

the public can see them. He has brought this entire process further into the light of day, allowing constituents, the news media, and outside watchdog organizations to track how taxpayer dollars are spent.

But a funny thing has occurred. Some of our Republican friends who have used earmarks to serve their constituents for years suddenly have had a change of heart and jumped on the anti-earmark bandwagon. In fact, the Republican leader, who in the past brought home hundreds of millions of dollars to his State of Kentucky, has done an about-face in calling for an earmark ban.

The hypocrisy of these new earmark critics is outrageous. Here is what the critics never mention: Earmarks do not add one cent to the deficit, not a single cent. We heard that from our leader here, from Senator INOUE.

When Congress includes an earmark in an agency's budget, it is not increasing that budget. It is specifying how a portion of the funding should be spent based on their understanding of their State's needs. After hearing many requests all of us do, they can evaluate which ones they see as the most important. It is a voice of reason and understanding.

The fact is the Founding Fathers gave Congress the power of the purse when they wrote the Constitution. Directing funding to specific projects is one way Congress exercises this power.

If we eliminate earmarks, we will transfer our funding powers to the President, and that is not the way the Constitution is structured. It undermines the authority the Founders placed on us two centuries ago.

The people who work in the Federal agencies here in Washington include some of America's best and brightest, but they simply do not necessarily know the needs of our States as well as we do. This debate over earmarks is nothing more than a distraction from the pressing issues on which we should be focused.

I call on my colleagues to consider the facts and not the rhetoric. Do not be misled. Do not allow the truth to be mangled, misconstrued, and misrepresented. Earmarks help create jobs and help millions of Americans through their lives, especially now in this stressful period where we have people who are afraid they are going to lose their jobs after many years of loyal support or, still, lose their homes because they cannot afford the mortgages they were sold.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the Coburn amendment because it will not solve a single problem we face. I hope we will use our time for more constructive debate. I would suggest that everybody who talks in opposition to earmarks, congressionally designated programs, say now on this floor—take an oath that you will in your own State announce the fact you are opposing the earmarks that were proposed for it. Tell the people back home that you are

going to deny their right to accept these things because it is dirty, because it is unclear, and they say that it goes only to those who contribute large sums of money.

If you want to look at those who contribute large sums of money, look at that side of the aisle. They dwarf what we do in our debate about where funding goes and where funding stops.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. INHOFE. Let me ask if I could extend my time by 5 minutes. Is there objection?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, consistent with Senate Standing Orders and my policy of publishing in the RECORD a statement whenever I place a hold on legislation, I am announcing my intention to object to any unanimous consent request to proceed to S. 3804, the Combating Online Infringement and Counterfeits Act, COICA.

Promoting American innovation, and securing its protection, is vital to creating new, good-paying jobs. But it is important that the government reach an appropriate balance between protecting intellectual property and promoting innovation on the one hand and the freedom to innovate, share expression, and promote ideas over the Internet. I am concerned that the current version of COICA has this balance wrong; it attempts to protect intellectual property in the digital arena in a way that could trample free speech and stifle competition and important new innovations in the digital economy.

Of perhaps greater concern, the sweeping new powers offered to the U.S. Department of Justice under COICA are granted without giving due consideration to the consequences. COICA may not only be ineffective at combating copyright infringement and the distribution of counterfeit goods, it gives license to foreign regimes to further censor and filter online content to serve protectionist commercial motives and repressive political aims. Until these issues are thoroughly considered and properly addressed, I will object to a unanimous consent request to proceed to the legislation.

COMBATING MILITARY COUNTERFEITS ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a bill I recently introduced: S. 3941, the Combating Military Counterfeits Act of 2010. This bill will help protect America's Armed Forces from the risk of defective equipment by enhancing the ability of prosecutors to keep counterfeit goods out of the military supply chain.

The safety of our servicemembers and the success of their missions depend upon the proper performance of weapon systems, body armor, aircraft parts, and countless other mission-critical products. Unfortunately, America's military faces a significant and growing threat: the infiltration of the military supply chain by counterfeit products. These counterfeit products do not meet military standards, putting troops' lives at risk, compromising military readiness, and costing taxpayers millions in replacement costs. In the case of microelectronics, counterfeit parts also provide an avenue for cybersecurity threats to enter military systems, possibly enabling hackers to disable or track crucial national security applications.

Let me give you a few examples from a recent report by the Government Accountability Office:

The Defense Department discovered in testing that it had procured body armor that was misrepresented as being "Kevlar." Think about that: a criminal sold fake body armor to the military, putting our troops' lives at risk just to make a buck. The law must provide strong deterrence and harsh sanctions for such conduct.

And in another example, a supplier sold the Defense Department a personal computer part that it falsely claimed was a \$7,000 circuit that met the specifications of a missile guidance system. As my colleagues may know, military grade chips are required to withstand extreme temperature, force, and vibration. Chips that don't meet those specifications are prone to fail—for example, when a jet is at high altitude, when a missile is launching, or when a GPS unit is out in the field. The possible tragic consequences of such equipment failing are unthinkable.

And the increasing number of counterfeits has broad ramifications for our national security. A January 2010 study by the Commerce Department, for example, quoted a Defense Department official as estimating that counterfeit aircraft parts were "leading to a 5 to 15 percent annual decrease in weapons systems reliability." And the risk is growing. The Commerce Department study, which surveyed military manufacturers, contractors, and distributors, reported approximately two and a half times as many incidents of counterfeit electronics in 2008 as in 2005. It is only going to get worse as the high prices of military grade products attract more and more counterfeits. Consider, for example, that before fleeing the country, the supplier that sold a counterfeit \$7,000 circuit for a missile guidance system had been paid \$3 million as part of contracts worth a total of \$8 million.

We should also evaluate this bill in the context of the relentless cyber attacks America weathers every day. The chip might not only be counterfeit, it might be the carrier for dangerous viruses and malware that may create

windows for enemies to enter to sabotage our military equipment to steal our military secrets.

I applaud those of my colleagues who have been working with the Department of Defense to ensure that it does everything it can to keep counterfeits out of its supply chain. And I am pleased the administration, and particularly the intellectual property enforcement coordinator, Victoria Espinel, is taking on this issue.

But I also believe that Congress needs to give the executive branch more tools to address these problems. As a former U.S. attorney, I know the significant deterrent effect criminal sanctions can provide. To that end, the Department of Justice has a vital role to play in using criminal investigations and prosecutions to identify and deter trafficking in counterfeit military goods.

Current law is insufficient. The existing counterfeit trafficking statute, 18 U.S.C. § 2320, provides for heightened penalties for trafficking in counterfeits that result in bodily injury or death. But unlike cases of counterfeit pharmaceuticals, it may not be possible to prove that a military counterfeit caused bodily injuries or death, since the faulty part may never be recovered from a battlefield. As a result, traffickers in military counterfeits are likely to face penalties that do not reflect the unacceptable risk that counterfeits impose on our troops, our military readiness, and our national and cyber security.

We must address this flaw in our laws and we must do so soon. Traffickers should face stiff penalties if they knowingly sell the military a piece of counterfeit body armor that could fail in combat, a counterfeit missile control system that could short-circuit at launch, or a counterfeit GPS that could fail on the battlefield.

The Combating Military Counterfeits Act of 2010 will make sure that such reprehensible criminals face appropriate criminal sanctions. It creates an enhanced offense for an individual who traffics in counterfeits and knows that the counterfeit product either is intended for military use or is identified as meeting military standards. It doubles the statutory maximum penalty for such offenses. The bill also directs the Sentencing Commission to update the Sentencing Guidelines as appropriate to reflect Congress's intent that trafficking in counterfeit military items be punished sufficiently to deter this reckless endangerment of our servicemembers and weakening of our national security.

The bill is narrowly crafted. It adds to an existing offense so that it only targets particularly malicious offenders—those who already are guilty of trafficking in counterfeit goods and know that the goods in question are intended for military use. As a result, this bill will not affect legitimate military contractors who might be unaware that a counterfeit chip has made

its way into one of their products. Nor will it apply to makers of products that unintentionally fall short of military specifications as a result of innocent mistakes. Indeed, this bill will help military suppliers by deterring criminals from selling counterfeits to them or to their subcontractors. Manufacturers will benefit from the protection of their intellectual property.

To that end, I have received a letter of support from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which explains that “[t]his legislation would . . . provide an important deterrent to those seeking to profit from the sale of counterfeit parts to the military.” The Semiconductor Industry Association has similarly weighed in with their support, explaining the irresponsible manner in which counterfeit chips are made and the harm that counterfeit chips, most of which are imported into the United States, can cause to the military and to their industry. I am grateful for their early support and I welcome the comments of other stakeholders as I work to make the legislation as effective as possible in its deterrence of this shameful criminal activity.

I of course also very much look forward to working with my colleagues on what I expect to be bipartisan legislation that we can act on promptly. We all have had the privilege of visiting with our troops. We all know the sacrifices they make for our country. We all want to do everything we can to ensure that their equipment functions properly and that counterfeits do not compromise our nation's military readiness or security. By deterring trafficking in counterfeit military goods, the Combating Military Counterfeits Act of 2010 is a vital and necessary step towards these important goals.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST DYLAN T. REID

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and heroic service of SPC Dylan T. Reid. Specialist Reid, who was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, in Fort Carson, CO, died on October 16, 2010. Specialist Reid was serving in support of Operation New Dawn in Amarah, Iraq. He was 24 years old.

A native of Missouri, Specialist Reid graduated from Desert Technology High School in Lake Havasu City, AZ, in 2005 and entered the Army in September 2008. He joined his current unit in April of last year and deployed to Iraq this past March. He was serving his first tour of duty, and quickly showed his commitment and skill.

During more than 2 years of service, Specialist Reid distinguished himself through his courage, dedication to duty, and willingness to take on any job. He was given numerous awards and medals, including the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Good Conduct Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Iraq Campaign Medal

with Campaign Star, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Army Service Ribbon, and the Overseas Service Ribbon.

Specialist Reid worked on the front lines of battle, serving in the most dangerous areas of Iraq. He is remembered by those who knew him as a consummate professional with an unending commitment to excellence. Friends and loved ones remember how proud Specialist Reid was of his new daughter, Avery. They also remember his love for fixing things and working on cars.

Mark Twain once said, “The fear of death follows from the fear of life. A man who lives fully is prepared to die at any time.” Specialist Reid's service was in keeping with this sentiment—by selflessly putting country first, he lived life to the fullest. He lived with a sense of the highest honorable purpose.

At substantial personal risk, he braved the chaos of combat zones throughout Iraq. And though his fate on the battlefield was uncertain, he pushed forward, protecting America's citizens, her safety, and the freedoms we hold dear. For his service and the lives he touched, Specialist Reid will forever be remembered as one of our country's bravest.

To Specialist Reid's parents, his wife, his daughter, and his entire family I cannot imagine the sorrow you must be feeling. I hope that, in time, the pain of your loss will be eased by your pride in Dylan's service and by your knowledge that his country will never forget him. We are humbled by his service and his sacrifice.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

EASTON, MARYLAND

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Eastern Shore town of Easton, MD, which is concluding its 300th anniversary celebration.

In 1710, the Assembly of the Province of Maryland chose Easton as the site for a new court house to serve the pre-Revolution population of sea merchants and farmers. Easton was incorporated as a town in Talbot County, MD, in 1790 and serves as the county seat.

Easton is located on the shore of the Tred Avon River that flows into the Chesapeake Bay. It was a bustling port for Eastern Shore agricultural products and seafood for much of its first 200 years. Many of the farms on the Eastern Shore of Maryland had slaves, and it was in Talbot County where Frederick Douglass, the abolitionist, was raised. Because of his national leadership in the abolitionist movement, a statue of Mr. Douglass will soon be erected on the court house lawn in Easton.

Easton remains a cultural and community center for merchants, lawyers, bankers, trades people, farmers, and watermen. Weekend visitors, sailors