Kitty are now back home in central Florida, and Sandy and I wish them both the very best.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to remember a good friend who is leaving the Senate after a career of public service, Senator Mel Martinez.

Mel Martinez came to the Senate in 2005 after serving as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under President George W. Bush. Senator Martinez was the first Cuban American to serve in the U.S. Senate. Born in Cuba, Senator Martinez arrived in the United States at age 15.

During his tenure as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mel Martinez addressed the National Congress of American Indians, pledging to strengthen the government to government relationship with tribes in the Federal Indian programs administered by his agency. He was keenly interested in ameliorating the third world housing conditions that exist in the Native villages of rural Alaska. Alaska's tribe and tribal housing authorities benefit greatly from Federal funding available under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act and other Federal housing programs, which were strengthened under Senator Martinez' leadership at HUD.

Despite the fact that the States we represent are as far away geographically as States can be, we have always been good friends.

I was proud to serve with Senator Martinez on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Senator Martinez was a close ally on energy issues, and he was always a fierce advocate for the interests of his Floridian constituents. We shared a common interest in promoting Federal energy efficiency standards, responsible nuclear waste storage, and we worked together on the 2005 Energy Policy Act. He was a tough bargainer on the more recent 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act as he aggressively pursued the interests of his constituents with respect to Federal Outer Continental Shelf energy development.

I wish Mel Martinez and his wife Kitty the best of luck in their future endeavors.

MILITARY NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the attached listing of nominations:

Those identified with a single bullet • are to be placed on the Executive Calendar. Those identified with a double asterisk (**) are to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to save the expense of printing again:

MILITARY NOMINATIONS PENDING WITH THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE WHICH ARE PROPOSED FOR THE COMMITTEE'S CONSIDERATION ON OCTOBER 8, 2009

• LTG David M. Rodriguez, USA to be lieutenant general and Commander, International Security Assistance Force Joint Command (Reference No. 1067)

ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that my name was incorrectly added next to the line item ''St. John's Bayou and New Madrid Floodway'' Project in the conference Report of the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Resources Development Appropriations Act. I ask that the RECORD reflect that this is a mistake. I did not make a request for funding for this project and my name should not be attached to this project.

PROTECTING OLDER WORKERS AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, October 6, I introduced S. 1756, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act.

To appreciate the need for this bill, consider the case of a hard-working Iowan named Jack Gross. Mr. Gross gave the prime of his life, a quarter century of loyal service, to one company. How did that company reward him for his dedication and hard work? It brazenly demoted him and other employees over the age of 50, and gave their jobs to a younger employee.

Expressly to prevent this kind of discrimination, over 40 years ago Congress passed the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA. The ADEA, which made it unlawful to discriminate on the basis of age, was modeled on and used the same language as title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the law that prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin and religion.

When Mr. Gross sought to enforce his rights, a jury of Iowans heard the facts and found that his employer discriminated against him because of age. That jury awarded him almost $47,000 in lost compensation.

The case was ultimately appealed to the Supreme Court. This past June, in Gross v. FBL Financial, Inc., five Justices rewrote the rules— indeed, effectively rewrote the law—and ruled against Mr. Gross and other older workers. In doing so, the Court made it harder for those with legitimate age discrimination claims to prevail under the ADEA.

For decades, the law was clear. In 1989, in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, the Court ruled that if a plaintiff seeking relief under title VII of the Civil Rights Act demonstrated that discrimination was a ''motivating'' or ''substantial'' factor behind the employer's action, the burden shifted to the employer to show it would have taken the same action regardless of the plaintiff's membership in a protecting class. As part of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Congress formally codified the ''motivating factor'' standard with respect to title VII.

Because the Age Discrimination in Employment Act uses the same language as title VII, was modeled off it, and had been interpreted consistent with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, courts correctly and consistently held that a victim bringing suit under the ADEA need only show that membership in a protected class was a ''motivating factor'' in an employer's action—the same standard for plaintiffs claiming discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, or national origin. If an employee showed that age was one factor in an employment decision, the burden was on the employer to show it had acted for a legitimate reason other than age.

In Gross, the Court—addressing a question on which it did not grant certiorari—tore up this settled decades old standard. In its place, the Court applied an entirely new standard that makes it prohibitively difficult for a victim to prove age discrimination. According to the Court, a victim of age discrimination bears the full burden of proving that age was not only a motivating factor but the decisive factor.

This extremely high burden radically undermines older workers' ability to hold employers accountable. Bear in mind that unlawful discrimination is often difficult to detect. Obviously, those who discriminate do not often admit they are acting for discriminatory reasons. To the contrary, they go out of their way to conceal their true intent. Discrimination cases rarely involve a smoking gun.

The reality, however, is that while employers rarely post signs saying ''older workers need not apply,'' ageism in the workforce does indeed exist, as Mr. Gross and his colleagues learned the hard way. Indeed, according to an AARP study, 60 percent of older workers have reported that they or someone they know has faced age discrimination in the workplace.

Countless thousands of American workers who are not yet ready to voluntarily retire find themselves jobless or passed over for promotions because of age discrimination. Older workers often face ugly, baseless stereotypes: That they are not as productive as younger workers; that they cannot learn new skills; that they somehow have a lesser need for income to provide for their families.

These stereotypes—and the discrimination they feed—are wrong and immoral. This is also harmful to our economy, inasmuch as it deprives us of the skills and talents of millions of older workers.

The timing of the Court's decision is particularly troubling. As our economy continues to struggle, older workers are being hit particularly hard. According to the Department of Labor, there are 2 million unemployed workers over the age of 55. This is an all-time high since the Bureau of Labor Statistics began matching age and unemployment in 1948. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, in 2008 nearly 25,000 age discrimination claims were filed, a 30-percent increase over 2007. Given the stereotypes that older workers face, it is no surprise that, on average they remain unemployed twice as long as all unemployed workers.

The Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act reverses