better to be complete than quick because we want to make sure, when the request comes in, that it involves everybody, that it involves all the claims, that they are properly documented. That has been our experience before. So that is my report to the people of middle Tennessee. I want them to know I care about it, that I am on the phone about it, we have staff members on site, and I believe the Governor and the mayor and the Federal and State emergency agencies are doing all they can and we can hope for the best as the Cumberland River crests, we hope sooner rather than later.

I yield the floor, and 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. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL SCOTT THOELE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to congratulate Scott Thoele (''Taylee'') of the Illinois Army National Guard on his promotion to brigadier general.

General Thoele, as a colonel, led the Illinois Army National Guard during its deployment last year to Afghanistan.

He commanded the 33rd Infantry Brigade Combat Team, whose soldiers served in that country from August 2008 to September 2009. The mobilization of his soldiers was the Illinois Guard's largest since World War Two.

Most of these men and women are civilian-soldiers from cities and towns across Illinois. They have their own lives separate from service in our Armed Forces.

Most do not serve full time in the Guard. In the midst of living their lives—working at their jobs, spending time with their families, and participating in their communities—they have made a patriotic commitment to their country.

They have said, if my Nation needs me to serve and to fight abroad, I will answer the call.

And last year, 3,000 soldiers from Illinois left their jobs, their families, and their communities to serve at the call of their Nation.

General Thoele is one of those soldiers. He lives in Quincy, IL, with his wife and four children. In his civilian life, he works at First Bankers Trust Company in the bank's audit department.

This was a difficult deployment for the Illinois Army National Guard. They spent the year in Afghanistan in austere conditions. Their main task was to train and mentor the Afghan National Security Forces, in an effort to help the Afghans take responsibility for their own safety and security. They also provided security to the provincial reconstruction teams across Afghanistan. Eighteen Illinois soldiers lost their lives in service to their country. Dozens more were badly injured.

A long time ago, before he became President, there was a young captain from Illinois who answered the call when his State needed men to fight in the Black-Hawk war of 1832. He gathered 400 volunteers from the Sangamon County State militia and traveled north to Prophetstown, IL, marching through miles of what author Carl Sandburg described as ''swamp muck and wilderness brush . . . pushing and pulling when horses and wagons bogged.''

It was also a difficult war—as all wars are. Sandburg wrote that to the men under the young captain, ''it didn't seem the kind of war they had expected and they wrote home about it.'' But ultimately they did come home, while young Abraham Lincoln went on to reenlist—and to serve his Nation in many ways.

I offer my thanks to General Thoele, who also continues to serve his Nation, now as the Deputy Commanding General for the Army National Guard at the Army's Combined Arms Center in Kansas. Thank you for your work in Afghanistan and for bringing our soldiers home safely. And congratulations again on your promotion to brigadier general.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last Friday, I introduced S. 3295, the DISCLOSE Act, because Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections. I am joined by 40 of my Senate colleagues as cosponsors.

Decades ago, Justice Louis Brandeis boldly said, ''Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.'' That is exactly what this bill will do—shine a light on the flood of spending unleashed by the Citizens United decision.

The DISCLOSE Act will drill down and give the public the information they have a right to know. No longer will groups be able to live and spend in the shadows.

The Court spoke in the Citizens United decision. And while there is disagreement with its ruling, there is room to maneuver. This legislation does not circumvent the Court by reimposing a backdoor ban on corporate spending. Instead, the DISCLOSE Act closes certain loopholes and relies on enhanced disclosure, an idea endorsed by the Court. This legislation meets the test of constitutionality.

The aim of the DISCLOSE Act is simply to level the political playing field so that special interests do not drown out the voice of the average voter. It applies to corporations and advocacy organizations the same rules that candidates already have to abide by. And it applies these rules equally across the board. It covers corporations and labor unions alike, as well as 527s, social welfare organizations, and trade associations.

The DISCLOSE Act will do the following:

First, new disclaimers on all television advertisements funded by special interests will be required in order to uncover who is really behind the ad. If a corporation is running the ad, the CEO will have to appear to at the end to say that he or she approved the message, just like a candidate must do today. If an advocacy organization is running the ad, both the head of the organization running the ad, and the top outside funder of the ad, will have to appear on camera. Additionally, a list of the top five funders to that organization will be displayed on the screen. This will stop the funneling of big money through shadow groups in order to fund ads that are virtually anonymous. For the first time, the money can be followed back to its origin and the source of the money will be public.

Second, an unprecedented level of disclosure is mandated, not only of an organization's spending, but also of its donors. In disclosing their donors, organizations will have a choice—they can either disclose all of their donors that have given in excess $1,000, or they can disclose only those donors who contribute to the group's campaign-related activity account, if they solely use that account for their spending. All spending intended to influence an election—be it on television, radio, print, mailers, robocalls, and billboards—would flow through this account. And every donor who contributes more than $1,000 would have to be disclosed. Organizations must not only disclose these donors to the FEC, but also to the public on their Web sites and to their shareholders and members through their annual and quarterly reports.

Third, loopholes created by the Court's decision are closed. The first loophole is closed by preventing foreign-controlled entities from spending unlimited sums in our elections through their U.S.-based subsidiaries. This was a loophole specifically mentioned by Justice Stevens in his dissent. Foreign leaders who don't have American interests in mind shouldn't have the ability to influence our elections. The second loophole is closed by banning companies with government contracts in excess of $50,000 from making unlimited expenditures. The third loophole is closed by banning expenditures by companies that receive government assistance such as TARP. Taxpayer money should not be used to help corporations influence elections.

Finally, in an attempt to allow all candidates and parties to respond to ads funded by special interests, the current law granting lowest unit rate to candidates is expanded by giving those same rights to the parties on a limited geographic basis.

I ask my colleagues to join me in sponsoring and passing the DISCLOSE Act.

I ask unanimous consent that a section by section analysis of the DISCLOSE Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

TITLE I—REGULATION OF CERTAIN POLITICAL SPENDING

SEC. 101. BAN PAY-TO-PLAY

Prevent Government Contractors from Spending Money on Elections. Government contractors would be barred from making campaign-related expenditures, defined to include independent expenditures and electioneering communications. This is an extension of an existing ban on contributions made by government contractors. Before Citizens United, corporations could not make such campaign-related expenditures. A $50,000 contract threshold will be included to exempt small government contractors.

Prevent Corporate Beneficiaries of TARP from Spending Money on Elections. Corporations that received bailout funding from the federal government should not be permitted to use taxpayer money to influence elections. This section would prohibit bailout beneficiaries from making campaign-related expenditures. Once that money is repaid, however, the restrictions would be lifted.

SEC. 102. PREVENT FOREIGN INFLUENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS

While foreign nationals, including foreign corporations (those incorporated overseas), are banned from making contributions or expenditures to influence U.S. elections, the opinion in Citizens United created a loophole for spending by domestic corporations controlled by foreign nationals. To close the loophole, the legislation extends the existing prohibition on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to include domestic corporations under the following circumstances:

1. If a foreign national owns 20% or more of voting shares in the corporation, which is modeled after the control test in many states, including Delaware;

2. If a majority of the board of directors are foreign nationals;

3. If one or more foreign nationals have the power to direct, dictate, or control the decision-making of the U.S. subsidiary; or

4. If one or more foreign nationals have the power to direct, dictate, or control the activities with respect to federal, state or local elections.

SEC. 103. PREVENT ORGANIZATIONS FROM COORDINATING THEIR ACTIVITIES WITH CANDIDATES AND PARTIES

The legislation ensures that corporations and unions are not allowed to coordinate campaign-related expenditures with candidates and parties in violation of rules that require these expenditures to be independent.

Current FEC rules bar corporations and unions from coordinating with congressional candidates and parties about ads that refer to the candidate and are distributed within 90 days of a primary election or within 90 days of the general election. For Presidential contests, current FEC rules prohibit coordination on ads that reference a presidential candidate in the period beginning 120 days before a state's Presidential primary election and continuing in that state through the general election.

This legislation would do the following:

For House and Senate races, the legislation would ban coordination between a corporation or union and the candidate on ads referencing a Congressional candidate in the time period starting 90 days before the primary and continuing through the general election. For presidential campaigns, the legislation would ban coordination between a corporation or union and the candidate on ads referencing a Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate in the time period starting 120 days before the first presidential primary and continuing through the general election.

SEC. 104. POLITICAL PARTY COMMUNICATIONS

The legislation provides that any payment by a political party committee for the direct costs of an ad or other communication made on behalf of a candidate affiliated with the party is treated as a contribution to the candidate only if the communication is directed or controlled by the candidate.

Party-paid communications that are not directed or controlled by the candidate are not subject to limits on the party's contributions or expenditures.

TITLE II—PROMOTING EFFECTIVE DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED ACTIVITY

The legislation ensures that the public will have full and timely disclosure of campaign-related expenditures (both electioneering communications and public independent expenditures) made by covered organizations (corporations, unions, section 501(c)(4), (5), and (6) organizations and section 527 organizations).

The legislation imposes disclosure requirements that will mitigate the ability of spenders to mask their campaign-related activities through the use of intermediaries.

It also requires disclosure of both disbursements made by the covered organization and also the source of funds used for those disbursements.

SUBTITLE A—REPORTING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FEC

SEC. 201. INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES

The definition of an ''independent expenditure'' is expanded to include both express advocacy and the functional equivalent of express advocacy, consistent with Supreme Court precedent. Additionally, the section imposes a 24-hour reporting requirement for expenditures of $10,000 or more made more than 20 days before an election, and expenditures of $1,000 or more made within 20 days before an election.

SEC. 202. ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS

This section expands the definition of ''electioneering communications'' to include all broadcast ads that refer to a candidate within the period beginning 90 days before a primary election, until the date of the general election. Any such ''electioneering communication'' is subject to the disclosure requirements in the bill. The section also expands the reporting requirements for electioneering communications to include a statement as to whether the communication is intended to support or oppose a candidate, and if so, which candidate.

SUBTITLE B—EXPANDED REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCLOSURE

SEC. 211. IMPROVED DISBURSEMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The legislation would require corporations, labor unions, and section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organizations—as well as section 527 organizations—to report all donors who have given $1,000 or more to the organization during a 12-month period if the organization makes independent expenditures or electioneering communications in excess of $10,000.

If an organization makes a transfer of funds to another person for the purpose of making an independent expenditure or electioneering communication, the organization shall be treated as making an independent expenditure or electioneering communication. A person shall be deemed to have transferred funds for the purpose of making campaign-related expenditures if there have been substantial discussions about such expenditures between the person making the transfer and the person receiving the funds, if the person making the transfer or the person receiving the transfer knows (or should have known) of the intent to make campaign-related expenditures by the person making the transfer or if making the transfer or the person receiving the funds made a campaign-related expenditure in the last election cycle or the current cycle.

SEC. 212. DISCLOSURE OF GENERAL TREASURY FUNDS

If a donor to a covered organization specifies that his donation may not be used for campaign-related activity, the organization is restricted from using the donation for that purpose, and may not then disclose the identity of the donor. The organization's CEO must certify to the donor within 7 days that such funds will not be used for campaign-related activity.

If a covered organization makes a disbursement for campaign-related activity, the CEO must file a statement with the FEC certifying that the expenditure was not made in coordination with a candidate, that funds designated by the donor not to be used for campaign-related activity have not been used for any campaign-related activity, and that the spending has been fully disclosed and made in compliance with law.

SEC. 213. CREATION OF SEPARATE CAMPAIGN-RELATED ACTIVITY ACCOUNT

An organization can establish a separate ''Campaign-Related Activity'' account to receive and disburse political expenditures. If an organization makes campaign-related expenditures exclusively from its separate account, then it is only required to disclose only donors who have contributed $10,000 or more for unrestricted use or donors who have contributed $1,000 or more specifically for campaign-related activity.

SEC. 214. ENHANCE DISCLAIMERS TO IDENTIFY SPONSORS OF ADS

Require Leaders of Corporations, Unions, and Organizations to Identify that they are Behind Political Ads. If any covered organization (corporation, union, section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organization, or section 527 organization) spends on a political ad, the CEO or highest ranking official of that organization will be required to appear on camera to say that he or she ''approves this message,'' just like candidates have to do now.

In order to prevent ''Shadow Groups'', Require Top Donors To Appear in Political Ads They Funded. In order to prevent individuals and entities from funneling money through shell groups in order to mask their activities, the legislation will include the following requirements:

The top funder of the advertisement must also record a stand-by-your-ad disclaimer.

The top five donors of non-restricted funds to an organization that purchases campaign-related TV advertising will be listed on the screen at the end of the advertisement. This has been used very successfully in Washington State and is the model for this section in the legislation.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTERED LOBBYISTS

SEC. 221. REQUIRING REGISTRANTS TO REPORT INFORMATION ON INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES AND ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS

In an effort to add to the transparency of lobbying activities, all registrants under the Lobbying Disclosure Act must disclose the

following information on their semiannual reports: the date and amount of each independent expenditure or electioneering communication of $1,000 or more, and the name of each candidate referred to or supported or opposed.

SUBTITLE D—FILING BY SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

SEC. 231. FILING BY SENATE CANDIDATES WITH THE COMMISSION

In addition to the increased disclosure and transparency placed on outside organizations, the legislation will incorporate language from the bipartisan S. 1858, which requires Senators to electronically file their campaign finance reports directly to the FEC.

TITLE III—DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED ACTIVITY TO MEMBERS & SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 301. ENHANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR DISCLOSURE OF POLITICAL EXPENDITURES TO SHAREHOLDERS AND MEMBERS OF COVERED ORGANIZATIONS

All campaign-related expenditures made by a corporation, union, section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organization, or section 527 organization must be disclosed on the organization's website with a clear link on the homepage within 24 hours of reporting such expenditures to the FEC. Additionally, all campaign-related expenditures made by a corporation, union, section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organization, or section 527 organization must be disclosed to shareholders and members of the organization in any financial reports provided on a periodic and/or annual basis to its shareholders or members.

TITLE IV—TELEVISION MEDIA RATES

SEC. 401. PROVIDE LOWEST UNIT RATE FOR CANDIDATES AND PARTIES

Current law allows for candidates to receive the lowest unit rate for airtime in order to get their message out over the airwaves.

If a covered organization (which includes corporations, unions, section 501(c)(4), (5), and (6) organizations, and section 527 organizations) spends $50,000 on airtime to run ads on broadcast, cable, or satellite television that support or oppose a candidate, then that candidate or political party committee is allowed to receive the lowest unit rate for that media market.

The broadcaster must also ensure that the candidate or political entity has ''reasonable access'' during nonpreemptible airtime.

TITLE V—OTHER PROVISIONS

This Title contains the judicial review, severability, and effective date sections.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to express my strong support for the Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, also called the DISCLOSE Act.

I want to thank Senator SCHUMER for his work on this important bill and say that I plan to support it every step of the way.

Before I discuss the merits of this legislation, I think it is important to provide some context.

This bill is a legislative response to a Supreme Court decision. In 2002 we passed the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. The law was bipartisan, widely supported, and we firmly believed it to be constitutional based on prior decisions of the Court.

In 2003, the Supreme Court upheld portions of the law in the case of McConnell v. Federal Election Commission.

But on January 21 of this year, the Roberts Court handed down a 5–4 decision striking down parts of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act.

That decision—Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission—flew in the face of nearly a century of congressional law. It also overturned two prior rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court. The overturned cases were McConnell v. Federal Election Commission, 2003, and Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce, 1990.

The case is not alone. It is part of a trend of decision after decision from the Roberts Court overturning prior precedents. I have real concern that this Court is going out of its way to rewrite and reinterpret prior law. Its decisions seem to favor corporate interests over the interests of the American people. We have heard talk of ''activist'' courts before and I fear that is exactly what we have today.

The Citizens United decision may be the most troubling one yet. This decision does not only impact one group of people or one area of the law—it affects the very way our elections and our democratic system are run.

The Court's decision in this case opened the door to unlimited corporate spending in federal elections. It held that the first amendment of the Constitution protects the rights of corporations, and protects their right to spend freely—in the millions or even the billions of dollars—on election ads to support or defeat their favored candidates.

This means that an oil company like ExxonMobil could spend any portion of its billions in profits to elect a candidate who will let them drill more, or to defeat a candidate who opposes their drilling plans.

It means that Xe Services, formerly known as Blackwater, and other defense contractors could spend unlimited sums toward the election of candidates who view their defense positions favorably.

And large banks like JPMorgan Chase would be free to use their corporate treasury funds to attack candidates who favor financial regulation.

This last example, of course, is a very real and present situation. The questions on the floor right now are of great importance—should the credit default swaps and derivative contracts that have wreaked havoc on our economy be regulated, and how? These are questions we need to answer with the interest of the American public and our economy in mind, not the possibility that JP Morgan could launch a multimillion dollar attack against us if we don't bow to their demands.

As Fred Wertheimer of Democracy 21 testified at a Rules Committee hearing, ''It would not take many examples of elections where multimillion corporate expenditures defeat a member of Congress before all members quickly learn the lesson, vote against the corporate interest at stake in a piece of legislation and you run the risk of being hit with a multimillion-dollar corporate ad campaign to defeat you.''

The Supreme Court's decision is based on constitutional law. They get the final word on the Constitution, and they have spoken. So our response unfortunately has to be made with one hand tied behind our back. The DISCLOSE Act is a powerful attempt to show the public the effect of this decision and to ensure that our election process will remain transparent.

Here is what the bill would do:

First, it would require new disclaimers so that the American public knows who is behind an ad they see on TV.

If a corporation runs an ad, the CEO must stand up and say that they approved the message. If an advocacy organization runs the ad, the head of the organization and the top outside funder must appear. The point is simple—if you are behind an ad, say so, and let the public know.

Second, the bill would impose new disclosure requirements.

Organizations will have to disclose all of their donors who have given over $1000 or who have contributed to their election spending accounts.

Let me give you an example from the National Law Journal of why these disclosure and disclaimer rules are important.

Last summer, an organization called America's Health Insurance Plans, or AHIP, collected between $10 and $20 million from major health insurance companies such as Aetna, Cigna, Kaiser Foundation, UnitedHealth Group, and Wellpoint. AHIP funneled these funds to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which set up two separate entities called the ''Campaign for Responsible Health Reform'' and ''Employers for a Healthy Economy.'' These two shell organizations then engaged in widespread advertising to oppose health reform. Although the health insurance companies were the primary funders of the ads, the American public had no way of knowing that by the time the ads appeared on TV.

The DISCLOSE Act will require disclaimers that name an ad's top funders and disclose where the money came from. I think this is important, and I believe it will be an important step forward in true voter education and transparency.

Third, the bill will prevent foreign-controlled entities from spending unlimited sums in American elections through their subsidiaries.

Under current law, foreign companies cannot directly contribute to candidates or air election ads, but their U.S.-based subsidiaries can and often do. According to the Washington Post, since 2007, U.S.-based subsidiaries of foreign corporations have contributed more than $20 million to Federal campaigns through political action committees.

The rules will prevent a corporation from making contributions or spending on election ads if a foreign national

owns 20 percent or more of its voting shares; a majority of the board of directors are foreign nationals; foreign nationals have the power to control the decision making of the subsidiary; or foreign nationals control election-related expenditures.

Fourth, the bill will prohibit any company with government contracts in excess of $50,000 and any company that receives TARP or similar government assistance funds, from making unlimited election expenditures.

The point here is simple—if your business relies on government contracts or government assistance for its revenues, you should not be in the business of trying to buy seats for your friends or take them away from your enemies.

Finally, the bill will expand current law to allow political parties the same ability as candidates to get television ad time at the ''lowest unit rate'' in certain situations and in certain geographical areas.

The Roberts Court's decision in Citizens United was, I believe, the wrong one. It protected corporations at the expense of drowning out individuals' free speech. It threatened to put democratic elections in the United States up for sale. And it will, I believe, lead to voters having less reliable information about candidates—not more.

The DISCLOSE Act cannot solve all of the problems created by the decision, but it is a critical step forward. The bill will ensure that the American public knows who is funding an ad when they see it on television, and it will close loopholes that could have otherwise allowed unlimited spending in our elections by foreign nationals and corporations receiving government assistance.

I believe it is essential that we pass this bill quickly, and I look forward to working with Senator SCHUMER and others to do so.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, each May, since 1978, we have honored the rich heritage and countless accomplishments of the many Asian Pacific Americans in our country. I am delighted to recognize Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and to pay tribute to the struggles and enormous contributions of Asian Pacific Americans to our Nation's history and culture.

May was chosen for Asian Pacific American Heritage Month to commemorate both the arrival of the first Japanese immigrants in 1843, and also the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad in 1869, which was constructed in large part by Chinese laborers.

''Lighting the Past, Present, and Future'' is the theme for this year's celebration of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. This phrase recognizes both the plight and extraordinary achievements of the Asian Pacific American community as they have forged ahead to become a successful and vital segment of American society.

Currently, Asian Pacific Americans constitute one of the fastest growing minority communities in the United States, and California is home to the greatest number of Asian Pacific Americans. There are over 15 million Asian Pacific Americans in the Nation, with more than 5 million living in California. In addition, there are thousands of Asian Pacific Americans currently serving in our Armed Forces, defending our country and securing freedom abroad.

With this wealth of diversity, our State is enriched by many famous ethnic enclaves such as San Francisco's Chinatown and Japantown, Westminster's Little Saigon, Los Angeles's Historic Filipinotown and Long Beach's Little Cambodia. As the Asian Pacific American community has grown, these historic neighborhoods have become vibrant centers of cultural exchange and learning.

The Asian Pacific American community has enthusiastically answered the call to public service, and as a result, we see more Asian Pacific Americans in government leadership. Throughout my career, I have worked with many extraordinary Asian Pacific American leaders, in particular Senators DANIEL INOUYE and DANIEL AKAKA of Hawaii, two longtime stalwarts of the Senate. Joining my colleagues this year in Congress was Representative JUDY CHU, the first Chinese American woman elected to the House of Representatives, becoming the 12th Asian Pacific American elected official currently serving in Congress. In addition, Dr. Steven Chu was appointed as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy, the first Asian Pacific American to hold the position. A new generation of leaders has emerged, who will no doubt continue to lead not only their community, but the Nation to new heights.

This past year has also meant many firsts for the Federal bench: two Asian Pacific American nominees, Ed Chen and Lucy Koh, for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, where there has never been an Asian Pacific American district judge; the confirmation of the first Chinese American woman to be a district court judge, Dolly Gee; and the confirmation of the first Vietnamese American district court judge, Jacqueline Nguyen. I recommended Magistrate Judge Chen and Judge Nguyen to President Barack Obama, as well as Professor Goodwin Liu for appointment to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, confident that their strong legal backgrounds and unique perspective will be valuable additions to the Federal courts.

As we celebrate the rich and diverse Asian and Pacific Islander cultures during this month, we are not only recognizing many notable achievements, but we are also reminded of the struggles and sacrifices endured to live and experience the American dream.

The Senate has worked on a number of major pieces of legislation this session, including the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which I proudly voted for and the President signed into law in March. In addition to providing health care to 2.3 million uninsured Asian Pacific Americans nationwide, the bill will provide subsidies to Asian Pacific American small businesses, close the Medicare ''doughnut hole'' for all Asian Pacific American seniors, and provide more resources and strong data collection provisions that will help address racial and ethnic health disparities. In a community where 52 percent of Asian Pacific Americans delay or forgo routine and preventative treatment due to the high cost of medical care and where cancer is the leading cause of death, access to quality medical care is vital.

This is a great beginning to health care reform and I look forward to continuing the work with my Federal medical insurance rate authority bill. My legislation would create a rate authority that would oversee premiums charged by the health insurance industry and provide a safeguard for Americans against soaring premium increases. Access to affordable medical care is a necessity of life that I will work hard to protect for all Americans.

In the Asian Pacific American community where about 60 percent of the population is foreign-born, immigration reform is a central and important issue. For example, although Asians and Pacific Islanders make up about 39 percent of all family sponsored immigrants, they represent nearly half the backlogs in family reunification visas. I recently cosigned a letter with Senator BARBARA BOXER to President Obama, urging his continued support for fixing our broken immigration system. As we address immigration reform, it is imperative that we support effective solutions and a commonsense approach that would keep families together, while improving the state of our economy.

At such an unprecedented moment in the Nation's history, there is no doubt that these are only two of the many challenges that the Asian Pacific American community will be faced with in the upcoming year. However, Asian Pacific Americans are a resilient people and their accomplishments this year alone are a testament of their remarkable spirit and important role in the history and culture of the United States.

I am proud to honor the tremendous strength, character, and courage of Asian Pacific Americans during Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and am confident that they will only continue to surpass these challenges and further add to the vibrancy of the American landscape.

REMEMBERING DR. RUSSELL ROSS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to recognize the passing of a