

besides marijuana. And according to the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, 55 percent of teens say that it is easy to get prescription drugs from their parents' medicine cabinets. We also know that up to 17 percent of all prescription drug medication goes unused each year.

This bill is an important step towards getting unused, unwanted or expired medication off families' shelves and into the hands of proper authorities. The bill makes it possible for State and local law enforcement "take-back" programs to accept controlled substances as well, which is something that is currently very difficult for them to do. I introduced this legislation because I believe we have to give families a better option than either leaving dangerous medication in their homes or flushing such medication into the water supply.

Parents know that keeping unwanted prescription drugs in their homes increases the risk that young people will find them, but current law provides them with few alternatives. By making it easier for people to dispose of controlled substances they no longer need, we can reduce teens' access to these drugs and help curb teen drug abuse. This bill amends the Controlled Substances Act to allow the Attorney General to draft regulations permitting authorized entities to accept and dispose of controlled substances. These regulations will enable state, local, and private entities to operate drug take-back programs for all prescription drugs, while taking the necessary steps to prevent unlawful diversion and promote safe disposal.

Senator CORNYN recounts with great specificity the provisions of this bill that were added after consultation with many of our House colleagues and their staffs. I want to mention those members whose contributions to this bill have improved it greatly: Representatives HENRY WAXMAN, JOE BARTON, JAY INSLEE, BART STUPAK, and LAMAR SMITH. I am grateful to their offices for working with us to get this bill to a place where it could obtain the unanimous support of the U.S. Senate, and I second Senator CORNYN's comments about the specific contributions of each of those individuals and their offices.

The provisions that we added after collaboration with House offices, along with the bill's "no cost" estimate from the Congressional Budget Office, are among the many reasons the bill enjoys the support of 41 State attorneys general, the Department of Justice, and the National Association of Chain Drug Stores. They also prove that this bill is bicameral in its design, as well as bipartisan.

I want to thank all of my colleagues again for their support.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise to thank and congratulate my colleagues for passing the Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act by unanimous consent. I am proud to have worked close-

ly with Senator KLOBUCHAR to draft and introduce the bill, and I thank her and her chief counsel, Paige Herwig, for their ideas and advocacy of commonsense drug disposal solutions.

The Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act will make a cost-free change to the Controlled Substances Act to permit State and private entities to accept unused controlled substances through drug take-back programs. As the Senate unanimously recognized, the Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act is necessary because up to 17 percent of prescribed medication goes unused every year.

State, local, and private entities already have established drug take-back programs to keep some of this unwanted medication away from children and drug abusers. But the Federal Controlled Substances Act, CSA, currently prevents these drug take-back programs from accepting the most dangerous medications—controlled substances. The CSA particularly prohibits people prescribed controlled substances from giving them to any person or entity without express permission from the Drug Enforcement Administration. As a result, individual consumers and long-term care facilities now either stockpile unwanted controlled substances or dispose of them in improper ways, such as flushing them into the water supply. This can lead to drug diversion or water pollution.

Diverted prescription drugs contributed to a 114-percent increase in overdose deaths involving prescription opioids between 2001 and 2005, and the number of treatment admissions for prescription opioids increased 74 percent from 2002 to 2006. Troublingly, over one-third of new prescription drug abusers are teenagers, who now abuse prescription drugs more than any controlled substance except marijuana.

This bill will fix the problems of unwanted prescription drug stockpiling and improper disposal by amending the CSA to allow the Attorney General to draft regulations permitting authorized entities to accept and dispose of controlled substances. These regulations will enable state, local, and private entities to operate drug take-back programs for all prescription drugs in a safe and effective manner consistent with diversion controls.

In discussing how the bill will allow drug take-back programs to accept unwanted controlled substances, I want to highlight certain provisions we added to the bill after collaborating with House colleagues and their staff. First, in authorizing new drug disposal regulations, the bill makes clear that "the Attorney General shall take into consideration the public health and safety, as well as the ease and cost of program implementation and participation by various communities." Representative JAY INSLEE, who has been a strong advocate for drug disposal programs, suggested this important provision. It ensures that the planned drug disposal regulations will give States

and private entities wide latitude to design the most effective take-back programs for their communities. This includes considering the differences between rural and urban communities.

Second, the bill notes that the Attorney General's regulations "may not require any entity to establish or operate a delivery or disposal program." Representative JOE BARTON, along with other members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, proposed this language to clarify that no State, town, or business will have to run a drug take-back program unless they want to do so. This provision is a welcomed change from the type of unfunded mandates we so often see in Federal laws.

Third, the bill allows long-term care facilities to dispose of their residents' medications, and it permits "any person lawfully entitled to dispose of [a] decedent's property" to deliver the decedent's unused medication for disposal. These common-sense provisions were advanced by Representatives BART STUPAK, HENRY WAXMAN, LAMAR SMITH, and other House members. They address the specific concerns of long-term care facilities and the practical worries of anyone who loses a loved one.

These collected provisions, along with the bill's "no cost" estimate from the Congressional Budget Office, are among the many reasons the bill enjoys the support of 41 State attorneys general, the Department of Justice, and the National Association of Chain Drug Stores. They also prove that this bill is bicameral in its design, as well as bipartisan.

By passing this bill, we have taken a major step toward getting unwanted prescription drugs out of medicine cabinets and off our streets. We have given State, local, and private groups more authority to serve their communities, and we have done so in a cost-free manner.

I believe the Secure and Responsible Drug Disposal Act exemplifies the type of bipartisan legislation Congress should look to pass. I thank my colleagues again for supporting it unanimously, and I look forward to it becoming law.

#### 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I celebrate and honor the venerable life, not of a person, but of the most important and successful domestic program in our Nation's history. On August 14, Social Security will turn 75.

In a special Message to Congress in June 1934, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt stated the promise of Social Security, saying:

If, as our Constitution tells us, our Federal Government was established among other things, to promote the general welfare, it is our plain duty to provide for that security upon which welfare depends.

President Roosevelt outlined his intention to "undertake the great task of

furthering the security of the citizen and his family through social insurance." Executive Order 6757 created the committee on Economic Security, putting his plan into action. The committee included 5 Cabinet-level officials and 21 government experts from several Federal agencies.

At the committee's 25th birthday celebration, Francis Perkins, who was Secretary of Labor and member of the Committee on Economic Security, recounted the work of that committee. And she remembered an embarrassing oversight in the rush to create it—the committee had not been funded. But that was not going to stop its members. Relying on a small personal loan from one committee member, the committee hired unemployed stenographers and typists and recruited professionals and experts to help out. They sent a telegram that stated:

We have no money. We can pay your railroad fare and your expenses if you really need expenses while you are in Washington, but there is no salary.

The response was huge. A team of great minds converged on Washington, DC, in the heat of August, long before air conditioning. They worked tirelessly. And about 6 months later, in early January 1935, they presented their committee report to the President. He, in turn, brought it to Congress.

Congress heard the call. Or perhaps Congress heard the voices of its constituents. Or perhaps Members of Congress carried with them the pictures of closed factories, desolate farms, and breadlines that weaved around city blocks. Unemployment topped 20 percent, and the homeless population was growing.

In a 1962 speech, Francis Perkins described the backdrop of the creation of Social Security:

People were so alarmed the specter of unemployment—of starvation, of hunger, of the wandering boys, of the broken homes, of the families separated while somebody went out to look for work—stalked everywhere. The unpaid rent, the eviction notices, the furniture and bedding on the sidewalk, the old lady weeping over it, the children crying, the father out looking for a truck to move their belongings himself to his sister's flat or some relative's already overcrowded tenement, or just sitting there bewilderedly waiting for some charity officer to come and move him somewhere. I saw goods stay on the sidewalk in front of the same house with the same children weeping on top of the blankets for 3 days before anybody came to relieve the situation!

Congress went to work. Committees held hearings, and a long list of individuals and groups, charities, hospitals, industries, actuaries, historians, and interested citizens testified. There were debates and arguments, compromises and drafts, more drafts and then more meetings and compromises. And then, 7 months later, on Wednesday, August 14, 1935, at about 3:30 in the afternoon, President Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law.

Upon the law's enactment, the President appointed a three-person Social

Security Board to run the new program. One of the Board's first daunting tasks was to register employers and workers by January 1, 1937, when workers would begin earning credits toward old-age insurance benefits. The Board contracted with the Post Office to distribute applications, and numbers were assigned in local post offices. Long before computers, typists created each card in typing centers and delivered it to Social Security's headquarters in Baltimore. Between November 1936 and June 1937, Social Security issued more than 30 million Social Security numbers through this manual process. By June 30, 1937, Social Security had established 151 field offices, and these field offices took over the task of assigning Social Security numbers.

Over the course of the next several decades, Social Security expanded to help more people secure themselves, as President Roosevelt said, "against the hazards and vicissitudes of life." In 1939, Congress broadened the program to include payments to dependents and survivors of retirees. In 1956, Congress created the disability program and later expanded the program to include benefits for dependents of disabled workers.

The Social Security Act of 1965 created a new social insurance program called Medicare that extended health coverage to almost all Americans aged 65 or older or receiving disability benefits.

In 1969, under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, Social Security began processing claims for disabled coal miners suffering from black lung disease and to their dependents or survivors.

Legislation passed in 1972 provided for automatic annual cost-of-living allowances and created the Supplemental Security Income program. SSI, funded from general revenues, provides a small benefit to people with limited income who have reached age 65 or are blind or disabled.

The Social Security Amendments of 1980 made many changes in the disability program. Most focused on various work incentive provisions for disability beneficiaries.

In the early 1980s, the Social Security program faced a financial crisis. President Ronald Reagan appointed the Greenspan Commission to study the issues and make recommendations on how to sustain Social Security. In 1983, Congress enacted comprehensive changes in Social Security coverage, financing, and benefit structure.

On December 17, 1999, President Bill Clinton signed the "Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act," which placed greater emphasis on assisting beneficiaries in efforts to return to work.

In 2003, Congress enacted the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act to give seniors extra help in paying for prescription medications.

Throughout the years, Congress passed amendments, added programs,

and addressed issues with Social Security. Presidents from both parties repeatedly acknowledged Social Security's importance.

President Richard Nixon said, "This Nation must not break faith with those Americans who have a right to expect that Social Security payments will protect them and their families."

A few years later, President Jimmy Carter said, "The Social Security program represents our commitment as a society to the belief that workers should not live in dread that a disability, death or old age could leave them or their families destitute."

Today, Social Security benefits are essential to the economic security of millions of Americans. An estimated 159 million workers, or about 94 percent of all workers, are covered under Social Security. Social Security is critical, as 52 percent of the workforce has no private pension coverage, and 31 percent has no savings set aside for retirement.

In 2009, nearly 51 million Americans received a total of \$672 billion in Social Security benefits. In Montana, 181,000 of our 975,000 residents or about 19 percent of all Montanans receive Social Security benefits. The payments were modest, with the average retiree receiving about \$14,000 annually. The average monthly benefit for a disabled beneficiary was about \$1,060.

Virginia Reno, vice president for Income Security from the National Academy of Social Insurance testified before the Subcommittee on Social Security: "If seniors had to count on only their income other than Social Security, almost one out of two would be living in poverty."

Social Security is anchored by a promise between generations. But its success has been due in large part to the vision and sincerity of its creators and the ongoing commitment of its stewards, the public trustees, Advisory Board members, Members of Congress and the approximately 70,000 employees who work for Social Security. As well, we owe a debt to the thousands of dedicated employees who have worked for Social Security since its inception. For those that have embodied the agency's mission, "to promote the economic security of the nation's people through compassionate and vigilant leadership in shaping and managing America's Social Security programs," we owe a big thank you.

Social Security's success was not built with the stroke of a pen. Social Security did not simply survive for 75 years. Rather, Social Security was built by embracing the promise of assisting people through life's hazards.

In a campaign speech in 1944, President Roosevelt said, "The future of America, like its past, must be made by deeds—not words." Social Security is the embodiment of many good deeds. In times of crisis, over and over again, Social Security has risen to the challenge.

Fifteen years ago, a bomb in Oklahoma City took the life of fifteen Social Security employees, one office volunteer, and 21 office visitors. Social Security employees across the country responded to help survivors and the families of victims. Employees from around the country converged on Oklahoma to assist taking claims, answering questions, and providing comfort to the hundreds of victims and their families.

Following the devastation of September 11, 2001, employees in the New York region immediately came to the assistance of families of those killed in the World Trade Center, at the Pentagon, and at the plane crash site in Pennsylvania, so that claims could be taken and paid as quickly as possible. Social Security allowed payment of survivors' claims with airline manifests or employer records rather than death certificates. Within days, Social Security launched a full-scale outreach effort to find families of victims and help them apply for benefits. A special Web page was set up. Public information spots aired on television. And Social Security contacted about 60 consulates to ensure that foreign survivors who might be eligible for benefits were reached.

By December 2001, Social Security had taken more than 5,000 disaster-related claims. Social Security set up Family Assistance Centers at Pier 94 in Manhattan and Liberty State Park in New Jersey. The New York Regional Commissioner continued to work with the Bureau of Vital Statistics to post death certificates for the survivors of victims whose bodies had not been recovered.

Social Security was also one of the first agencies at the Pentagon Family Assistance Center in Virginia offering assistance to victims and their families. In Pennsylvania, Social Security staff assisted family members of victims on applying for benefits.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Social Security moved quickly to ensure that monthly payments to beneficiaries continued uninterrupted. Immediate payment procedures allowed for on-the-spot payments if beneficiaries could not get their benefit check. Social Security opened a temporary office in the Houston Astrodome, and provided service 7 days a week. Social Security employees were on site at FEMA's Family Assistance Centers, and many offices offered extended hours of service through Labor Day weekend to help evacuees.

Just recently, in my home State of Montana, in the old city hall building next to the Libby Police Department in Lincoln County, eight employees from Social Security arrived. They quickly set up a processing center to assist the victims of the Environmental Protection Agency's first-ever public health emergency. The Social Security employees tirelessly answered questions and handled a steady stream of claims from applicants diagnosed with asbes-

tos-related disease. Social Security's work helping the good people in and around Libby Montana was deeply important to me.

Social Security has been described as the bedrock of our industrial society. It has been called the beacon of light for those on life's stormy seas. It has been called a pillar of our democracy. Social Security offers Americans peace of mind.

Social Security has lived up to its message. It has stood as a silent partner to those in need. It has done all this by sending about 99 percent of its annual budget back to the people as benefit payments. Only about 1 percent of Social Security's budget goes toward administrative expenses. The rest fulfills the promise of its mission.

Social Security can and should work for the next 75 years, and for generations beyond that. Now that Social Security is here, now that Social Security has proven itself, it is up to all of us to protect and maintain it. It is up to us to assure the millions of Americans that currently rely on Social Security and the millions more who pay into it that Social Security is a promise that we can and will keep.

In the words of Carl Sandburg, "In these times you have to be an optimist to open your eyes when you awake in the morning." Our optimism can be found in the accomplishments of Social Security. I celebrate its 75th birthday.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, next week our Nation celebrates the 75th anniversary of Social Security, a vital program that has provided comfort and security for millions of Americans through the years.

During my career in the Senate, I have fought to protect Social Security benefits for our Arkansas seniors. I believe in the promise our government made to working Americans—that if we work hard, Social Security will be there to help us in our golden years. Social Security has made a healthy and secure retirement possible for tens of millions of Americans, including my own mother.

Since its inception, Social Security has helped provide stability for Arkansans who otherwise may not have had an income at all.

When President Roosevelt signed Social Security into law on August 14, 1935, he said:

The civilization of the past hundred years, with its startling industrial changes, has tended more and more to make life insecure. Young people have come to wonder what would be their lot when they came to old age. The man with a job has wondered how long the job would last. This law, too, represents a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete. It is, in short, a law that will take care of human needs and at the same time provide the United States an economic structure of vastly greater soundness.

More than 600,000 Arkansans are enrolled in Social Security, and I am proud of my work on their behalf. Last year, I pushed for relief for Arkansas's beneficiaries who would not receive

cost-of-living adjustments because of the economy. I have consistently opposed attempts to privatize Social Security, and I do not support a reduction in Social Security's current guaranteed benefits.

I have met with Arkansans from all four corners of the State to hear their concerns about Social Security. I believe that providing adequate resources for the Social Security Administration is a crucial first step toward strengthening this vital program. As the baby boom generation enters retirement, we will be asking more of the Social Security Administration's services, and we must work to make certain the trust funds are well maintained.

As we commemorate the 75th anniversary of Social Security, I remain committed to protecting Social Security benefits for Arkansans and all Americans. I will continue to use my position as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Social Security to fight to ensure seniors receive the benefits they have earned and deserve.

#### ALCOHOL REGULATORY EFFECTIVENESS ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to bring the attention of the Senate to a recent joint resolution passed by the California State Legislature. This resolution, S.J. Res. 34, urges Congress to defeat the Comprehensive Alcohol Regulatory Effectiveness Act of 2010, H.R. 5034, a bill that would restrict legal challenges to unconstitutional alcohol regulation laws and negatively impact the American wine industry.

This bill is being described by its proponents as an effort to promote regulation of alcohol and protect the public from dangerous effects. What the bill does instead, however, is to erect new legal barriers which give preference to in-State beer, wine, and spirits wholesalers at the expense of free and open competition. With its broad sweep, the bill cedes Federal authority over licensing, labeling, advertising, taxation policy and other matters.

Under current Federal law, each and every State has authority to set its own law regarding the direct shipment of alcohol. A State can allow direct shipments to consumers, or a State can prohibit it. What a State cannot do, however, is to allow in-State producers to ship directly to consumers while barring out-of-State producers from doing so. This is a constitutional requirement, stated most recently in the case of *Granholm v. Heald*.

The House bill could not constitutionally alter this system. Instead, it would erect new legal barriers that would make it more difficult for out-of-State producers to enforce their rights to equal treatment under State laws.

I am very proud to say that my State of California is the fourth largest wine-producing region in the world. Our wine industry creates more than 330,000