worked at newspapers in Tennessee before returning to Alabama in 1960 to join The Dothan Eagle. From there, he moved to Butler, where he served as publisher for The Choctaw Advocate and began winning awards

from the Alabama Press Association (APA). He purchased The Choctaw Advocate in 1968, and later, he co-owned The Demopolis Times.

In 1969, he and his wonderful wife, Glenda, bought The Wilcox Progressive Era in Camden, a newspaper that decades earlier had been in my family. Throughout the years, Hollis Curl also owned newspapers in Montevallo and Marion.

Hollis gained national recognition in 1997 when he was selected by Sigma Delta Chi as the first weekly newspaper editor to receive the Ethics in Journalism Award presented at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. In addition, the Alabama Press Association awarded Hollis with its first Lifetime Achievement Award.

Over his four-decade-long career in Camden, Hollis took more than a few politicians to task on his editorial page and in his award-winning, weekly column, "For What It's Worth." A proud and lifelong Democrat, Hollis penned the very first editorial endorsement for my candidacy for Congress back in 2002, even though I was running as a Republican in a congressional district that was different from his own.

Hollis was perhaps best known to those outside of Wilcox County for the national publicity he received for his tireless efforts to restore ferry service to Gee's Bend, Alabama—an area that for nearly 40 years had been isolated from the county seat of Camden. The resumption of the ferry—which took many years of hard lobbying on the part of local residents, backed by Hollis' powerful voice—meant the prospect of a better life for many.

Madam Speaker, I join all of Wilcox County—and everyone else who was privileged to call Hollis a friend—in expressing my deepest sympathies to his wife, Glenda, their children, Mark and Julie, and their grandchildren. Thank you for sharing this extraordinary person with us for all these years. You all are in our prayers.

ACADEMY NOMINEES FOR 2010  
11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT  
NEW JERSEY

## HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 2010

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Madam Speaker, every year, more high school seniors from the 11th Congressional District trade in varsity jackets for Navy pea coats, Air Force flight suits, and Army brass buckles than most other districts in the country. But this is nothing new—our area has repeatedly sent an above average portion of its sons and daughters to the nation's military academies for decades.

This fact should not come as a surprise. The educational excellence of area schools is well known and has long been a magnet for families looking for the best environment in which to raise their children. Our graduates are skilled not only in mathematics, science, and social studies, but also have solid backgrounds in sports, debate teams, and other extracurricular activities. This diverse upbringing makes military academy recruiters sit up and take note—indeed, many recruiters know our towns and schools by name.