CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOND, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. COBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 452

Whereas, in 2003, Japan was the largest market for United States beef, with exports valued at $1,400,000,000;

Whereas, after the discovery of 1 Canadian-born cow infected with bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) disease in the State of Washington in December of 2003, Japan closed its market to United States beef, and still restricts access to a large number of safe United States beef products;

Whereas for years the Government of the United States has developed and implemented a multilayered system of interlocking safeguards to ensure the safety of United States beef, and after the 2003 discovery, the United States implemented further safeguards to ensure beef safety;

Whereas a 2006 study by the United States Department of Agriculture found that BSE was virtually nonexistent in the United States;

Whereas the internationally recognized standard-setting body, the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), has classified the United States as a controlled risk country for BSE, which means that United States beef is safe for export and consumption;

Whereas, from 2004 through 2009, United States beef exports to Japan averaged roughly $196,000,000, less than 15 percent of the amount the United States sold to Japan in 2003, causing significant losses for United States cattle producers; and

Whereas, while Japan remains an important ally and trading partner of the United States, this unscientific trade restriction is not consistent with fair trade practices, nor with United States treatment of Japanese imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is not in the interest of either the United States or Japan to arbitrarily restrict market access for their close partners;

(2) trade between the United States and Japan should be conducted with mutual respect and based on sound science;

(3) since banning United States beef in December 2003, Japan has not treated United States beef producers fairly;

(4) both Japan and the United States should comply with guidelines based on sound science;

(5) Japan should immediately expand market access for United States exporters of both bone-in and boneless beef beyond the existing standard of beef from cattle 20 months and younger; and

(6) the President should insist on increased access for United States exporters of beef and beef products to the market in Japan.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I rise to offer a resolution supporting increased access for U.S. beef and beef products to the country of Japan. Let me step back and set the stage for this resolution.

On December 23, 2003, one cow was discovered in the United States with BSE, the disease sometimes referred to in a kind of slang way as ''mad cow disease.'' Even though that animal was actually born in Canada, the reaction of our trading partners around the world was swift and devastating. Almost immediately, Japan and other countries closed their markets to U.S. beef. Virtually with the snap of a finger, we lost over 90 percent of our export market. It just disappeared. At the time, Japan was the largest export market for U.S. beef. It had a value to our producers of $1.4 billion.

We began work to address BSE in this country dating all the way back to 1988, when the Department of Agriculture established a BSE committee to make recommendations on appropriate regulatory controls. Our government has developed and implemented a multilayered system of interlocking safeguards to ensure the safety of American beef. After the 2003 BSE discovery, we added even more safeguards. These efforts by our government, in coordination with U.S. cattle producers, have paid off. A 2006 study by USDA found that BSE was virtually nonexistent among the 40 million adult cattle in our country. Again in 2007, the World Organization for Animal Health, the internationally recognized standard-setting body, also known as OIE, classified the United States as a ''controlled risk'' country for BSE. This classification simply means that because of the expansive system of safeguards that are in place, U.S. beef is safe for export and for consumption.

Interestingly enough, that is the identical classification the OIE gave to Japan just last year. So as Japan asked their trading partners to treat them fairly under OIE standards, we are asking them to reopen their market for our beef.

Seven years have passed. We have proven, time and again, the effectiveness of our safety system. The Japanese still restrict most U.S. beef products. Japan's actions are not consistent with fair trading practices, nor with the U.S. treatment of Japan's imports. That is why I agreed to meet last week with the Japanese Ambassador to discuss this matter. I asked the Ambassador: What would happen if the United States said it doesn't want any more car parts from Japan until they can assure us that there are absolutely no defects? That is essentially what it has done to our beef industry. If we in the United States said we would never do anything in response to the current Toyota situation that they have not already done to us, that would not be a good deal for Japan when it comes to exports. Their treatment of our beef has cost our Nation's beef industry billions of dollars and has been economically devastating to States such as mine, the State of Nebraska. If we treated their products the same way, it would be equally as devastating to Japan because we are a major importer of Japanese goods. Over the last 6 years, the United States has purchased, on average, over $132 billion in Japanese goods annually. In 2009 alone, even in the midst of a global economic downturn, the United States purchased $95.9 billion of products from Japan. Cars led the way. We purchased $31.5 billion in vehicles and parts. Beyond that, we bought $19.5 billion in nuclear reactors, machinery, and parts. Just over $15 billion worth of electronics we bought from Japan, another $5 billion in optic, photo, medical or surgical instruments, and dozens and dozens of other products that add up to another $25 billion.

I wish to make something clear. I am not advocating that the United States close its borders to Japan's products. Japan is a valued friend. But what I do say I say directly and with the resolution: Sanctions on our beef do not represent the act of a friend nor that of a fair trading partner. There is simply no scientific justification for their restrictions, none whatsoever, a point my friends from Japan cannot deny. Quite honestly, Japan's standard of accepting only beef from cattle aged 20 months and younger was pulled out of thin air. It is nothing more than an economic sanction.

I have been dealing with this issue for nearly 7 years, first as the Governor of Nebraska, then as our Agriculture Secretary, and now as a Senator. My confirmation hearing before this body to become Secretary of Agriculture was dominated by one topic: Opening Japan's borders to our beef.

I come forward to offer this sense-of-the-Senate resolution. The resolution does not say we want to keep Japanese products out of the United States. It is in the interest of neither the United States nor Japan to arbitrarily restrict market access for friends and close partners. We are both with Japan. Trade between the United States and Japan should be conducted with mutual respect and based on sound science, something we haven't seen from Japan in this area in the last 7 years. My resolution does say that both Japan and the United States should comply with science-based standards. It also states the Obama administration should insist on increased access for U.S. beef and beef products to Japan.

Very simply, it is time for fair treatment from our friends in Japan. I will continue to press this issue. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting a resolution that basically says trade should be fair.

SENATE RESOLUTION 453—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ''NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK''

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 453

Whereas the week of April 5 through 11, 2010, is ''National Public Health Week'';

Whereas the theme of ''National Public Health Week'' is ''A Healthier America: One Community at a Time'';

Whereas the United States spends more on health care than any other country in the world, but an estimated 47,000,000 people in the United States do not have health insurance and millions more do not have access to life-saving clinical preventive services;

Whereas millions of people in the United States do not have access to cost-effective, community-based preventive services;

Whereas many of the illnesses that are caused by tobacco use, poor diet, physical inactivity, and alcohol consumption are potentially preventable;

Whereas many neighborhoods lack access to safe walkways and bikeways, are inaccessible by public transportation, and are too far from offices, schools, health providers, and grocery stores to walk;

Whereas studies have shown that 10,500,000 cases of infectious disease and 33,000 deaths can be prevented in the United States by the standard childhood immunization series;

Whereas public health professionals and lawmakers are working to enact a health reform bill that emphasizes prevention and supports a strong public health infrastructure, despite challenges; and

Whereas a change in individual communities will improve the health of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of ''National Public Health Week'';

(2) recognizes the efforts of public health professionals, the Federal Government, States, municipalities, local communities, and individuals in improving the health of the people of the United States;

(3) recognizes the role of public health programs in preventing disease, promoting good health, protecting the food supply, protecting worker health and safety, ensuring access to clean air and water, promoting nutrition for children, and achieving the many other benefits of public health programs that promote the health of the people of the United States;

(4) encourages efforts to increase access to both clinical and community-based preventive services and to strengthen the public health system of the United States to improve the health of the people of the United States;

(5) encourages community planners to consider the health implications of planning decisions and to plan communities and transportation systems that enable all residents to access safe, affordable housing, nutritious foods, clean air and water, public transportation, safe sidewalks, safe streets, and public health services; and

(6) encourages each person in the United States to learn about the role of public health programs in improving the health of the people of the United States.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, I rise to ask the U.S. Senate to resolve that April 5th–11th be known as National Public Health Week 2010. I submit this resolution along with my colleagues Senators AKAKA, BEGICH, SHERROD BROWN, BURRIS, DURBIN, MENENDEZ, TESTER, WYDEN, and BERKLEY.

Since 1995, we have recognized the first week in April as National Public Health Week in order to help focus the efforts of hundreds of thousands of public health professionals and organizations to educate the public, policymakers, and practitioners about the importance of public health.

This year's theme is ''A Healthier America: One Community at a Time.'' This is especially timely since I hope that we sill soon pass comprehensive health care reform and because for the first time, the next generation is not expected to be healthier that the previous one. This is also consistent with the First Lady Michelle Obama's efforts to reduce child obesity.

Our Nation's health is in poor shape. Despite spending more money on health care than any other country, more than 47 million Americans still do not have health insurance, nearly 900,000 people die from deaths that can be prevented each year, and we lag far behind the rest of the developed world in preventing obesity, HIV/AIDS infections, and many other diseases.

During this week, public health workers across the country will be focusing on how to more fully and effectively achieve a healthier Nation. They will be addressing the underlying social and economic conditions that encourage individuals and communities to be healthy, as well as shifting us from a Nation solely focused on treating individual illness to one that also promotes population-based health services that encourage preventive and early intervention practices.

For example, public health and prevention strategies from the foundation for health system reform. Community-level intervention has more positive health impact on people than individual interventions alone. Population-based programs address main causes of disease, disability and health disparities for a wide range of people and can help achieve increased value for our health dollar.

During National Public Health Week, Americans will be asked to champion public health by making healthy changes—big and small—in their families, individual neighborhoods, workplaces and schools.

I wish to thank the American Public Health Association for leading this effort and the National Association of County and City Health Officials, Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, and Partnership for Prevention for endorsing this recognition, and helping us highlight the importance of strengthening our public health system and encouraging Americans to value public health and take part in preventing disease and building healthier communities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3466. Mr. KAUFMAN (for Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2194, to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran.

SA 3467. Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, to impose an additional tax on bonuses received from certain TARP recipients; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3468. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3469. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3470. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BROWN, of Ohio, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra.

SA 3471. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3472. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3473. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3474. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3475. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BAYH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3476. Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3477. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3478. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3479. Mr. NELSON, of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3480. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. NELSON, of Florida) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3481. Mrs. HUTCHISON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3482. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3483. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3484. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3485. Mr. SPECTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3452 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER to the bill H.R. 1586, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3486. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to