

Mr. KAUFMAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO EVELYN LIEBERMAN, KAREN HUGHES, AND JAMES GLASSMAN

Mr. KAUFMAN. Madam President, this afternoon I will preside over a Foreign Relations Committee hearing on the future of U.S. public diplomacy. Never has public diplomacy been more important for promoting U.S. national security interests, especially in volatile regions and areas where we are engaged in counterinsurgency. In order to evaluate past achievements, successes, and challenges in public diplomacy, the committee invited three former Under Secretaries of State for Public Diplomacy to testify on the matter earlier today. Given their wide breadth of experience, they will share their views about lessons learned from their tenure and their recommendations on tools and future strategy.

The three former Under Secretaries who are participating—Evelyn Lieberman, Karen Hughes, and James Glassman—promise to provide incredibly useful insight, and I am grateful they are able to be here for the hearing today. Not only are they important voices on public diplomacy, they have also been dedicated public servants in both the Clinton and Bush administrations.

I wish to make a point here. They don't stay, as do the vast majority of the people we have talked about who have spent 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 years in the government. These people come from a different group. They are the group who come for a short period of time and bring incredible expertise and intelligence to the issues we face—expertise and intelligence, by the way, that we in the Federal Government could never afford to pay for. These three are perfect examples of that, and that is one of the reasons I wish to recognize them today.

During their years of service as Under Secretaries of State for Public Diplomacy, they oversaw our State Department's efforts to promote American foreign policies abroad using tools such as educational exchanges, public affairs and embassy outreach, international broadcasting, and the establishment of American corners or centers. They did this through communication with international audiences, cultural programming, academic grants, and international visitors programs. Public diplomacy programs such as the Fulbright Fellowship and Sports Envoy exchanges bring emerging leaders from foreign countries to

visit the United States, promoting a cross-cultural exchange and contributing to sharing an American perspective with the world.

Although these three officials come from different sides of the aisle, they each hold unique perspectives on American public policy, and all share—and I can say from firsthand experience they all share a love of country and dedication to service that called them to government service. I was honored to work with each of them in various capacities over the years, especially during my tenure on the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

Evelyn Lieberman is a native of New York and a graduate of State University of New York in Buffalo. She first entered government service in 1988 as press secretary to my predecessor, now Vice President JOE BIDEN. In those days I was serving as chief of staff, and I had the privilege to work with Evelyn early in her career. In 1993 Evelyn moved over to the White House where she served as Assistant to the First Lady, now Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton. Three years later, after serving also as Deputy White House Press Secretary, she was appointed Deputy Chief of Staff under Leon Panetta.

In 1997, President Clinton appointed her as director of Voice of America, and she served there for 2 years. During that time, I was a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees Voice of America programming, and I was fortunate to work closely with Evelyn once more.

In 1999, President Clinton nominated Evelyn to serve as the State Department's first Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, and she was confirmed by the Senate. He could not have picked a better person. What happened back then was, we took the Information Agency and split it into two pieces. The Broadcasting Board of Governors created an independent entity for that, and then we brought the rest into the State Department, and Evelyn was the one who got that started and got it started on the right foot. She stayed there until the Bush administration.

Since then, since 2002, Evelyn has continued a career in the Federal Government serving as the Director of Communications and Public Affairs for the Smithsonian Institution.

The second witness today is Karen Hughes, who was appointed by President Bush to this position after serving as Counselor in the White House from 2000 to 2002. A Texas native, she holds a bachelor's degree from Southern Methodist University. Before embarking on a career in politics, Karen worked in broadcast journalism for 7 years.

When she was appointed as Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy in 2005, Karen was given the rank of Ambassador to underscore the importance of public diplomacy as a central component of U.S. foreign policy. While she was there, Karen implemented impor-

tant changes including the creation of a rapid response unit in her bureau at the Department of State and many others.

Upon leaving State in 2007 to pursue work in the private sector, Karen told the BBC that her greatest achievement was "transforming public diplomacy and making it a national security priority, central to everything we do in government," which is the goal I believe continues to this day.

During her tenure as Under Secretary, she represented former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in meetings with the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and I had the opportunity to work with her on promoting a free press overseas.

I have worked with all three of these people. These are extraordinary public servants, Republicans and Democrats; people who have disagreements on many things but came to the government, took incredible financial sacrifice, and worked together to solve bipartisan problems that have put the public diplomacy effort in a positive light.

When Karen Hughes left the State Department, President Bush nominated James Glassman to take her place. James is a Harvard graduate and a prominent writer and journalist, to say the least. He was confirmed by the Senate in June 2008 as Under Secretary of Public Diplomacy. Jim has done a whole lot of things. He has held senior roles at a number of leading news organizations, including the New Republic, the Atlantic Monthly, and U.S. News and World Report. He is also a former owner and editor of Roll Call.

Before joining the Bush administration, Jim served as a fellow at the non-profit American Enterprise Institute for 12 years. In 2007, Bush nominated him to be chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and he served in that role until moving to the State Department several months later. As I said, I worked with Jim during my service on the board, and I saw firsthand his dedication to promoting American values and policies overseas.

Since the Bush administration left office, Jim has been working in the nonprofit sector, and he was recently selected to lead a new public policy institute at the George W. Bush Presidential Library.

Think about this: Here I am, a Democrat, and I can tell my colleagues there aren't three better people with whom I have worked in the whole world than Evelyn Lieberman, Karen Hughes, and Jim Glassman. They care. We have a lot of fights about a lot of things, but when it came to public service, these three individuals all did incredible work.

Political appointees make up an important constituency in our Federal Government. When a President requests their service, they often make real sacrifices to respond to that call, and I can tell you without a shadow of a doubt, these three made incredible

sacrifices, financial and personal, to answer the call of this country.

I hope my colleagues will join me in thanking Evelyn Lieberman, Karen Hughes, and James Glassman for answering the call to serve and for their work on behalf of the American people. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### RESPONDING TO THE ECONOMY

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, thank you very much. I appreciate the many times Senator KAUFMAN comes to the floor to celebrate what is working in Washington and the good work that is done by so many public officials, but also public employees in our Federal Government.

I rise this afternoon to talk about the recession, unemployment, job loss—all of those related topics—and in a very particular way to focus on the trauma, the suffering that a lot of Pennsylvanians and a lot of Americans are living through right now.

This has been and continues to be a horrific recession for the American people. When we are confronted with that kind of economic difficulty, we need to respond to it in very bold ways. I think we have over the last couple of years and even the last couple of weeks. I will talk about that today. But we do need bold action to put people back to work and to keep our economy moving in the right direction, as I think it is now, more than a year after the recovery bill was enacted.

In Pennsylvania, the unemployment situation is as follows: Our rate is at about 8.8 percent as of January. That is lower than a number of States of comparable size. But, unfortunately, the rate doesn't tell us much. It doesn't often reflect the true meaning or the true impact of unemployment. We have 560,000 people in Pennsylvania out of work through no fault of their own. I think it is also important to put this in the context of where we have been and where we are now, not only in Pennsylvania but across the country.

In late December of 2008, Congress took action to stave off the impending collapse of our Nation's financial system. Months later, the downturn required Congress to pass, as I mentioned before, the recovery bill known as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, known by the acronym ARRA. I tend to refer to it as the recovery bill.

These actions were at the time—meaning the legislative actions—unpopular but absolutely necessary. I said we have worked on job creation strategies and legislation more recently within the last couple of weeks. Our majority leader Senator REID has led us in that, and we are making progress. We have more to do.

First, let me go back in time a little bit to the fall of 2008. At that time I happened to be a member of the Banking Committee. We were given briefings at that time on how perilous our

financial system was; that we were on the edge of a cliff in terms of the collapse of our financial system and, therefore, the collapse of our economy. We passed legislation which included the Troubled Asset Relief Program, known by the acronym TARP.

I know as soon as I say it, it doesn't bring back positive recollections for people. It was not popular. Even the bill itself was not that popular—the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act—and part of that was the so called Troubled Asset Relief Program or TARP. But I think it is important to put the facts on the table about what has happened since that time.

The Troubled Asset Relief Program was, indeed, unpopular, but we should note that to date the Treasury Department has spent, invested, or loaned \$500 billion through TARP. To date, almost \$190 billion of the \$500 billion has been returned or paid to the Treasury Department. These actions helped steer the economy back from the brink and, by the program's conclusion, we expect all but \$100 billion of that \$500 billion to be repaid, which makes the Troubled Asset Relief Program significantly less expensive to taxpayers than earlier estimates. It met some of the predictions at the time by some of us that the money would be paid back. So that is good news. It is not enough, though, to report on good news.

We had to take other action. We took action when we passed the recovery bill in the early part of 2009. Just by way of example, Pennsylvania is on track to receive more than \$26 billion through the recovery bill, including billions in direct tax relief. We had 4.9 million Pennsylvanians who got tax relief as part of the recovery bill. Among, or part of, I should say, that more than \$26 billion, \$13.15 billion was in so-called formula-driven funding for health, education, infrastructure, job training, and other aid. It was a tremendous boost to the economy in Pennsylvania, not only creating jobs but preventing the erosion of our job creation strategies and preventing people from being laid off, including teachers in school districts, law enforcement officials, as well as in jump-starting the economy of Pennsylvania. We still have a ways to go. We still have basically another year of a jump-starting effect for the recovery bill.

Across the country, when we measure the impact of the recovery bill, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which is known by the acronym CBO—we hear about it all the time, but they are a referee in a sense in Washington, an arbiter of what the numbers mean. The CBO reported a few weeks ago that the Recovery Act added between 1 million and 2.1 million jobs by the fourth quarter of 2009. Again, impressive, halfway basically—or almost, I should say, halfway through the recovery bill's implementation at the end of 2009, 1 million to 2 million jobs. The CBO also said the Recovery Act raised economic growth by 1.5 percent

to 3.5 percent over that same period. So it has contributed to growth.

The CBO Director, Doug Elmendorf, said during a recent Joint Economic hearing:

[T]he policies that were enacted in the bill are increasing GDP and employment relative to what it otherwise would be.

So that is the CBO talking about the recovery bill as another way to measure. There are lots of ways to measure the impact and, I would argue, the success of it.

In January of 2009 the country lost 1.2 million jobs. Job loss, as of the most recent report for February, was a little more than 60,000 jobs, just about 62,000 jobs. So that reduction or diminution in the number of jobs lost from 1.5 million jobs to 62,000 jobs is, indeed, substantial progress but, again, it is not enough. We have to keep going. We have to keep putting in place strategies to create many more jobs.

The facts speak for themselves. More people are currently employed and more goods and services are being produced as a result of the Recovery Act. Put another way, if the Recovery Act had not been enacted, the economic situation would be much worse than it is today. That is an understatement, if we did not pass that legislation.

But we need to do more and move forward. We need to pass legislation to continue to create jobs. That is why I am standing today in support of passage of the American Workers, State, and Business Relief Act, the legislation we are now considering. This legislation contains vital policies that will support our workers and our businesses as we recover from the recent economic recession. The most important part of the legislation is the extension of unemployment insurance and COBRA health insurance through December 31 of this year.

The national unemployment rate is 9.7 percent. It is expected to remain at this level, unfortunately, through most of 2010. I mentioned earlier that in Pennsylvania it is about a point lower, 8.8 percent. There are 560,000 Pennsylvanians who are out of work. These numbers are far too high for us to in any way be satisfied with the positive impact the recovery bill has had and other measures we have taken.

We are about to pass and enact into law the HIRE Act—four provisions agreed to in a bipartisan way. We have to do more than that as well. Congress must continue to provide for comprehensive unemployment benefits and a subsidy to pay for COBRA health insurance for those who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. The eligibility for emergency unemployment compensation and COBRA premium assistance will expire at the end of March. According to our State's department of labor and industry, hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvania workers could lose unemployment benefits over the next several months without an extension.

An extension of federally funded unemployment compensation and the