

Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Improvement Act of 2010 that addresses the concerns outlined below.

Both the House version (H.R. 6430) and the Senate version (S. 3447) make welcome improvements to current law, such as expanding the benefits to troops serving in the Active Guard Reserve and to National Guard members who have honorably served their country on active duty, including at the sites of natural disasters. The bills also replace the complex state-by-state tuition and fee cap look-up chart with language that specifies that GI Bill benefits cover tuition and fees for veterans attending public institutions while establishing a single national tuition baseline for those who enroll in private institutions.

However, we believe that the House version is preferable in two very critical respects. First, S. 3447 contains a provision that would add a new source of confusion for veterans and prevent them from having a clear idea of the level of support to which they are entitled. This so-called "last-payer" provision, which withholds the GI Bill benefit until a calculation is made of any state and private tuition aid for which a veteran may be eligible, would not only confound veterans and delay the delivery of aid, but in some cases would conflict with state statutes. In contrast, H.R. 6430 does not include such a provision and will help end the frustration and confusion that far too many veterans have experienced in attempting to access their benefits.

Second, H.R. 6430 includes an important "hold harmless" provision, designed to protect veterans who might otherwise be negatively impacted by the establishment of a national baseline. In several states, veterans attending private institutions currently receive a base benefit that is greater than the new national baseline amount provided in either version of the legislation. By failing to include this "hold harmless" language, the Senate bill would reduce benefits for a number of veterans upon enrollment for a subsequent term. In contrast, the House bill would help ensure that veterans continue to receive their current benefits without interruption.

As this legislation nears passage, we strongly urge you to modify S. 3447 so that it reflects the approach taken by the House bill on these two important issues. Our campuses have worked very hard to smooth out the difficulties that veterans have faced under current law, and these improvements will enable them to serve veterans even more effectively.

Thank you for all of your work on behalf of the nation's veterans.

Sincerely,

MOLLY CORBETT BROAD,
President.

DOMESTIC MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE AND VICTIMS SUPPORT ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 21, 2010

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2925, the Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Deterrence and Victims Support Act.

It is fitting that as one of the last acts of this Congress which has done so much to aid the

most vulnerable in our society, we are considering legislation that would protect children from sex traffickers.

Tragically, this heinous crime is becoming more common with as many as 100,000 young people trafficked every year within our borders.

To address this heartbreaking trend, the legislation before us authorizes a comprehensive grant program to identify and assist victims and strengthens the National Crime Information Center, NCIC, database that enables law enforcement officials to track missing and exploited children.

These commonsense steps will make a real difference in the lives of thousands of kids who have experienced unimaginable ordeals.

S. 2925 mirrors House legislation authored by my colleagues Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY and Congressman CHRIS SMITH. I applaud their hard work on behalf of these forgotten young people and commend them for their leadership in devising smart solutions to fight the scourge of child prostitution in America.

The Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking Deterrence and Victims Support Act will significantly augment our efforts to help children traumatized by the worst kind of criminal act and I urge its swift passage.

In an era characterized by bitter partisanship, it is exceedingly gratifying for me that members of this body can still reach across the aisle and stand together in defense of children caught in perilous circumstances.

It is my sincere hope that next year we can come together in the same spirit of bipartisanship to help young people apprehended along our southern border.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEAN HELLER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. HELLER. Madam Speaker, on roll call No. 663, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, due to an illness, I was unable to be in Washington, DC, for votes on December 21, 2010 and December 22, 2010.

Had I been present for the votes on Tuesday, December 21, 2010, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote No. 662: I would have voted in favor of the Motion to Concur in the Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment on H.R. 3082, the Continuing Appropriations Act for 2011.

Had I been present for the votes on Wednesday, December 22, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote No. 663: I would have voted in favor of the Motion to Concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 847, the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALPHONSE R. TELESE JR. AND SPECIALIST JIM BATCHELOR

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, as we approach the close of the 111th Congress, it is important to remember our men and women in uniform around the world. These brave men and women sacrifice every day to ensure that United States citizens enjoy the freedom that we all cherish. We pay tribute as well to our wounded warriors and wish them a safe and happy holiday season.

One such hero is retired specialist Jim Batchelor who has served his country proudly for over three and a half years. During his tenure in the Army he has earned numerous awards and decorations, including the Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, expert badges in driving and marksmanship, good conduct medals, and Army Commendation medals. Not allowing his military injury to slow him down, he has finished his degree in criminal justice and is now pursuing a master in psychology to help his fellow soldiers returning from the war. He and his wife, Antoinette, live in Cooper Texas, and are expecting the birth of their first child.

Another hero who deserves tribute is retired Lieutenant Colonel Alphonse R. Telese Jr. Mr. Telese served in the U.S. Army for over 32 years before retiring in August of 2008. It was during his tour of duty in Iraq that he was permanently injured during a mortar attack. He has received numerous awards and decorations throughout his distinguished career. These include the Legion of Merit award, National Defense Medal, and the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, to name a few. Today, he and his wife Tierney reside in Frisco, Texas. Since his retirement, LTC Telese continues to support the military, volunteering his time and talents to the Dallas Summer Boat Show Tournament of Heroes Invitation Bass Fishing Tournament which provides a much deserved break for our military heroes.

As we adjourn today, let us do so in memory and in honor of those who answer the call to duty and to whom we owe a debt of gratitude that can never be paid.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 657, (H. Res. 1771), my flight was delayed due to weather and had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEAN HELLER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. HELLER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 657, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 660 and 661.

REFLECTIONS

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 22, 2010

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, when I was elected to Congress 28 years ago, it was the fulfillment of a life-long ambition. But I had never served in elective office before, and frankly, I wondered how well it would wear—all the back-slapping and glad-handing and garrulous talk.

My first revelation was to find that this House is not made up of back-slappers and glad-handers. It is made up of members who work hard to get here, many out of patriotic purpose, hoping that they in their time can contribute something worthy of this great country. Most of the members are extroverted and energetic, and have to be, to get elected every two years.

At Davidson College, my alma mater; at Oxford on scholarship; at Yale Law; in the Pentagon as a young analyst, and as a practicing lawyer, I made many good friends, but few as good as the friends I have made here. Of all the things I will miss, I will miss most the fellowship and camaraderie.

I first experienced Congress as a young Army officer in the Pentagon, working for the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) on defense contractors in financial distress, mainly Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. As staff at the Department of Defense, we did a lot of work that I thought staff at Congress should be doing, particularly if Congress hoped to be a co-equal branch. The greatest difference between Congress then, from '69 through '71, and Congress 12 years later, when I came here in 1983 as an elected member, was staff. Committee staff and members' staff both had grown greatly, in quality and quantity. As a result, today's Congress is better staffed and equipped, more effective and independent, and a lot closer to being co-equal.

I have had the good fortune of working with talented staff in my office and on the committees where I have served; and as I leave, I thank them all, because anything I have done of significance, I did with their good help.

My first quest in Congress was to get a good committee assignment. After two days of

bidding, I had struck at every option and never scored a hit. I was at a loss for where to go when Tony Coelho sought me out and offered me a seat on the House Armed Services Committee.

The HASC dove-tailed nicely with my district because the Fifth District includes Shaw Air Force Base. But as important as Shaw is, I learned that other members had defense interests far larger than mine. Since I was not carrying water for a large defense constituency, I had the independence to take on troubled systems, like the DIVAD, the Division Air Defense gun, which my amendment effectively killed; or the MX, which I voted to stop at 50 missiles, or binary chemical weapons, which my amendments helped side-track and eventually derail.

In selecting members for every committee, the leadership tries to match the member's interests at home with his committee in the House. That's natural and to be expected, but we should also select members for ballast—members free to act, ask hard questions, and offer amendments.

At the time I took my seat on Armed Services, the nation was engaged in the biggest defense build-up in our peace-time history, and the committee chairman presiding over this build-up was well past his prime. Elderly and weak, he could barely be heard over the din of noise in the committee room. When Les Aspin let it be known that he was going to run for the chair, and leap-frog six senior members, I was among the first to offer support. We prevailed, and over the next five years, Aspin allowed me to set up and chair two panels, the first on Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, and the second, on the nuclear weapons complex. Though both were important, neither was receiving the attention it deserved by the committee or any of its subcommittees, due to other issues or a lack of interest in these.

Because of our oversight, we were able to pare back the SDI budget; shift funds from strategic missile defense to theater missile defense, and wipe out a few far-fetched systems altogether. For example, my amendment deleted funding for the space-based interceptor. In the press release accompanying passage of the defense bill, the headline read: "House Takes the Star out of Star Wars." President Reagan did not find it amusing; he vetoed the defense bill, but after many years and billions of dollars, our cuts have stood the test of time.

After two years, we had to return SDI to the Research and Development Subcommittee, so we set up a new panel dealing with nuclear facilities. The Cold War had enabled our nuclear complex to put off environmental and safety issues. To deal with these problems, we shifted nearly a billion dollars from Defense to Energy, and saved over a billion dollars by stopping the Special Isotope Separator, a laser-driven process to produce plutonium, even though the Secretary of Energy acknowledged we were "awash in plutonium."

We scored a number of such successes, but the most satisfying took place largely off stage where we made the case for a moratorium on nuclear testing. We first helped Representative Kopetski draft a bill calling for an immediate cessation of testing, and we then drafted an alternative that we thought the Senate would pass allowing for a few final tests before declaring a moratorium. We proposed the alternative to Senators Exon and Hatfield,

who took up its support and moved it to passage through the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. This saved the moratorium from being vetoed because the super-collider was also in this bill, and President Bush wanted it to be funded.

Another satisfying measure: my substitute to the war powers resolution authorizing President Bush to use force against Iraq. This substitute authorized the force needed to search for weapons of mass destruction, but before going further, it called on the president to seek the sanction of the U.N. Security Council, as his father had done, and to come back to Congress with the case for a broader use of force, which would be received with a fast-track guaranty, an up-or-down vote in the House and Senate. My substitute did not prevail, but it drew 157 votes, and gave many members a position they could uphold.

I made my mark in the House on defense, but during most of my 28 years, my greatest concern was the budget and chronic deficits. In 1997, I was elected by the Democratic Caucus as ranking member of the Budget Committee. I ran against opposition and told the caucus that if I was elected, we would "finish the job" of balancing the budget that began with President Clinton's first budget. About the same time, Erskine Bowles returned to Washington to be the President's Chief of Staff, and when he paid me a courtesy call, he told me that he had the same understanding with the President. With the President's encouragement, the four budget principals in the House and Senate began meeting, and by May 1997 we had hammered out a balanced budget agreement which worked. By 1998, the budget was in balance for the first time in 30 years.

President Bush took office with an advantage few presidents have enjoyed, a budget in balance, in the black by \$236 billion the year before. I was invited to Austin, Texas with 12 other members to discuss defense issues with the incoming president. I used my time to encourage President Bush to apply the surplus in Social Security to buy outstanding Treasury debt, and reduce Treasury debt held by the public. This would increase net national saving, lower public debt, and be a long step toward making Social Security solvent. The president-elect professed interest but not for long, and by 2004, the deficit was over \$400 billion.

President George W. Bush was greeted as he took office by a surplus of \$200 billion. When he left office in 2009, the surplus was gone, and the deficit projected for that fiscal year was \$1.2 trillion.

As I leave Congress, the deficit is hovering around a trillion dollars and while improving, current deficits exceed the deficits of the mid-1990s by every measure. But the process of resolving both is basically the same: everything must be on the table and everyone must be at the table.

As the menu for such a meeting, the President's Fiscal Commission has submitted a plate full of recommendations. I served on the commission and voted for the report, even though I do not support all of its proposals. I cast an "aye" because our country is in desperate need of a plan for balancing the budget and making Social Security and Medicare solvent. These will not be popular—far from it—but as they shore up our economy, they will prove their worth and raise the standing of Congress in the eyes of our countrymen. I am