prohibits the closure of the commissary and exchange programs at Naval Air Station Brunswick in my home State of Maine.

Unfortunately, before I was a Member of Congress, Naval Air Station Brunswick was selected for closure during the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure process. We are saddened to see the base close and so many active duty members, who have made Maine their home transfer to Jacksonville, Florida. However, a significant active duty population will remain whose mission still requires them to be stationed in the midcoast area. These units include Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, which is a field activity of Naval Sea Systems Command located in Bath, 1st Battalion, 25th Marines located in Topsham, and units of the Maine Army National Guard that will soon construct a joint reserve center at Naval Air Station Brunswick. Additionally, there are thousands of military retirees who depend on this fundamental part of their pay and benefits package.

Military families count on the commissary and exchange programs to deliver costs savings. Access to these programs is not a fringe benefit, but a critical part of the pay package we have promised the men and women who serve.

The fact that Brunswick has been selected for closure is no excuse for these men and women to go without the same programs their counterparts across the globe depend on. Many of the retirees in the midcoast Maine area relocated there after their service specifically for the commissary and exchange programs. We must honor the promises that we made to these individuals, and not abandon them now during these difficult economic times.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming weeks to pass this important legislation in the House.

ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH EAST END

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an institution in my hometown of Newport News. On Friday, May 28, 2010, Second Baptist Church East End will celebrate its 100th anniversary, and I would like to highlight some moments from the history of the church and its contribution to our community.

Second Baptist was organized during the first week of May, 1910, with Minnie Jones, A.B. Lucy, Rebecca Vaughan and Daniel Peters serving as charter members. The first worship service was held on the second Sunday in May 1910 at the Odd Fellows Hall in the 1100 block of 33rd Street, with Reverend J.E. Tynes serving as the guest speaker.

The church chose Reverend H.H. McLean as its first pastor. Under his leadership the church membership increased rapidly—a new church building was built in less than a year with the first worship service being celebrated Easter Sunday, April 16, 1911. Under Rev. McLean's leadership, many church organizations were founded that are still alive today, including the Choir, the Deacon Board, the Board of Trustees, the Sunday School, the Baptist Young People's Union and the Willing Workers Club.

Second Baptist has had eleven pastors throughout its history, including Rev. F.A. Brown, Rev. W.S. Sharp, Rev. A.A. Watts, Rev. O.B. Allen, Rev. John Tilley, Rev. L.A. Williams, Rev. E.D. Harrell, Rev. O.L. Simms, Rev. Preston T. Hayes, and Rev. Avery E. Miller.

Under Rev. Sharp, the church was able to pay off its mortgage. Under Rev. Watts, multiple improvements were made to the church including the furnishing of stained glass windows, chandeliers and carpeting. The term of Rev. Allen saw the purchase of a parsonage. Rev. Harrell added a basement and annex to the church building. Under Rev. Simms a new parsonage was purchased and a new organ installed.

The longest serving Pastor in the history of Second Baptist was Rev. Preston T. Hayes, who succeeded Rev. Simms in July 1956. Under Rev. Hayes' leadership, multiple organizations and ministries were formed, including: The Layman Fellowship; The Women's Prayer Breakfast; Youth Fellowship; Blind and Deaf Ministries; and the Wednesday Morning and Evening Bible Classes. While at Second Baptist, Rev. Hayes was elected President of the Virginia Baptist General Convention (1977–79). During his tenure as President, the Convention formed a Division of Men to provide an avenue through which the Men of the Convention could utilize their skills and talents in promoting Christian stewardship and support for their local congregations. Rev. Hayes passed away in 2001, and the church dedicated the Preston T. Hayes Center for Christian Education in his honor. In the period between permanent pastors, the church continued Rev. Hayes' tradition of establishing programs to serve the church and the community by starting a Mentoring Program and a Computer Lab.

Rev. Hayes was succeeded by Second Baptist's current pastor, Rev. Avery E. Miller. Under Rev. Miller, Second Baptist has continued to flourish with the establishment of a Media Ministry, a Nursing Home Ministry, a Singles Ministry, and Mannah Inc., the Church's non-profit community service organization. Among Mannah's numerous efforts to serve the East End community are: one-on-one services for at-risk children in school; afterschool tutorial programs; summer day camps; and a weekly feeding program.

As Second Baptist gathers to celebrate its centennial, the church can truly remember its past, celebrate its present, and focus on the future with great expectations. I would like to congratulate Pastor Miller and all of the members of Second Baptist Church East End on the occasion of their 100th anniversary. I wish them 100 more years of dedicated service to the community.

FEDERAL JUDGES TO APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT OVER COMPENSATION

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 2010

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I would like to enter into the record an article from the New York Sun dealing with a court case that could have a dramatic impact on current federal legal tender laws. A number of federal judges are appealing the elimination of their cost of living increase, claiming that this is an unconstitutional diminution of pay. In fact, Madam Speaker, even if they had received a cost of living increase they may still have received a pay cut, because the government's CPI figure is purposely manipulated to underestimate the true inflation rate.

Perhaps the most interesting facet of this case is the potential implication for federal legal tender laws. Some experts speculate that if the current case is unsuccessful the judges' only recourse would be to challenge legal tender laws that artificially prop up the value of paper money. Against gold, the paper dollar has lost 80 percent of its value over the past decade. No amount of cost of living increases could overcome devaluation this severe. I am waiting with anticipation for the ultimate resolution of this case, and encourage my colleagues to read this thought-provoking article.

[From the New York Sun, May 11, 2010]

KAGAN'S FIRST CASE COULD INVOLVE A QUESTION OF HER OWN—AND HER COLLEAGUES'—PAY

(By Staff Reporter of the Sun)

NEW YORK—If Solicitor General Kagan is confirmed before the start of the Supreme Court's coming term, one of her first big cases on the high bench could touch on one of the most sensitive questions the court has ever handled—the pay of federal judges themselves.

The case was launched quietly some years ago by a rainbow coalition of some of the most distinguished judges on the federal bench. They are seeking to overturn an act of Congress rescinding an automatic pay increase designed to protect federal judges from the ravages of inflation, and are likely this month to ask the Supreme Court to take the case.

What makes the case so sensitive—potentially explosive, even—is that it could prove to be a stepping stone, whether intended or not, toward re-opening the question of legal tender. For the question of judges' pay confronts the courts with the question of whether a one-dollar note of legal tender that trades today at less than 1,000th of an ounce of gold is compensation equal to a one-dollar note of currency that was worth, say, a decade ago four times as much. What makes federal judges so special is that it is unconstitutional to diminish the pay of any federal judge while he is in office.

Were the judges eventually forced to confront that question, says one legal scholar of the monetary system, Edwin Vieira Jr., ''it would have profound economic and political effects, and it would cause a re-evaluation of the entire monetary system. Congress would be forced to undergo a complete re-evaluation of the monetary system.''

The federal judges asking the Supreme Court to review the rescission of their cost-of-living adjustments aren't raising the legal tender question, at least not yet. They are not asking to be paid in constant—or inflation-adjusted—dollars, and they appear to believe that the Supreme Court doesn't have to address that issue to satisfy their claim that Congress violated the anti-diminishment clause of the Constitution when it removed a previously promised cost-of-living raise. But they also have to be well aware of the enormity of the issue that lies just beyond the claim they are making.

The plaintiffs themselves comprise an array of senior judges and some of the most

distinguished figures on the federal bench. They include two appointees of President Carter—a district judge of the Eastern District of Louisiana, Peter Beer, and a judge on the district court in central California, Terry Hatter, Jr.; two appointees of President Reagan—Thomas F. Hogan, of the District Court for the District of Columbia, and Laurence H. Silberman, who rides the District of Columbia Circuit of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Also among the plaintiffs are three appointees of President Clinton—Richard Paez, who rides the Ninth Circuit for the United States Court of Appeals, and Jas. Robertson, of the District Court for the District of Columbia, and A. Wallace Tashima, who was elevated to ride the 9th Circuit by Mr. Clinton after having first served as a district judge on the nomination of Mr. Carter.

The pay of judges is one of the most sensitive issues in American history. The Declaration of Independence enumerates judges pay as one of the ''injuries and usurpations'' committed by George III against the Americans. The Declaration stated that the British tyrant ''has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.''

It was that claim that led the Founders to establish, in Article III of the Constitution, that ''[j]udges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour''—meaning for life—and that they ''shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.''

The complaint in the latest case, which is known as Beer v. U.S., would not be the first time federal judges have gone to court with claims in respect of their pay. As recently as 2008 at New York State, judges launched a legal case to gain a raise. New York's constitution, like the federal constitution, also prohibits the lowering of a judge's pay. But the argument the New York judges have made, and they have made it in their own courts, is that the way the legislature in Albany has handled the issue violates the principle of separation of powers.

Beer v. U.S. involves federal judges, who are seeking a hearing by the Supreme Court with a different argument—that when Congress scinded a legislated cost-of-living adjustment, as it did for a number of recent years, the judges' pay was diminished. The judges lost in their early rounds on a complicated set of issues, partly of precedent established in an earlier case when judges fought for a cost of living increase.

In some recent legal fracases involving judges pay, there have been statements from several Supreme Court justices, including one by Justice Scalia, that seem to have emboldened the judges filing a claim in the latest case. They are expected to file in the next few days a petition for the Supreme Court to hear their claim that earlier precedents were wrongly decided and that rescinding a legislated cost-of-living adjustment is a diminishment. The Supreme Court has ruled that in cases where a judge has an interest in the outcome of a case but is by necessity the party who must hear it, it is the judge's duty to rule, despite the conflict of interest. It may be that were Ms. Kagan to be elevated to the Supreme Court she would decide to recuse herself from Beer v. U.S. because of her either direct or tangential involvement in the case as solicitor general.

One difference between the current case and earlier ones is that the country is now in a historic monetary crisis, in which the value of United States fiat money has collapsed to such a degree that the Supreme Court would have to go through contortions to avoid considering it. In the past decade, the value of a dollar has plummeted to less than a 1,200th of an ounce of gold from, say, the 265th of an ounce of gold that it was worth at the start of the president of George W. Bush.

This means that the legal tender with which a judge is paid today is worth less than a quarter of what it was worth a decade ago.

The Supreme Court ruled after the Civil War that the federal government's paper money had to be accepted as legal tender. The centerpiece of the court's rulings was called Knox v. Lee and involved payment for a flock of sheep. But there is a legion of scholars and activists who believe—as did the Chief Justice of the United States at the time of Knox, Salmon Chase—that Knox v. Lee was wrongly decided. Such scholars argue that the majority in Knox v. Lee would never have sustained the monetary system we have today.

These critics point out that the Founders of America, who used the word ''dollars'' twice in the Constitution, all knew what the word meant—namely, 416 grains of standard silver or 371¼ grains of pure silver, the same as was in a then-ubiquitous coin known as a Spanish milled dollar, which was also known as a piece of eight. That standard was codified in one of the most famous laws passed in the early years of the republic, the Coinage Act of 1792. Critics of the legal tender law believe that 416 grains of standard silver—or the free market equivalent in gold—is the only form of constitutional money.

''If the judges bringing the case of Beer v. United States fail to convince the Supreme Court to restore their cost of living adjustment, federal judges will then have no option left but to reformulate their case so as to challenge the legal tender concept as presently applied,'' says Mr. Vieira.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SIKES ACT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Sikes Act to improve natural resources management planning for State-owned installations used for the national defense. I have introduced this bill after working with appropriate officials at the Department of Defense (DOD). The amendments proposed by DOD will improve coordination between DOD, the Department of the Interior and State, Territorial and local partners for the protection of fish and wildlife resources on DOD lands and State-owned installations used for the national defense.

As the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, this bill that I have introduced today is appropriate as the 111th Congress moves forward with an agenda promoting responsible environmental stewardship. DOD controls nearly 25 million acres of valuable fish and wildlife habitat at approximately 400 military installations nationwide. These lands contain a wealth of plant and animal life, vital wetlands for migratory birds and habitat for nearly 300 federally listed threatened and endangered species. For 50 years, the Sikes Act has helped the commanders of these installations balance their use of air, land and water resources for military training and testing with the need to conserve and rehabilitate these important ecosystems. In past National Defense Authorization Acts, Congress has made improvements to the Sikes Act and my bill, the Sikes Act Amendments Act of 2010, continues this progress by proposing three significant improvements to the law.

First, my bill clarifies the scope of the Sikes Act by extending its provisions to State-owned National Guard installations, including the requirement to develop and implement Integrated Natural Resources Management Plans, INRMP, that are already required for federally owned military installations. Another provision in this bill would make permanent the successful invasive species management pilot program on Guam, authorized into law in 2004, and expand its score to all military installations. Finally, the bill makes several technical and clarifying changes to the U.S. Code to make it consistent with other subheadings and titles.

I want to thank Chairman SOLOMON ORTIZ of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness for his leadership on issues affecting management of military installations and the readiness of our military forces. I also thank Chairman NICK RAHALL of the House Natural Resources Committee for his leadership in providing for seamless protection for our fish and wildlife resources, a national treasure, across all public lands. I look forward to working with my colleagues in both the Natural Resources Committee and the Armed Services Committee in receiving testimony, support and views on the Sikes Act Amendments Act of 2010.