

died fighting for his country. Are we to do less when we see people making the ultimate sacrifice? Are we to do less than at least ask for sacrifice by all Americans or are we going to continue to say: We will borrow money to continue to prosecute a war. We will send young men and women to risk their lives, but we will not pay for it. We will just add it to the debt. And when it comes time to answer the question—perhaps in a lameduck session at the end of this year—of who shall get the benefit of the extended tax cuts, we will also say—some would insist—that those who are fortunate enough to make \$1 million a year in net income in this country—quite a blessing, I would say—those who are fortunate enough to make \$1 million a year, we will say to them: You are fortunate enough to get another \$104,000 tax reduction, another tax cut. Why? Because a lot of people here believe that is the way you promote economic progress. Not to me. You promote economic progress by demonstrating to the American people that you understand the kind of choking nature this debt and deficit have on future opportunities and future economic growth in this country.

We all grew up at a time when we almost always understood just viscerally—we didn't have to be told—that our children would have it better than we have it. We grew up in a time when it was almost inevitable and we didn't need to be told that we were the biggest, the strongest, the best; we could beat anybody in the world at almost anything with one hand tied behind our back. But it has changed. It has changed. Now this country needs some good decisions, some tough decisions, some decisions to do the right thing.

The question on these talk shows this weekend was, Will you compromise? The better question is, Will you do the right thing for a change? We all know—this country knows—you can't fight a war for 9 years and not pay for any of the costs of it and add it to the Federal debt, and deficit every single year. We know better than that. That is not the way you run a country, it is not the way you share sacrifice, and it is not the way you honor soldiers. You go to war, and we will charge the cost for blood and death. That is not the way to honor those who fight for our country.

Let me mention one final point. It is interesting to me that unless you believe all tax cuts that were enacted in 2001 and 2003 should now be extended in this circumstance, you are a "liberal." So apparently the conservative approach is to borrow money and extend the tax cuts, add \$1 trillion to the Federal debt in order to extend tax cuts for those earning over \$250,000 a year or more. It doesn't seem to me as though that is a conservative approach; it seems to me that is a liberal approach if you want to add \$1 trillion to the Federal debt in order to accomplish that.

I wish no one had to pay any taxes. Wouldn't that be wonderful? Sign me up to say that I wish no one had to pay taxes. But the cost of this country's governance, the building of roads, the schools, yes, the Defense Department, the payment for soldiers and weapons and so on to protect this country—all of that needs to be paid for.

I hope those who decide to affix labels to various positions might well understand that to borrow a substantial portion of money to provide tax cuts when the country is up to its neck in debt is not a conservative position. It just is not. And to suggest we have fewer extensions of tax cuts for the upper income people so that we don't borrow money to add to the Federal debt, that is not a liberal position. It just is not.

FAIR TRADE

Let me also mention one final point. It is the case this weekend, again, with the chattering class, that they describe President Obama's trip to South Korea as something less than a success because there was not a trade agreement negotiated and completed with South Korea. Well, that wasn't the President's fault. The fact is, the South Koreans were not willing to budge on the significant issue that divides our country and South Korea on international trade, and that is the bilateral trade on automobiles. I won't give a lot of statistics except to say this: 99 percent of the cars driven on the streets of South Korea are made in that country. Is that an accident? It is not an accident. That is exactly what they want in South Korea. Ninety-nine percent of the cars they drive on their roads are made there because they want South Korean jobs to make cars driving on their highways. South Korea ships us, depending on the year, anywhere between 600,000 and 800,000 cars a year that they make in their country to sell in our country. We are only allowed to sell about 6,000 cars a year in South Korea. Let me say that again: 600,000 to 800,000 cars being shipped this way and 6,000 cars from the United States being shipped to South Korea. That is exactly what the South Korean Government wants—jobs there, not here.

Well, you know what, the President should not have—and I applaud him for being unwilling to negotiate a trade agreement that is so fundamentally at odds with the issue of having jobs in this country. This country needs jobs. We are terribly short of jobs. We shouldn't be negotiating trade agreements that would fritter away those jobs. We at least ought to require fair trade agreements with countries such as South Korea—at least fair trade—and that has not been the case. So the President ought not be criticized for not bringing home a bad trade agreement. He was not willing to negotiate a bad trade agreement. Good for him. Everyone in this country who needs a job ought to stand up and say: Good for him. Good for standing up for this country's interests. No, it is not being

protectionist to insist that if your products are open to our market, then you open your market to our products. That is called fair and reciprocal trade. If other countries don't want to do that, then they have to understand that there are consequences to that.

The President has not failed at all on this issue. When and if the South Korean Government decides it wants fair trade and reciprocal trade opportunities on bilateral automobile trade, I expect we will have a trade agreement. Until that time, I applaud the President for deciding not to sign a bad trade agreement. I want the President to negotiate trade agreements that lift this country up and say to people who are now jobless—and there are millions of them—that, I am fighting for your jobs. It is not protectionist to fight for and demand fair trade and reciprocal trading procedures with our trading partners.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UPCOMING CLOTURE VOTES

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the day after tomorrow, on Wednesday, we are going to have three cloture votes. These cloture motions were filed before we broke in October. Those will be the first three votes of our returning this fall. Those three cloture votes are, of course, motions to proceed—a motion to proceed on an energy bill, a motion to proceed on the paycheck fairness bill, and a motion to proceed on the food safety bill.

Mr. President, the food safety bill came out of my committee, the HELP Committee, on November 18 of last year. We have been working for a year to get this up. It has strong bipartisan support. We tried to get it up before we broke in October, but there were objections on the Republican side, and we were not able to move forward even though we had been working—Senator ENZI and I—on this along with Senators GREGG and BURR on the Republican side, and Senator DURBIN, I, and others on the Democratic side to work it out. I believe we are there.

This bill has strong support from the consumer groups, from the business and industry groups, and it has strong bipartisan support. I hope we will be able to get a successful vote on the motion to proceed to that bill. I will have more to say about that later in the week, on Wednesday specifically.

Today I wish to confine my remarks to the other two cloture votes, the Energy bill and the one on the Paycheck

Fairness Act. On November 9, a bipartisan group of us from the Senate—four of us—sent a letter to the majority leader, Senator REID, about this bill, the Energy bill. We are going to be voting on the motion to proceed to this bill on Wednesday.

Basically, what this letter—which is bipartisan—said to Leader REID was that we need to move forward on energy legislation. We all recognize that. But there is a major omission in this bill. What is missing from the bill is any mention of biofuels and what biofuels can contribute to our energy independence in this country.

At the outset, first of all, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, November 9, 2010.

HARRY REID,
Senate Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID: Achieving a transition to cleaner, more secure, and more sustainable energy systems is one of the public policy imperatives of our generation. We cannot afford to continue to send billions of dollars every year to unstable oil producing countries, nor to spend additional billions protecting those investments. We also cannot continue to ignore the rising global temperatures, changing climates, and health effects that are direct results of the annual emissions of billions of tons of greenhouse gases and air pollutants from fossil fuel combustion.

There is also broad recognition that promotion of energy efficiency and alternative fuels and energy systems offer one of our clearest and most promising avenues for significant job creation and economic development. Indeed, we are seeing increasing calls for domestic development of renewable fuels and technologies, both for their export potential and to avoid our eventual import of those same technologies if we fall behind in their development.

We are heartened that you have filed cloture on energy legislation because it provides an opportunity for a full debate about our nation's energy future, and we would like to work with you to craft legislation that can obtain broad bipartisan support. To that end, we urge you to include in that legislation a number of broadly supported programs and policies addressing some of our most immediate and obvious energy challenges.

One of our most pressing energy issues is our continued dependence on imported petroleum for fueling our transportation systems. On this issue, we are encouraged by the progress that is being made by vehicle efficiency gains and by the increasing contributions from domestic biofuels. However, we are also deeply concerned that continued expansion of biofuels is being constrained by marketplace limitations. Quite simply, we need more vehicles that can utilize high percentages of ethanol and other biofuels, we need to develop pipelines to transport these fuels from their production sites to the largest markets, and we need to ensure that these high renewable content fuels are available at filling stations across the country. We therefore urge you to include biofuels market expansion provisions addressing these barriers in energy legislation considered by the Senate.

We also urge consideration of legislation to extend the Volumetric Ethanol Excise

Tax Credit (VEETC) beyond its current expiration date of December 31, 2010. Letting this key support policy lapse in the coming year could cause a precipitous drop in biofuels production, threatening thousands of good-paying green jobs as well as putting pressure on gasoline prices and supplies. While we believe that the VEETC program deserves review in the context of broader discussions about how best to address the most important limitations facing biofuels, it is very important to not let this support program lapse while those discussions take place.

The enactment of these policies will enable as much as a 5-fold increase in biofuels' displacement of oil-based fuel use in transportation within the next 2 decades—generating energy resource production and refining jobs all across America, improving our international balance of payments, and lessening our dependence on imports from unstable regions of the World.

TOM HARKIN.

CHRISTOPHER BOND.

TIM JOHNSON.

AMY KLOBUCHAR.

Mr. HARKIN. Again, what is missing is biofuels. While I will certainly vote for the motion to proceed because I think we should proceed to it, major changes need to be made in this bill before it can earn my support on final passage. Let me talk about what those changes are.

First of all, I think it is very clear that we have to wean ourselves off of spending more and more of our taxpayers' dollars, consumer dollars, on imported oil. I think President Bush said that, and President Obama has said that, and it is not a partisan issue. It is a national security issue dealing very much with our economic security in this country. What is missing from the bill is a focus—any focus at all—on the one thing that over the last, say, 20 years has decreased our dependence on foreign oil; that is, the use of biofuels for transportation.

Again, there have been a lot of alternatives proposed: natural gas, hydrogen, electric vehicles—all of which will be pursued in the future. But, quite frankly, the only thing right now and in the foreseeable future, the next 10, 15 years that will do anything to decrease our dependence on foreign oil is biofuels.

There has been a remarkable success story with biofuels in this country. This chart shows what we have done—it shows production increasing from 1998 up until about 2010. We had a huge increase in the use of biofuels, so we are up to about 11 billion or 12 billion gallons a year. Under the renewable fuels standard 2—the mandate we passed in 2007—that is projected to go up to 36 billion gallons of biofuels by 2022. That is in the law—36 billion gallons by 2022. So, again, this is what is going to replace imported oil. We are well on our way to doing that. However, right now biofuels are facing significant market limitations. Well, first of all, about the only thing that can be used is 10 percent ethanol blends with gasoline—E10—although the EPA just recently came out with a new standard where we will be able to use E15—or 15 percent ethanol—in model cars 2007 and

higher. It is thought that maybe sometime next year EPA will come out with another standard that will allow as much as 20 percent ethanol.

These are all well and good, but, again, there are a couple of things that need to be done. First of all, let's keep in mind that converting to use of biofuels is much quicker and much easier, much more cost effective than using natural gas. For example, to use E85 or any other blend of biofuels at a pump just takes a different kind of pump. But you, as the driver of the car, would simply drive up, pick up the handle, put the fuel in your gas tank, just as you put in gasoline today. But for natural gas, there would have to be a big pressurized storage tank. That natural gas would have to then be transferred to your vehicle tank, a very strong tank in your car, and there would have to be some kind of nozzle to transfer that pressurized fuel. It wouldn't just be putting gasoline in a vehicle. So a whole new infrastructure would have to be built to accomplish this. But no new infrastructure needs to be built to put biofuels in your car. So it is much easier and much more rapid.

Now, a couple of things I have already said about the infrastructure, but let me talk a little about two things. The first is the ethanol tax credit. Right now it is at 45 cents a gallon. There is a lot of talk that when it expires this year it shouldn't be renewed because it costs \$5.9 billion a year for this tax credit for ethanol. You might say: Maybe we shouldn't be spending that. Well, studies by McKinsey and others show that ethanol reduces gasoline prices—estimates vary, but conservative estimate is 17 cents a gallon. So that savings of 17 cents a gallon saves consumers in America \$24 billion a year—\$24 billion a year. So it is not a net cost to taxpayers but a real savings of four to five times as much as the cost in the tax credit.

Secondly, on jobs. Everyone is talking about jobs. We have to have more jobs in this country. Well, each 1 billion gallons of biofuels generates anywhere from 10,000 to 20,000 jobs—a broad range. So if we go from 13 billion gallons today to 36 billion gallons in 2022, that would generate over 400,000 permanent jobs—400,000 permanent jobs. That is not to mention the number of construction jobs that would be needed during the building of the facilities.

Now, two other things about market problems. Right now, we have a problem in terms of the number of cars that can be flex-fuel. Every car that General Motors makes in Brazil is flexible fuel. Every car Ford makes in Brazil is flexible fuel. Every car Honda makes in Brazil is flexible fuel. They can burn anything from gasoline to 85 percent ethanol—E85. So why aren't they doing it here? The cost is minimal.

The second thing is to get blender pumps—pumps at gas stations—that

can take ethanol and blend with gasoline at any mixture you want and then can be put in that flex-fuel car. So we need two things: We need more flex-fuel cars, and we need more blender pumps. Very low cost, very easy to install.

Senator LUGAR and I have repeatedly introduced legislation to accomplish this, and that ought to be a real part of this Energy bill we are bringing up a motion to proceed to on Wednesday.

Lastly, let me get to the issue of net energy. This is a red herring that comes up all the time. People say it takes more energy to produce ethanol than we get out of it. We have been hearing this for about 30 years, and it is simply not true. It is like the old Will Rogers saying: It is not what we don't know that hurts us, it is what we know that ain't so. And what we seem to know that isn't so is that it takes more energy to produce ethanol than we get out of it. That is factually incorrect.

Take gasoline for example. Think about gasoline in terms of net energy payback. For every unit of energy going in, how much do we get out? For gasoline, it is .813. In other words, we get less energy out of the gasoline than we have used to drill for the oil, pump the oil, transport the oil, refine the oil, get the gasoline, and pipe the gasoline. All that takes energy. That plus the energy in the resource means the net energy payback for gasoline is at about .813. For ethanol it is 1.42.

Now why is that? Why would we get almost half, again, as much as energy from a unit of ethanol than we put into it? Very simple. The energy that is in the biofuels comes from the Sun when it is growing, and that is free. That doesn't cost anything.

This figure also takes into account the energy used to make the fertilizer, the energy in the diesel fuel for the equipment, the energy used in harvesting, and the energy in conversion and transportation. That is all figured into this, and we still get 1.42 units of energy for every unit of energy going into ethanol.

Now, that is just the ethanol. We know when we take the ethanol out of certain biofuels—say corn—there is something called distillers dried grain left over which we can feed to the livestock. If we take that into account, and allocate some of the input energy to those byproducts, then we get over two times the energy output for every unit of energy we put into ethanol. But I will not go there. I am just talking about using the ethanol that we would put into a car where we would get a net payback. So, again, we have heard for the last 30 years about how ethanol takes more energy than we get out of it, and that just isn't so.

So, as I say, Mr. President, on Wednesday, the motion to proceed to the Energy bill, that is fine. I am going to support that. But I want to make it clear there have to be major changes in the bill before I can support it, and one

of the major changes is that we need to make sure we have a strong biofuels section in that bill.

The second issue that is coming up on Wednesday that I want to discuss is the Paycheck Fairness Act. Again, this is something I and a lot of others have been working on for a long time. I say the real leaders on this have been Senator MIKULSKI and Senator DODD. They have led the charge on this for a long time.

In 1963 we passed the Equal Pay Act, which said a woman had to be paid the same as a man for the same job. In other words, if you had the same job, same job description, you couldn't have any pay differential. That went into effect in 1963. However, all of these years later, right now, a woman earns 77 cents on the dollar compared to what the man makes. There is a differential even if we talk about different jobs. And why is that? Well, it is because, quite frankly, this wage gap between men and women basically has been ignored lately, and we have built in a kind of infrastructure that lends itself to women being sort of shortchanged. Studies done by the Academy of Management Perspectives in 2007 tried to explain the difference as to why women are making only 77 cents on the dollar compared to what a man makes.

Race accounts for 2.4 percent—that is interesting—whether they were a member of a union—organized labor—experience, and then the industry category or what industry you were in might explain the difference. For example, the construction industry would be more heavily dominated by men than women. Then the occupational category—the occupational category itself. I have always said truckdrivers tend to be men not women. So the occupational category, that explains a lot of the differential.

The point is that 41.1 percent was unexplained. It could not explain why there was a difference between what a woman makes and what a man makes. What is the difference? Well, quite frankly, the difference is the gender. The gender gap is what it is. No other thing, nothing else explains it other than that.

The other thing we have to understand is that today two-thirds of mothers are major contributors to the family income. Almost 40 percent are the primary breadwinners. Think about that: 4 out of 10 mothers are the primary breadwinners for their families, and 24 percent are cobreadwinners. In other words, the husband and wife are both working together. About 36 or 37 percent are other factors. In other words, they may be a third or something like that because of maybe part-time work or other things.

The fact is, that is not what Congress intended when we passed the Fair Pay Act back in 1963. We wanted to close that gap. Yet 47 years later we still have this gap. So the Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen the penalties for discrimination. It would give

women the tools they need to identify and confront unfair treatment. It would fund education programs designed for women and girls to support and empower them. It would increase training, research, and education to help the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission respond to wage discrimination claims more effectively.

Again, these are steps that are meant to make the Equal Pay Act of 1963 more meaningful. We had a lot of bills in the past on civil rights, but it wasn't until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that we actually put teeth in it and made those previous laws something that meant something. So, Mr. President, we can't afford to kick the can down the road any longer on the Paycheck Fairness Act.

On the heels of the Paycheck Fairness Act is what I call the Fair Pay Act. I have been introducing this bill every year since 1996. In every session of Congress since 1996 I have introduced the bill. It is basically to understand the gap that occurs—this gap here—in this occupational category. You see, there are a lot of women who work at jobs that require as much education and training as a man's job, but it is in a different category.

For example, millions of female-dominated jobs—such as social workers, Head Start teachers, childcare workers, nurses, nurse assistants, long-term care assistants in our long-term care facilities—are equivalent in skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions to similar jobs dominated by men, but they pay a lot less. Again, this is inexcusable, and that is why I have introduced this Fair Pay Act in every session of Congress since 1996.

The Fair Pay Act would require companies to publish their job categories and their pay scales. It wouldn't require a company to say what each person is getting paid, it would just say they have to publish their pay scales and their job categories. That way people would know what their contemporaries are making, or at least a range of what they are making.

I asked Lilly Ledbetter when she appeared before our committee a couple of years ago if the Fair Pay Act had been in existence when she was discriminated against would she have been in a better position. She said yes; she would have known then that she was being unfairly paid less than what her contemporaries were. So, again, that is why we have to move ahead on the Fair Pay Act. We can't forget that there are millions of women who work very hard—they care for our elderly, they care for our kids, they teach our kids, in many cases they are daycare workers, nurse assistants, and they do extremely important work. What would we do without them? But because they are categorized as women's jobs, they are paid a lot less. For example, take the difference between a truckdriver and a nurse. They both require about the same amount of skills, education and training and physical

ability—about the same amount. Yet a truck driver is making much more than a nurse makes. Why is that?

We tend to think of truckdrivers as big burly men but, you know, with power steering and power brakes and some other machinery, it does not require a lot of muscular effort anymore. But a nurse, who has to turn patients over—that requires physical effort also. That is one example of the disparity we have in our society.

We have to end this categorization that certain jobs are women's jobs and therefore we can pay them less. I dare say a truckdriver is an important part of our society. You make no bones about it. But so is a long-term care assistant taking care of our grandparents, or someone on an Alzheimer's unit, or a person who is taking care of our kids in the dawn of their life when they are in daycare centers. They do important work, vitally important work. They should not be discriminated against any longer.

I hope we will move forward on these two bills. As I said, the third bill is the food safety bill. I am hoping we will move forward on that also and that we can finish that bill by the end of the week. We reported this bill unanimously out of our HELP Committee November 18 of last year. There was not one "no" vote against it. Frankly, I daresay if we can bring the bill out on the floor—I am just wagering—I bet we get 90 votes. But there is a small group on the Republican side that is basically filibustering the bill. I am hopeful in good faith, working with Senator ENZI, Senator BURR, Senator GREGG, and others on our side, we can break this logjam and we can get the food safety bill through this week. It is so vitally important. As I said, it has broad bipartisan support. We worked hard to keep it that way. We have industry support and consumer groups support. Certainly it is vitally important to the health and safety of our country.

Our food safety laws have not been upgraded in 30 years. Think about the changes that have taken place in the way we grow food and ship food and prepare it compared to what it was 30 years ago.

Again, I am hopeful we will be able to bring that up and pass it, not only the motion to proceed but the bill itself, sometime this week. I will have more to say about that.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, are we in morning business presently?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are in morning business. The Senator is authorized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARGARET BURROUGHS AND BISHOP ARTHUR BRAZIER

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, every day we walk the hallowed Halls of the

U.S. Capitol, a building filled with statues, busts, and paintings honoring great Americans—Lincoln, Washington, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., names we will never forget because they are the individuals who built and altered the foundation of this country.

But we must also never forget to recognize those Americans who may not appear in our history books but whose contributions have helped write our American story, great Americans like Dr. Margaret Burroughs who became a legend in her own time.

Dr. Margaret Burroughs is a true American treasure—an artist, advocate, poet, and progressive. She celebrated her 93rd birthday this month and today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her.

Born in Louisiana before women could vote, Dr. Burroughs moved to the south side of Chicago when she was five, eventually studying at both Englewood High School and Chicago State University.

Politically active from an early age, Dr. Burroughs and classmate Gwendolyn Brooks joined the NAACP Youth Council, and her ambitions only grew from there.

She taught art at DuSable High School for 23 years, and taught humanities at Kennedy King College for over a decade.

For most, a 30-year career teaching thousands of students would be enough. But for Dr. Burroughs, her life in education was just one part of her story. This extraordinary woman always opened her doors to friends and colleagues. Her coach-house flat became a social center, which many called "little Bohemia."

She worked tirelessly to establish the South Side Community Art Center, opening in 1940. And she nursed her growing interest in the arts by studying at the Art Institute of Chicago where she earned her master's of fine arts in 1948.

An established painter and printmaker in her own right, Dr. Burroughs began exhibitions in 1949, showing her work all over the United States and abroad.

She was generous enough to gift several of her works to my daughter, and several more adorn the walls of my Home and Senate offices in Chicago.

When she founded the DuSable Museum of African-American History in 1961, Dr. Burroughs established herself as one of the outstanding institution builders of her generation.

Once again, Dr. Burroughs created a place for people to come together. The museum that began on the ground floor of her Chicago home is now located in Washington Park and has become an internationally recognized resource for African-American art.

Dr. Burroughs served as a director of the museum she founded until her appointment as a commissioner of the Chicago Park District in 1985.

She has always been committed to the progressive cause, and she has been

a prolific writer over the long course of her rich lifetime.

Dr. Burroughs contributed to "Freedomways," a publication founded by W.E.B. Du Bois and Paul Robeson, both heroes of hers. She served as art director for the Negro Hall of Fame. She has illustrated a number of children's books. She is an accomplished poet, with poems that triumph African and African-American culture. And she served as an early and often lonely pioneer of black awareness, her writings provided a beacon of hope for a younger generation.

Her paintings, poems and prints alone make Dr. Margaret Burroughs an important part of American history.

But her desire to pass knowledge, hope, and inspiration to future generations means Dr. Burroughs will also be a significant part of the fabric of our nation.

Tens of thousands of African Americans have been touched by her art, taught in her classrooms, motivated by her words, and inspired by the institutions she helped create.

In her 1968 poem, "What Shall I Tell My Children Who Are Black?," she writes about how we can encourage future generations of African Americans.

And as she celebrates 93 years on this Earth, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking her for her service. We know that her life's work will long be remembered by future generations: an extraordinary life of an educator, an artist, a poet, and an inspiration.

Likewise, I would like to present a eulogy for a second great American.

Many towering figures of American history have walked these halls, leaving their legacy written across our shared history. And one American whose life and work have made a deep and indelible mark on this Nation is Bishop Arthur Brazier, who passed just last month after a lifetime of leadership.

Those who knew the Bishop personally called him "one of our nations great moral lights," "a stalwart of the city of Chicago," "father, leader, and friend."

Bishop Brazier was born and raised on the South Side. After just 1 year at Phillips High School, he dropped out to find work and was promptly drafted into the army where he served as a staff sergeant in India and Myanmar, then known as Burma. Discharged in 1945, he returned to Chicago where he met his future wife.

At the age of 26, Brazier was baptized. He took a job as a mail carrier but felt a deep urge to preach. So he began studying at night at the Moody Bible Institute, a place at which my wife served as a professor, and in 1952 became pastor of the Universal Church of Christ.

Eight years later, he merged his congregation with that of the Apostolic Church of God in Woodlawn where he was the pastor for more than 48 years—building a congregation of over 20,000 members.