



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2011

No. 93

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 28, 2011, at 10 a.m.

## Senate

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2011

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

High and Holy God, we extol and adore Your Name. Lord, You shower us with love and forgiveness, and You guide our footsteps through life's challenging seasons. Today we pray that You would bless America. Quicken the hearts of its citizens that they may labor to bring honor to You. Redeem this land from coarse secular prosperity, and build it up in an ethical and moral fitness that will bless the world. Use our Senators today as Your choice instruments. May they not lose the vision of the goals of righteousness and honor, of justice and understanding, of peace and good will.

We pray in Your matchless Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 27, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. Senator SANDERS will be recognized in morning business at 4 p.m. for up to 90 minutes. There will be no rollcall votes today. The first vote of this week will be tomorrow at noon on the confirmation of James Cole to be Deputy Attorney General. Also on Tuesday, the Senate will resume consideration of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act. We need to work out an agreement to complete action on that bill as soon as

we can. Additionally, we hope to confirm David Petraeus to be Director of the CIA this week.

We have an idea of what we need to get done this week, but it is up to Members as to when we get it done. It is not magic that we finish here Thursday night. We should be able to finish, get all the work we need done, but if we do not, we will have to have this spill over until Friday. We have to finish the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act. We need to do that. We have a number of nominations we have already agreed to that we have to vote on, and we have to do David Petraeus. There is no reason we can't get all of that done, but we need cooperation of Senators.

### THE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last Thursday, Democrats sat down with the chief executives of three successful corporations. Their companies are responsible for the jobs and livelihoods of about 100,000 workers. One company makes medications that help Americans live longer, healthier lives. Another invests in entrepreneurship, giving inventors the capital they will need to bring their ideas to the production line. Another employs scientists and engineers to make more efficient the things we use every day, from jet engines to home thermostats.

These three CEOs understand what it takes to create jobs, so we asked them what Washington can do to help. This is what they told us. All Democratic Senators were there.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4107

First, we must improve and reform our education system, from kindergarten through 12th grade, so we produce the skilled workers of tomorrow. Plus we need to train more scientists, engineers, and mathematicians so we do not risk falling behind China, India, and other global competitors.

All three of these executives—all of them—believe we must reform our immigration system to stay competitive. The brightest students from around the globe come to the United States to take advantage of our world-class universities. Unfortunately, our broken immigration system forces most of those students to go back to their home countries, where they compete with American companies. We should be keeping the best here, where they were educated, so they can build companies that employ U.S. workers.

Of course, we must simplify and streamline our broken tax system, lowering rates but eliminating loopholes so everyone pays his or her fair share, including corporations.

This is what three successful CEOs told us we should do to create jobs for American workers. I know these are big issues. They are complicated and politically divisive. We cannot tackle them all at once. But they are not the only solution. These three CEOs we met with last week said there are smaller, more manageable issues we can tackle right now. There are things we can do to help create jobs right now.

Mother Teresa urged us to “be faithful in small things because it is in them that your strength lies.” Putting Americans back to work can and should start with the small things.

This is what these three successful CEOs told us we should do to spur hiring:

First, reauthorize a program that gives grants to the technology companies that are inventing new products, such as the electric toothbrush or body armor for soldiers, so these innovators can continue to grow and hire. That is what we tried to do with the small business innovation research legislation. The Republicans stopped it.

Second, they said we should modernize America’s air travel system to make it safer and more efficient to fly American skies. That is what we tried to do when we reauthorized the Federal Aviation Administration, which is lost in the Republican-dominated House.

Third, we must reform our patent system and clear a 3-year backlog of applications. The next laptop computer or iPod could be in that pile, just waiting to be taken from the basement to the boardroom. That is what we tried to do with the America Invents Act. The House passed a version of our bill, but the person—for example, Senator COBURN—said he is going to stop this bill because it doesn’t have the payment system that was a good idea. We all thought that here. We voted for this 95 to 5. But, again, it has been stopped by the Republicans; that is, our patent system.

That is 580,000 jobs just for patents and FAA, and there are tens of thousands of jobs with small business innovation. These are commonsense steps we can take today. Each would help put people to work across the country. That is not just what the Senate says, that is what business leaders say. Here is the catch. Congress has already taken up, as I indicated, all three of these measures. Not one has become law. Why? Republicans have killed or stalled all three of these important pieces of legislation—legislation business owners say they need to put more than ½ million Americans back to work.

Putting Americans back to work must be our most important debt-reduction strategy. Democrats know it is critical that we reduce the deficit and pay down the national debt, but we will never balance the budget with 14 million people out of work.

Democrats know how to balance budgets. Remember, when Democrats in Congress helped President Clinton balance the budget in 1998, unemployment was 4.5 percent. Now, unfortunately, it is twice that. That is why we must do two things at once: reduce the deficit and do whatever it takes to get American workers back doing what they need to do to bring in a paycheck. The business leaders we spoke with support this two-pronged approach. Democrats and Republicans do not have to look hard to find common ground; we only have to be willing to admit it when we see it.

I met with the President earlier today. We had a productive meeting. My Republican counterpart will meet with the President this afternoon. I hope my Republican colleagues will put the economy ahead of politics and join us to create jobs and set aside their desire to please the tea party and defeat President Obama. This is the way forward. Neither party should confront this crisis alone, and no one will be successful unless we confront it together.

We owe the country our commitment to do at least the small things. Again I repeat Mother Teresa when she said it is in them; that is, the small things, that our strength lies. And they, in turn, will inspire faith that the big things will follow.

---

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

---

#### THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, a little later today, I will sit down with President Obama to discuss his request to raise the Nation’s debt ceiling. When I do, I intend to make a request of my own. I intend to ask the President what he is prepared to do, outside of raising taxes, about the massive deficits and

debt that have accumulated on his watch. I will tell him what Republicans are looking for in this debate: to cut spending now, cap runaway spending in the future, save our entitlements from bankruptcy, and get our economy moving. I will tell him the truth about requests by some in his party that we increase spending and raise taxes as a way of solving the debt and jobs crisis that precipitated the President’s request to raise the debt limit in the first place: Not only are they counterproductive from the standpoint of an economic recovery, they are also politically impossible since Republicans oppose tax hikes and Democrats have already shown they will not raise taxes in a down economy either.

Let’s start by taking both proposals off the table and focus on what can actually pass Congress and what will actually spur the private sector in our future and create jobs. Those who are calling for tax hikes as a part of these debt discussions either have amnesia about the fate of similar proposals just 6 months ago when Democrats controlled both Chambers of Congress by very large margins, as well as the White House, or they are acting in bad faith since we all know that including massive job-killing tax hikes would be a poison pill.

Let’s move past the tax hikes, talk about what is actually possible, and let’s talk about what has and has not worked over the last 2 years. On this second point, this much is clear: If government spending were the answer to an economic slowdown, we would be in a boom time right now. Instead, we are facing record deficits and debt and a seemingly endless stream of bad economic news. Despite massive spending increases by Democrats, millions have lost their jobs.

The problem is that Washington spends too much. That means Democrats are simply going to have to make the kinds of tough choices about Washington’s budget that most other Americans have been forced to make about their own budgets over the past couple of years.

Last week, President Obama told a group of people he was prepared to bring down the deficit by trillions of dollars but refused to list any of the ways he was willing to do it. All he did was list the things he refused to cut. This weekend, the President proposed even more deficit-financed spending disguised as what he calls investment. You really cannot have it both ways.

At some point, the President needs to realize that the reason our debt has skyrocketed 35 percent over the last 2 years and that our annual deficit is now three times greater than the highest deficit the previous administration ever ran is that spending has spiraled completely and totally out of control and that the big-government policies of the last 2 years simply have to change. Consider the failed stimulus bill when Democrats passed it. They said it was a one-time cash infusion that was supposed to keep unemployment below 8

percent. Two years later, with unemployment still hovering around 9 percent, they are saying we need to keep up the stimulus-level spending, despite its obvious failure. Their commitment to spending and tax hikes is so deeply held, it seems they do not even recognize the state of our economy or the fact that the tax-and-spend policies of the past 2 years have made matters worse, and they have to change if they are ever going to get out of the fiscal mess we are in.

Democrats seem to think the solution to our tax crisis is to ask taxpayers and businesses to reward their economic stewardship with even more money to spend as they please. They don't seem to understand that the voters didn't elect dozens of additional Republicans to the House of Representatives last November because they wanted their taxes raised. They sent them to reverse policies that had failed. We have seen the consequences of giving Washington a blank check. It is the reason we are in the mess to begin with.

So my message to the President is quite simple. It is time for Washington to focus on fixing itself. It is time for Washington to take the hit, not the taxpayers.

I yield the floor.

---

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in morning business until 6 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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.

---

#### FISCAL POLICY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, nearly every day we see scenes playing out in countries around the world where their financial security is in ruins. This is the last thing we want to experience in our great country, and that is why we need to reform our fiscal policy and the way we have done business. There is too much at stake not to take action.

The International Monetary Fund urged us to address our soaring budget deficits, and credit rating agencies Moody's and S&P may be forced to

downgrade our government's AAA rating.

So what is the majority doing to address this fiscal crisis? Absolutely nothing. It has been nearly 790 days without the majority in this Chamber proposing a budget, and it appears the majority isn't anxious to work on one. The majority-led Budget Committee has failed to meet this year to begin working on a resolution. We can't even have an open debate in this Chamber about the budget. Instead of voting to start the debate on budget measures last month, the majority squashed all proposals, including the President's own plan. This is failure to govern at the most basic level and the American people deserve better. We need a budget that puts us on the path to fiscal discipline.

Every week we hear warnings of why this must be done. Last week the Congressional Budget Office issued the starkest warning yet of the danger posed by our spending problems. Our Nation's debt will exceed the size of the U.S. economy by 2021 and will double the size of our Nation's GDP within 25 years. This is not the way I want to leave this country for my kids, my grandkids, and the people of Arkansas.

In his State of the Union Address, President Obama pushed for a conversation that will put us on the path to fiscal responsibility but, so far, he has been absent from the discussions. Only today, 36 days before the deadline given by Secretary Geithner to raise the legal limit on Federal borrowing, is he beginning to take leadership in negotiating for spending limitations.

Our debt is slowing the economic recovery. The simple truth is higher debt leads to slower economic growth. We have seen this with the failed stimulus, but in the past week the Senate-led majority is once again proposing this flawed strategy. This failed policy of borrowing, spending, and taxing is just what the CBO is warning us to avoid. It hasn't worked in the past and it won't work in the future.

What we need are debt reduction measures in the form of spending cuts. The CBO's last report shows that spending is the primary cause of our fiscal crisis and supports spending cuts rather than tax increases to reverse this trend. I urge President Obama to take tax hikes off the table. Let's get to work reining in the reckless spending and putting our Nation back on a fiscally responsible path.

If American families ran their household budgets the way Washington runs its budget, the utilities would be shut off and the collection agencies would be knocking on their doors. The American people are now knocking on the doors of the Capitol demanding the government limit its spending.

We must rein in our spending to protect programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security for current recipients and for future generations. In order to achieve this, we must reform the manner in which we budget

and allocate Federal dollars. We need a mechanism to cap spending and force the government to spend within its means.

We must act now to move our country off the brink of financial collapse, and we must make tough decisions because that is what the American people deserve and expect of us.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for up to a half an hour in morning business.

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

---

#### THE DEBT CRISIS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, last week, three events conjoined to elevate the subject of the U.S. debt crisis in this country and should energize us in the Senate and our colleagues in the House to redouble our efforts to find a solution to this serious problem.

I wish to briefly mention those three events and then talk about the problem from my perspective, some of the potential solutions, and put an item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' review.

The first of what occurred was a new report by the Congressional Budget Office which was a new projection about U.S. debt as a percentage of our economy. One of the things they said was that our debt could almost double by the year 2035—far larger than they thought it would be as a percent of our economy or the GDP—and they said it is going to exceed 100 percent by the year 2021. Actually, it could get to that point sooner than that. It is approaching 100 percent right now. Greece is a little bit over 100 percent. Countries that get to that 100-percent level of public debt as a percent of GDP have a very hard time ever recovering. As a result, the time is now for the U.S. Government to act on our huge and growing debt.

Secondly, we had reports by the Labor Department, the Commerce Department, and others that confirm what we already know about the state of our economy and the state of joblessness in this country.

Applications for unemployment benefits rose. It was the biggest jump in a month. We are over 9 percent unemployment now. New home sales fell in May. The values of our homes in this country have decreased more than they did during the Great Depression. That has been a horrible factor for millions of American families. Stocks fell last

week. The Federal Reserve Board lowered its outlook for growth, which in the last quarter was less than 2 percent—it was 1.9 percent—and this is unacceptable. It is much lower than ordinarily recovery is coming out of a recession. Confidence is slipping among small businesses and households. There are higher gas prices, higher food prices.

All of this simply confirms what most of us have heard from our constituencies; namely, this recovery is not much of a recovery and we need to do everything we can to try to improve it.

Third, of course, is the news that negotiations with the White House over extending the debt ceiling had broken down. Actually, as a member of the group negotiating that, I would not say they had broken down. I think the Vice President is correct that they have moved on to a new phase; namely, the phase where the President himself, the Speaker of the House, and the two leaders here in the Senate are going to have to try to resolve some of the largest issues—the kinds of issues that the negotiators in the so-called Biden talks were simply not able to resolve because it would go against instructions from our principals.

The primary problem there was the insistence by the Democratic negotiators that Republicans agree to tax hikes—something which we think would be inimical to economic growth, the very problem of the slow recovery in the economy would be exacerbated by, if we were to increase our tax rates. You do not add new taxes to an already struggling economy. So the White House's insistence that had to be a condition to approving the reductions in spending we had been talking about made it impossible for us to go forward at that time.

There is an old saying that there is a difference between a pessimist and an optimist. I usually think of myself as optimistic. The saying is: The pessimist says things are so bad they can't get any worse. The optimist says, sure they can. And they could. If the Congressional Budget Office is correct about its projections here, we could be in a far worse debt situation tomorrow or the year after that than we are today—a situation which would make it extremely difficult for us to ever recover and essentially relegate our children and our grandchildren to a standard of living far below that which we have all been accustomed to, and which they deserve.

Looking at some of the other factors that should frame the problem for us, we have over a \$14 trillion debt—and growing every day. We are going to need \$2.4 trillion in increased debt ceiling authority to get us through the end of next year. You cannot tax your way out of it. You cannot borrow your way out of it.

We have to reduce the level of spending, which is now approaching 25 percent of our gross domestic product. The

average is around 20 percent, and that is where we were before President Obama took office. We have to borrow now 40 cents of every \$1 we spend. So when we talk about spending more money in a new stimulus package—another new idea to come out of the Democratic Congress last week—we are talking about having to borrow 40 cents of all of that money that would be spent. Think of it now: For every program we have here at the Federal Government level, we have to borrow more than 40 cents of the money we are then going to spend. That takes money out of the private sector that is needed to produce jobs and provide for investment in the private sector.

I mentioned before unemployment is over 9 percent now and according to the CBO projection is not going to go down by very much over the course of the next year, if at all.

So what is the solution? A lot of our Democratic friends have said we need to have a new stimulus program, we need to spend even more, notwithstanding we do not have the money, and we should be raising taxes. As I mentioned, that is the reason why we terminated the discussion with Vice President BIDEN last week, because of the insistence on the part of our Democratic colleagues that the only way they were willing to move forward was if we committed to raising taxes, and I mean by a substantial amount. There was \$400 billion in revenue raisers on the table, put there by our Democratic colleagues. That simply will not pass the House of Representatives. But, more importantly, it would be the worst medicine possible for an ailing economy.

We cannot afford more spending. Even if we could, it would not put Americans back to work. Jobs are created by private businesses, and the more the government taxes or borrows, the less there is available for businesses to invest and hire. So the answer here is less government spending, not more taxation and more borrowing.

We put forth a budget. The Republicans passed it in the House of Representatives. We voted on it here in the Senate, and it did not pass because Democrats in the Senate would not support it. But it is a legitimate effort to allow job creation, economic recovery, and eventually get our budget balanced at the Federal Government level back here in Washington.

People have said it is a radical budget. It is not. Even under the so-called Ryan budget, we would go another \$5 trillion in debt. You cannot call that radically slashing spending if over the next 10 years we add another \$5 trillion to our national debt. That shows you how hard it is to reduce spending. People say: Well, you can't cut this program, you can't cut that program. You cut them in a way that still adds \$5 trillion in debt over 10 years, and they say it is radical, you are slashing spending.

The Obama budget, by contrast, would add \$12 trillion in debt. So both

of them would add to our debt. But at least under the Ryan budget that was passed by the House of Representatives, over time we would get back into balance. In fact, it would be in primary balance by the year 2014, meaning except for interest payments it would be a balanced budget, and we would reduce Federal spending from 25 percent of our economy back down to a little over 20 percent, which is the historic average. Excuse me, it would be a little under 20 percent, which would be close to our historic average of spending as a percent of the gross domestic product.

One of the best ways for us to ensure we are in balance is to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. All 47 Senate Republicans have cosponsored the balanced budget amendment. It is carefully written so that even though it requires balance in the budget, it does not easily allow Congress to raise taxes as a way of achieving balance. That would require a two-thirds vote. It also contains a very important spending limitation as a percent of the gross domestic product. So we would achieve balance, but we would achieve balance by reducing our appetite for Washington spending here and, as a result, could achieve the kind of balance that would promote economic growth.

You could spend more money if we had more economic growth because spending would be tied to the gross domestic product. So it is a perfect solution for Republicans and Democrats alike. If you like to spend more money, there is a perfectly good way to get to spend more money: Do that which would enhance the recovery of our economy—because the bigger our economy got, the higher the percentage of money Washington could spend. The incentives are aligned properly. We propose to promote economic growth. So this balanced budget amendment would accomplish that. For those who like to spend money, the more growth, the more money you would get to spend.

We hope that balanced budget amendment will come to the Senate floor in the next week or two or three. We certainly look forward to the opportunity to debate it and getting a vote on it.

But when you look at the alternative that has been proposed by a lot of our colleagues on the other side—a new stimulus program and increased taxes—you have to wonder: How serious are they about actually helping our economy recover? Everything so far that the other side has tried under the leadership of the President has failed to work. In fact, it has actually made things worse.

We are all familiar with the stimulus that did not help, did not bring unemployment down as the President promised. It made things worse. That is why I have this chart here in the Chamber that shows the Obama economic record has not made things better. It has made things worse.

Look at a few of the things that are afflicting our economy today, the indicia of what is wrong. You start with the Inauguration Day for President Obama, where we are today, and what the change has been.

If you look at unemployment, unemployment has gone up by 1.9 million Americans. The unemployment rate has gone up 17 percent since the President took office. This is not like the situation where he said: Well, I inherited a bad economy, but I am gradually making it better. He is making it worse.

Gas prices have gone up 101 percent under President Obama. He will not approve the leases that would allow our oil companies to explore for more oil and gas, thus bringing the prices down.

The Federal debt has gone up 35 percent since the President took office.

The debt per person has increased by \$11,311. It has gone up from \$34,000 to over \$46,000. That is the debt each one of us has.

So it has increased that much in just 1 year. By the way, health insurance premiums have gone up 19 percent, notwithstanding the passage of the so-called ObamaCare.

Getting back to this matter of debt, just to put it in perspective, if we took all of the Presidents of the United States from George Washington all the way through the Presidency of George W. Bush, if we took all of those Presidents and added up all of the debt—the debt from the Civil War, the debt from World War I, World War II, Vietnam, all of the debt that all of the Presidents of the United States accumulated—in one budget, President Obama will double that debt.

Each one of the years he has been President we have had a deficit of over \$1 trillion, closer to \$1.5 trillion. So at the end of 5 years, he will have doubled the debt. At the end of 10 years, he will have tripled the debt that all of the other Presidents of the United States combined accumulated. Now, I say the Presidents. Obviously, it takes a Congress to do this as well.

What the Members of the House of Representatives are saying to the Obama budget is, no. Even the President decided not to pursue his budget. When that was offered on the Senate floor, not a single Member of the Senate, Democrat or Republican, voted for the Obama budget because it takes us in the wrong direction. It would make things even worse than they are today.

At least with the Republican budget we have an effort to begin to solve the problem, even though a lot of people say it is not enough in the way of cuts, and they have proposed alternatives to reduce spending even more. I am all for reducing spending even more. The bottom line is, however, we have to get something passed. That is going to take Democrats and Republicans working together. So I am happy to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but we have to have some cooperation to reduce spending and not insist on tax increases.

What we have said as a part of these negotiations to increase the budget deficit is, some of us might be willing to increase the debt ceiling if we do not have to keep doing it. We need reforms that will enable us to not have to keep raising the debt ceiling, or at least not so much. The way we achieve those reforms is, first of all, to identify savings that can be made. There is an enormous amount of wasteful Washington spending. We have identified it is closer to \$500 billion. The Vice President has said more than \$1 trillion. The money is certainly out there to be saved. We need to save that kind of money on the front end as a downpayment to let the markets know and to let the American people know we are serious. That is savings that we can pass that can be locked in.

By the way, there is a little bit of revenues involved in that. It is not just all savings. There are some fee increases. There are user fees. There are some means testing of various Federal programs that can actually result in some increased revenue.

So when our Democratic friends say, well, there has to be revenue on the table, there is revenue on the table, but it is not tax increases. So if you are so ideological that you have to insist on tax increases in order to cut spending, unfortunately, you have taken yourself out of the game.

The bottom line is, there is somewhere between at least \$500 billion and \$1 trillion, probably more, in various kinds of mandatory savings that we could achieve. Then we have discretionary spending. We need to set a budget number since the Senate has not passed a budget in over 700 days now—I forget the exact number. We have not had a budget, so we do not have a number that the Appropriations Committee can deal with to appropriate funds for the discretionary part of our spending in this country.

We need to set that number. The Ryan budget set that number, and we were negotiating with the White House as to what that number would be. But we need to set that number. Then we need to make sure in the ensuing years Congress will actually live with that number. The tendency around here has been to set a budget number, then we have an emergency here, and we need to waive it there. The next thing we know, we are way over the number that we all agreed to in the beginning.

So we need something that will constrain both discretionary and mandatory spending over the course of the next 10 years and, hopefully, beyond. A lot of us believe the best constraint is the balanced budget amendment. But for colleagues who say: No, we are never going to agree to that—and, of course, we would have to get 20 colleagues in the Senate to agree in order pass it; it takes a two-thirds majority—then at least agree with us to put handcuffs on the Congress and the President, some kind of straitjacket so we do not spend beyond the number we

agree on for next year and the year after that.

We can save well over \$1 trillion, somewhere between \$1 trillion and even more than \$1.5 trillion in discretionary spending over the next 10 years if we would agree to these so-called section 302(a) top-line budget numbers, and then constrain ourselves to sticking with those numbers over time.

The reason? It is kind of like compound interest. Let's say we reduce spending in next year's budget by \$30 billion over the previous year. That is not a huge amount of money. But over a course of 10 years, when we set a new baseline, that translates into hundreds of billions of dollars if we really do it.

The bipartisan Congressional Budget Office says: We are not sure we want to score that as real savings because we are not sure you will really do it. But if we are able to pass some kind of constraint—such as the old Gramm-Rudman bill, for example—then I think the Congressional Budget Office will give us some credit for those constraints.

The best proposal I have seen is one proposed by Senator CORKER and Senator McCASKILL. It is bipartisan, a Republican and a Democrat, and they have Republican and Democrat cosponsors for the same proposal in the House of Representatives. It is called the CAP Act, to cap spending. So once the level is determined—they do it as a percentage of GDP.

I think that is the smartest way because that is an incentive for everybody to help the economy grow more. The more it grows, then the more, as a percentage, the spending can be. Over 10 years, we save a lot of money that way. It is enforced by the simple mechanism that if we do not achieve the savings that is called for, then there is an automatic sequester where all of the accounts of the government—defense spending, nondefense spending, mandatory spending—would all have to save a little bit. They would not be able to spend quite as much money so that we could make up the difference between the target or the goal and what the law called for.

There are other ways to do it as well. We were discussing different alternatives in the conversations with Vice President BIDEN. But the point is, we cannot allow waivers. We cannot have exemptions and emergencies and all of that—at least not without a supermajority vote, such as a three-fourths vote or a two-thirds vote—or else it is going to be too easy for Congress to do what it has done in the past, which is to simply say: This is too uncomfortable for us to comply with. We are going to declare this an emergency, vote for it by a majority vote, and then it is done.

If we mean it, we would have to be willing to abide by it. So we have to have a meaningful downpayment. We can do that. We have already identified substantial savings. We need to have a 302(a) budget number for at least the next couple of years and a mechanism

for enforcing that over the next decade and beyond.

Finally, we need to have a way to help the markets actually believe we are serious about entitlement reforms so the biggest part of our budget—representing two-thirds of all of the money we spend; namely, the entitlements—is actually beginning to grow at a slower pace.

We are not talking about drastic cuts, but we are talking about slowing the pace of growth. We can do that without having huge benefit cuts or without slashing payments to the providers. I mean, the last thing we want to do for Medicare—for example, I am concerned about my mother. We can use any of our mothers or dads or grandparents on Medicare. The last thing we want to do is say we have a great Medicare Program except for one thing: there is no doctor or hospital to take care of people because they will not because we are not paying them enough. So we need to be able to pay the people we rely upon for the medical treatment we have promised. We cannot do that by slashing payments to providers. Too many physicians have already said they cannot afford this program anymore and therefore are not going to take any more new Medicare patients—we have all had that experience—nor should we do it by slashing benefits. But we do not have to do either of those two things to have reforms.

I mentioned in these negotiations we have been discussing a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse-type reforms. Those of us in the Senate and the House kind of smiled because we always talk about the amount of money that can be saved because of the amount of waste, fraud, and abuse in the system. But the reality is, there is a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse and we can save a lot of money if we put our minds to it.

But what that means is, for example, we have to enforce the law. I will pick a hypothetical program because we are not going to be talking about the specifics with our negotiations. I am assuming we will get back to those negotiations at some point.

But we have eligibility standards to receive a certain Federal benefit, let's say. But 20 percent of the benefits that are being paid out are being paid out erroneously to people who do not qualify. They are not supposed to get the benefit. So we have to enforce the law.

We say: Sorry, you do not qualify for this benefit. This is a benefit for the elderly or this is a benefit for poorer Americans or for whatever. If we just enforce the law, we can save a lot of money, and that is not cutting benefits for anyone.

We can also do means testing. Republicans, for years, have said—well, I will use a couple of names because they both said we do not need the benefits of all of these Medicare Programs. People such as Warren Buffett, for example, have made it clear, and Bill Gates. They have both made it clear they do

not need to have the government take care of their medical requirements when they are age 65 or older.

There are a lot of Americans who are in the position to be able to afford a lot more of their own care, and they do not have to rely exclusively on the Federal Government. So through means testing we can either provide that their benefits will not be as generous as for people who are less fortunate economically or that they will pay a little bit more in the way of a copay or a deductible or maybe even a premium.

The bottom line, there are ways to ensure the future success of a program such as Medicare without affecting people who cannot afford to have big benefit cuts. One idea that has not been discussed—but I have heard it discussed—is to simply conform Medicare benefits to the same age eligibility as Social Security. That would save a great deal of money. It would represent a slowing in the time when people are eligible for the benefit.

Maybe some people believe, therefore, that it should not be considered. My point is that there are a lot of ways the entitlement programs can be reformed so they will be there when people need them. If we do not, if we say we do not want to touch them, here is what is going to happen. I will give one program as an example: Medicare Part A, the hospital part.

The Medicare trustees say by the year 2021, Medicare Part A will begin to run out of money. There will not be as much money in the trust fund, and it could well therefore happen in the following years if people need to go to the hospital, the hospital is not there anymore. If one lives in a small town, and it is the only hospital there and they cannot afford to stay open, they are going to close. So someone thinks they have Medicare Part A benefits, but the hospital either is not there or it cannot take care of them because it does not have the money to do so because it is not being reimbursed by the Federal Government.

So the choice is not to do something or to do nothing. If we do nothing, the benefits will not be there—the benefits we have promised to senior citizens will not be there. Doing nothing is not an option. We have to do something. So instead of demagoguing the issue politically, some politicians need to be responsible, get in the game and say: Let's figure out a way to save these programs so they will be there when we want them.

I also wanted to mention—this is a little bit off point, but it just shows how some of these things work. I mentioned high gas prices before. Ironically, one of the things the President has said we want to do is to tax the oil companies.

Well, of course, if we tax the oil companies more, then gas prices are going to be higher. The President just released some of the petroleum from the National Petroleum Reserve to try to bring gas prices down. It will bring

them down a little bit temporarily. But why would we then want to have those prices go right back up again by taxing the oil companies, which everyone knows will flow through to the consumer? It does not make sense.

There is something else, however, that does make sense, and this has had an impact on gas prices. The Federal Reserve Board has been buying bonds under a program called QE2—buying Treasury bonds. The purchase of those Treasury bonds has made our dollar less valuable. That means it takes more dollars to buy the same amount of gasoline. So, ironically, this effort by the Fed to put more money into the economy has had the pernicious effect of raising gas prices, raising food prices, and raising other prices because the dollar is not as valuable as it used to be, and to buy some commodities, especially commodities that are bought and sold on the world market such as gas, we have to have more dollars to pay for the same amount. So gas prices are increased. This QE2 program is going to come to an end at the end of this month. The Federal Reserve has already announced that. What will happen as a result is that the value of the dollar will not be cut by the amount of this selling of bonds, and so the expiration of the program lets the dollar strengthen, causing oil to return to levels we saw in the beginning of the year. That will have the result of having more purchasing power with the dollar you have, so you can buy the same amount of gasoline for fewer dollars or, to put it another way, the same amount of dollars you have will buy you more gasoline. That is one positive effect as a result of that change in policy by the U.S. Government.

The key is to allow our economy to work without too much government interference. That is a good example of government interference that displaces or reduces the value of the dollar and therefore hurts the consumer.

I heard our colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, say the other day—this is reported on June 14—in his first speech on the Senate floor:

There is nothing wrong with our people. Americans haven't forgotten how to start a business. They haven't run out of good ideas. Americans are as great as we have ever been. But our government is broken. And a broken government is keeping us from doing what we have done better than anyone in the world for over a century: create jobs.

He is right. If the government will get out of the way and not insist on burdening our economy with new taxes and let Americans do what they have always been able to do well, I think we will be able to come out of this economic downturn and come back to life as an economy, helping families, small businesses and, ironically, by making more money and paying taxes at the same tax rate, the Federal Government will have the benefit of our increase in salaries, profits, and so on, and will have more money to spend as well.

Spending more money, taxing more, having the government try to stimulate the economy has never worked. I want to put into the RECORD a quotation from the Wall Street Journal of today, June 27, which is as follows:

With spending at 24 percent and debt held by the public at 70 percent of GDP—both modern records—the U.S. needs drastic spending cuts to head off a downward future spiral of tax increases and unaffordable interest payments. As Milton Friedman taught, spending is the real measure of government's burden on the private economy, and reducing it leaves more resources for private actors to spend and invest.

I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the point they are trying to make is, government spending is a pretty good indicator of what is left over for the private sector to invest and spend, for example, on new jobs. When the government spends more, inevitably, it has to borrow more—40 cents on every \$1—or increase taxes—either way, reducing what is available for the private sector to invest and hire.

We should be focused, as a result, as the editorial notes, on reducing wasteful Washington spending and allowing the genius of the American people to do what Senator RUBIO has made very clear: We have always had the capability of creating jobs, unfettered by too much government taxation and regulation. So we need to do away with those policies, such as the Federal policy that reduced the value of the dollar, we need to try to eliminate as many regulations that burden the American people as possible, and we need to avoid raising taxes.

Bear in mind, we are not talking about cutting taxes. We are not talking about cutting taxes for the wealthy or cutting taxes for business or cutting taxes for people, generally. Leave them alone, don't raise them, is all we are saying. When you hear some politicians say you want to cut taxes for the wealthy or give oil companies big tax breaks—no, leave it alone. Don't touch it. Let businesses and families and small businesses do what they have always done best. If you want to mess up the economic growth, to use the colloquialism, follow what the administration has been doing. We will have higher unemployment, higher gas prices, higher Federal debt, higher debt per person, and higher health insurance premiums, not to mention other pernicious effects. Those policies have made it worse, not better.

That is why Republicans have said don't force us to raise taxes as part of this increase in the debt ceiling. Let's reduce spending, and let's enforce that through a balanced budget amendment and other kinds of spending constraints. We are not talking about drastic cuts, as I said. Think about this again.

The Ryan budget that passed in the House, and that most of us on the Republican side voted for over here, adds \$5 trillion to the debt over the next 10 years. That is \$500 billion a year. That is higher than any other budget deficit in history, until President Obama came into office. We talked about the Bush budget deficits. It is a lot higher than any deficit under President Bush—\$500 billion a year for 10 years. That is another \$5 trillion. You can't say that is drastically cutting spending. The alternative, though, is the Obama budget, which would add \$12 trillion. At least the Ryan budget gets us on a path where we can get back into balance and back to the standard or the normal historical average of spending, as a percent of our GDP, around 20 percent.

If you don't like that budget, then produce one that you think will get us to the same place. We have laid that challenge down. Our Democratic colleagues have not produced a budget. It is pretty obvious they are not going to do so. That is why we have had to have these discussions with the Vice President. At least, perhaps as a conclusion to those discussions that the President is now involved in, we can make a big downpayment on spending reductions, set the budget levels for the next several years that represent a real reduction. It doesn't have to be huge. Even a \$30 billion reduction over last year will save a huge amount of money in the outyears. We need to ensure that those reductions will be enforced, that we will not return to our wayward spending ways, and we need to deal with the two-thirds of the budget that represents the big money; namely, entitlements.

There are ways to do so that don't represent big benefit cuts and that don't represent slashing payments to providers, although we would not have any more doctors to take care of them. We can effectuate reforms that will send the right signal to our constituents and also to the markets, which will have a lot to say about interest rates in the future and whether they believe in the recovery we would like to achieve.

I hope my colleagues will be very open to the consideration of a balanced budget amendment when we bring that up. I wish the President and the leaders of the House and Senate all the best in their discussions now on how to deal with this problem. The President will have to make a decision: Is raising taxes more important than trying to get our budget back into balance and reduce spending? He will find there is support on both sides for the latter. There would not be much support for the former. By getting together and achieving those goals within the next 4 weeks or so, we can both meet the deadline of August 7 that he has set for a debt ceiling increase and also get our country on a more sound fiscal path. We can do that to give confidence to the markets and to the American people. We owe our constituents, our chil-

dren, and our grandchildren nothing less.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 27, 2011]  
SPENDING HIS WAY TO AUSTERITY—PRESIDENT OBAMA'S LATEST ECONOMICS LESSON

President Obama enters the debt-ceiling talks today when he meets with members of both parties, and in his Saturday weekly radio address he unveiled a new line of argument against significant spending cuts: "We can't simply cut our way to prosperity."

That's a nifty rhetorical riff, a play off the old Ronald Reagan line that we can't tax our way to prosperity. The argument is that if we cut too much spending on too many good things—like education, "clean energy" and "advanced manufacturing," to name three examples highlighted by the President—the economy will suffer.

Too bad it won't fly. It's a truism that budget cuts alone will not guarantee faster economic growth, but at the current moment they will get us closer to it. With spending at 24% and debt held by the public at 70% of GDP—both modern records—the U.S. needs drastic spending cuts to head off a downward future spiral of tax increases and unaffordable interest payments. As Milton Friedman taught, spending is the real measure of government's burden on the private economy, and reducing it leaves more resources for private actors to spend and invest.

It is also true that some government spending can be economically useful—to the extent that it enhances productivity more than it would have in the private economy. But the irony is that it is precisely the spending priorities that Mr. Obama mentions that will be crowded out because of his refusal to cooperate in reforming entitlements like Medicare and Social Security. By trying to protect all federal spending except defense, liberals are guaranteeing that many of their most cherished plans will be squeezed. They're the ones who are spending us into austerity.

Mr. KYL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. 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.

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand to talk about a looming crisis in this county, a problem that has the potential to affect every American from every State, from every political party, of every political ideology. That issue relates to our national debt.

We have accumulated nearly \$15 trillion in debt through the Federal Government, which is a lot of money split up amongst 300 million Americans. It works out to close to \$50,000 a head. A lot of people don't make that much money in a year, and yet that is what every man, woman, and child owes on a per capita basis the moment they are born. If it is calculated out on the basis of debt per taxpayer, the number is much larger, anywhere between \$120,000

and \$150,000 per head, depending on how you calculate it.

We are now approaching the August 2 deadline given to us by Secretary Geithner that has been identified as the time by which we must increase our national debt yet again, a debt that has been raised time and time again, resulting in our accumulation of about \$10 trillion of new debt in roughly the last decade. This is a problem, and it is a problem that is only going to become more severe the longer we kick this can down the road without doing anything to change the way Washington brings money in and the way Washington spends money.

I want to talk for a minute first about how Washington brings money in. There are those who have suggested in this town very recently that what we need right now is a tax increase in order to address the debt crisis. I could not disagree more, and I need to state with the greatest emphasis I am able to place on this issue that a tax increase is something I would oppose, something I would devote every ounce of energy in me to opposing. The reason is we have in Washington something that is not a revenue problem. What we have is a spending problem. Spending is the crisis that we need to address.

But on a more fundamental level we have to remember what we do when we raise taxes. When we raise taxes, we chill investment. It is investment that we rely on for the creation of jobs. We have to remember that government doesn't have the power to create jobs, because it can't create wealth. It can create policies. It can adopt laws and regulations designed to promote or deter certain kinds of behavior. It can raise revenue through taxation. But it can't create wealth. All it can do is set in place certain circumstances that might allow wealth to be created or, in other circumstances, might deter new wealth from being created.

To have true wealth creation leading to true job creation, you have to have a circumstance in which willing investors with capital are ready to invest, have the reasonable assurance and promise that if they invest their money and thereby place it at risk, any gains resulting from that risky behavior will be gains that inure to their benefit, not taken away by some third party and not taken away by the government. So when we raise taxes, in effect what we are doing is deterring investment, deterring investment at a time when we are hemorrhaging jobs, and we can ill afford to lose any more. Not one job should be lost as a result of something the government does. We need to find ways to get the government out of the way so job creation can occur. But it can't occur whenever we punish the investor, whenever we tell the investor: Invest at your own risk, because if you dare to make a profit, we are going to take away more of that money than we have previously been taking away in taxes.

For that reason, I continue to emphasize the fact that I will oppose any attempt to address this debt limit crisis by raising taxes, and I will continue to oppose any effort to raise taxes. Spending is the problem.

As to the question of how Washington spends money, if the definition of insanity is the practice of doing something again and again expecting to achieve different results than we have achieved every time in the past, then we would be insane if we approach this debt limit discussion with the same kinds of tired, malfunctioning, unproductive strategies that have been employed in the past, strategies that focus exclusively on immediate cuts or even long-term cuts. Let me explain what I mean.

As we approach the debt limit discussion, there will be those who will want to focus a lot of the attention on long-term spending cuts. In other words, they might say, If we are going to raise the debt limit by \$1 trillion, then we need to find \$1 trillion in cuts that can be made. If we are going to raise it by \$2 trillion, then we need to find \$2 trillion to cut.

But of course we can't cut \$1 trillion out of our budget immediately. That is not possible. We can't do that in 1 year. That would have to be stretched over a period of many years. Most likely, in this scenario, as it has been discussed, it would be stretched over a period of a decade or more.

We do have the power to control what we do in this Congress, but we can't bind the Congress that will take power in January of 2013, January of 2015, or 2017. Every 2 years, we get a new Congress in place and that Congress has the power to make those decisions that will best fit what they decide is in order at that time. We can't bind them permanently. So any promise that we make right now to cut, let's say, \$2 trillion relies on the promise that that will be honored by future Congresses. We can't bind them to do that.

There is one way, however, we can bind them. That is by amending for the 28th time that 224-year-old document that has fostered the development of the greatest civilization the world has ever known. When we amend the U.S. Constitution, that is the one credible way, the one binding way in which one group of Americans can bind a future group of Americans. That is why I have said that the only circumstance in which I think it is appropriate for us to raise the debt limit is a circumstance in which Congress has first passed a balanced budget amendment out of Congress by the requisite two-thirds margin in this body and in the House of Representatives, and submitted it to the States for ratification. In that scenario, and only in that scenario, can we proceed with any degree of confidence that the commitments we make now to the American people, to make not just immediate cuts but long-term changes to the way we spend

money, it is only in that scenario that those promises can be and will be honored, because it is only in that scenario that we can bind a future Congress.

That is why I have pledged to vote against, and to oppose in any way I can, any debt limit increase that involves something short of prior passage of a balanced budget amendment, in addition to any caps, in addition to any immediate cuts that may be raised.

We have got to have cuts. We have got to have some kind of spending cap, where we cap spending as a percentage of gross domestic product every year, and we have got to have a constitutional amendment requiring that and requiring the revenues and outlays match each other from year to year. If we don't have this, then we are at great risk for the practice of perpetual deficit spending in which Congress year in and year out spends more than it takes in. Congress can sustain this for a period of time. But where, as is now the case, the amount of money Congress spends is in excess of \$1.5 trillion a year more than it brings in, we have reached a certain point of unsustainability at which, if we continue with this practice, a halt in borrowing will be much more immediate, much more Draconian than anything that could be within our control. At some point, those who would be willing to loan us that money, who would be willing to buy U.S. Treasury instruments of one form or another to finance our debt, will eventually start demanding a higher and higher yield. That means that instead of spending about \$250 billion a year on interest on our national debt, as we are currently paying, the time could very soon come in which we might have to pay something closer to \$700 billion just to pay the interest on our national debt. In fact, if we were now required to pay interest rates on our Treasury instruments consistent with the 40-year average, we would be about there.

Mr. President, \$700 billion is a lot of money. Seven hundred billion dollars in a year is roughly what we spend on Social Security. It is roughly what we spend on Medicare and Medicaid combined in a year. It is roughly what we spend in national defense in an entire year. If we have to spend that amount of money every year, as we could easily have to spend within just few years' time if we continue spending at this rate, that is going to crowd out funding for every Federal program out there.

Whether you are most concerned, as many conservatives might be, about protecting national defense or whether you are most concerned, as many liberals are, about protecting our entitlement programs, you ought to insist, as I have been insisting, that we will not raise the debt limit until such time as the Congress has passed a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. That is why I am pleased to support the "cut, cap, and balance" pledge and why I will continue to take this position in addition to standing



firm on my position that we ought not even consider any tax increase at a time when we can least afford it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this is a pivotal moment in the history of our country. In the coming days and weeks, decisions will be made about our national budget that will impact the lives of virtually every American in this country for decades to come. The time is now for the American people to become significantly involved in that debate and not leave it to a small number of people here in Washington.

At a time when the wealthiest people and the largest corporations in our country are doing phenomenally well and in many cases have never had it so good, while the middle class is disappearing and poverty is increasing, it is absolutely imperative that any deficit-reduction package that passes this Congress not include the horrendous cuts, the cruel cuts in programs that working people desperately need that are utilized every day by the elderly, by the sick, by our children, and by the lowest income people in our country, that the Republicans in Congress, dominated by their extreme rightwing, are demanding.

America is not about giving tax breaks to billionaires and attacking the most vulnerable people in our country. We must not allow that to happen.

In my view, the President of the United States needs to stand with the vast majority of the American people and say no to the Republican leadership and make it clear that enough is enough. No, we will not balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in this country—on our children, on our seniors and the sick. No, we will not do that. Working families in this country have already sacrificed enough in terms of lost jobs, lost wages, lost homes, lost pensions. The working families of this country are hurting right now. Enough is enough.

Now is the time to say to the millionaires and the billionaires in this country and to the largest corporations that in many ways have never had it so good that they must participate in deficit reduction, that there must be

shared sacrifice, that deficit reduction cannot be based on cutting back on the needs of working families and the middle class but that the rich and large corporations have also got to participate in this process.

Furthermore, it is absolutely necessary, if we are talking about a sensible deficit-reduction package, that we take a hard look at unnecessary and wasteful spending at the Pentagon.

Let's make it very clear that we will not be blackmailed again by the Republican leadership in Washington that is threatening to destroy the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government so that, for the very first time in our Nation's history, we might not pay the bills we owe. That is their threat. We will destroy the record of always paying our bills, never failing to do that, unless they get everything they want.

Instead of yielding to the incessant, extreme Republican demands, as the President in many respects did in last December's tax cut agreement and this year's spending negotiations, the President has to get out of the beltway. He has to connect with the needs of working families and ordinary Americans and rally the overwhelming majority of our people who believe that deficit reduction must be based on shared sacrifice, that the wealthy and the powerful and the large corporations cannot continue to get everything they want while we wage a cruel and unprecedented attack on the most vulnerable people in this country. It is time for President Obama to stand with the millions who have already lost their jobs, their homes, their life savings, instead of the millionaires, who in many cases have never had it so good.

Unless the American people in huge numbers tell the President not to yield 1 inch to Republican demands to destroy Medicare and Medicaid while continuing to provide tax breaks to the wealthy and the powerful, unless the American people rise up and say enough is enough, I am afraid that what will happen is the President will yield once again and the wealthy and the powerful will laugh all the way to the bank, while working people will be devastated.

Today, I am asking the American people that if you believe deficit reduction should be about shared sacrifice; if you believe the wealthiest people in our country and the largest corporations should be asked to pay their fair share as part of deficit reduction; if you believe that, at a time when military spending has almost tripled since 1997, we must begin to take a hard look at our defense budget; and if you believe the middle-class and working families have already sacrificed enough, I urge you to make sure the President hears your voice, and he needs to hear it now. I urge the American people to go to my Web site, [sanders.senate.gov](http://sanders.senate.gov), and sign a letter to the President letting him know that enough is enough. I also urge the American people to contact the White

House directly through their Web sites and leave a message for the President there.

As you know, this country faces enormous challenges. In fact, we have not suffered through such a difficult moment since the Great Depression of the 1930s. We do not talk about it very much, but the reality is that the middle class in this country is disappearing while at the same time poverty is increasing.

When we talk about the state of our economy, it is important to talk about it within the context of deficit reduction because when you understand what is going on in the economy, you know you cannot get blood out of a stone. You cannot keep attacking people who have been devastated in the last few years in terms of unemployment, in terms of losses of pension, in terms of losses of health care.

When we talk about the economy, we have to understand that the situation is in many cases even worse than official statistics indicate. For example, we read in the papers that the official unemployment rate is now 9.1 percent. But the truth is—and no economist disagrees with this—that official statistic ignores the number of people who have given up looking for work and people who are working part time when they want to work full time. If you add all of that together, you are looking at a real unemployment rate in this country of about 16 percent. Are those really the people whom we should go to for deficit reduction? Are they not suffering enough right now? Young people graduating college who can't find a job, let's hit them hard. Older people who have lost their jobs and can't find a new one or are working for half the wages they previously worked at, let's go after those people. Fifty million people have no health insurance. Let's attack them. Working mothers and fathers cannot find affordable childcare. Let's go after them.

We must understand that when we look at the economy, the middle class is hurting and hurting badly. Over the last 10 years, on top of the high unemployment rates, the median family income in this country has declined by over \$2,500. Do you know why working families are angry? That is why they are angry. They are working longer hours for lower wages. Are those really the people you want to ask to balance the budget? I don't think so. I think any sense of fairness, any sense of morality that one might have suggests you do not beat up on people who are already suffering. You don't try to get blood out of a stone.

As a result of the greed and the recklessness and the illegal behavior on Wall Street which caused this terrible recession, millions more Americans have lost their homes, they have lost their pensions, and they have lost their retirement savings. We hear it every day in calls that come to our offices. Unless we reverse our current economic costs, our children will have, for

the very first time in modern American history, a lower standard of living than their parents. It is the American dream in reverse. Kids are going to do worse than their parents unless we reverse current economic trends.

We can throw out a lot of numbers around here, a few hundred billion and a trillion. But the truth is that behind those numbers in my State of Vermont and all over this country, there are real people who are hurting terribly, and as Members of the Senate our job is to pay attention to those people and not just the well-paid lobbyists, representing the most powerful special interests in the world, who surround this Capitol every single day.

Last year I asked my constituents in Vermont to share some personal stories with me. I asked them basically: How are you doing in this recession? The stories I got back from Vermont, I am sure, are absolutely similar to the stories you would get in Delaware or anyone would get in Michigan or any other State in this country. I asked them: How are things going? Let me tell you as a result of the e-mail we sent out, we had more than 400 Vermonters responding to that e-mail, and what they had to say was poignant. Sometimes these stories were so powerful, it was almost hard to read more than a few at a time. The message I received from Vermont—I suspect similar messages are coming from every State in this country—is that people are finding it hard to get jobs. They are now working for lower wages than they used to earn. We are seeing older workers who have depleted their life's savings, and they are worried about how they are going to retire. What happens to them when they are unable to work anymore? Who is going to take care of them?

We hear from young adults in their twenties and thirties who are deeply in debt from college loans, and they don't know how they are going to pay off those loans. We hear from people of all ages, all walks of life, from every corner of Vermont, who have sent us their stories. Let me read a few of them, to make the point to put some flesh and blood behind the statistics we often throw out.

We have a letter from a 51-year-old woman from central Vermont. This is what she wrote:

Dear Senator Sanders, Don't really know what to say, I could cry. My significant other was out of work for a year, now he works in another state. I've been out of work since April. Our mortgage company wants the house because we can't make the payments. I can't find a job to save my soul that will pay enough to make a difference. How bad does it have to get! My mother went through the Great Depression and here we go again. I figure that I'm going to lose everything soon! I'm a well educated person who can't see through the fog.

A gentleman in his mid-fifties from Orange County, VT, writes:

After being unemployed three times since 1999 due to global trade agreements, I now find myself managing a hazardous waste

transfer facility that pays about 25 percent than what I was making in 1999.

You hear that all of the time. Yes, many people, of course, are working, but many older workers today are dealing with the humiliation and the economic tragedy of now earning substantially less than they earned 10 or 20 years ago.

He continues:

My wife's children have moved back in, unemployed. And we are saving very little for retirement. If things don't improve soon we will likely have to work until we die. We consider ourselves lucky that we are employed. Our children's friends tend to show up around meal time. They are skinny. We feed them. This is no recession, it's a modern day depression.

Are those the people we want to go after when we talk about deficit reduction? Are they not suffering enough already?

A woman in her late forties from Westminster, VT, writes:

I am a single mom in Vermont, nearly 50. I patch together a full time job making \$12 an hour and various painting jobs and still can't afford to get myself out of debt, or make necessary repairs on my home. No other jobs in sight, I apply all the time to no avail. Food and gas bills go up and up, but not my income. I have no retirement at all, can't afford to move, feeling stuck, tired, and hopeless.

"Stuck, tired and hopeless." I suspect that sentiment reflects how many millions of Americans are feeling today.

I have another letter from a 26-year-old man from Barre, VT. He writes:

In 2002, I received a scholarship to Saint Bonaventure University, the first in my family to attend college. Upon graduation in 2006, I was admitted to the Dickinson School of Law at Penn State University, and graduated in 2009 with \$150,000 of student loan debt.

Mr. President, \$150,000. That is high. But there are people all over this country who have extremely high student loans, and they don't know how they are going to pay them off.

Then he continues:

In Western New York I can find nothing better than a \$10 an hour position stuffing envelopes. I live in a small studio apartment in Barre without cable or Internet. I have told my family I don't want them to visit because I am ashamed of my surroundings. My family always told me that an education was the ticket to success, but all my education seems to have done in this landscape is make it impossible to pull myself out of debt and begin a successful career.

On and on it goes. Over the last couple of weeks we have been focusing in my office on the crisis in dental care, the fact that in Vermont and all over this country millions of people cannot find a dentist.

I want to give you an idea. I am raising these issues today, and I am quoting from folks in Vermont. Again, these stories are not just from Vermont. In fact, Vermont is doing better in this recession than most States in this country are doing. So take what we are talking about here in Vermont and multiply it by several times for other States.

A gentleman writes to me within the last couple of weeks. He says: "I can't afford health insurance, so dental work is definitely out." And he talks about how studies have linked bad dental care to heart problems and cancer, but he cannot get to a dentist.

The reason I raise this issue is to try to give us a better understanding of who some of the people are who will be impacted by the Draconian cuts the Republicans are talking about. Let us be clear. They are talking about throwing millions and millions of people off Medicaid.

Let me tell you what that means. Earlier this year, as you know, Arizona passed budget cuts that took patients off its transplant list. Remember reading about that? I think most of the country read about that. Essentially because of the financial reasons, what they said in Arizona is: Yes, you need a transplant; yes, you are not all that old, but I am sorry, we cannot afford it for you, and you are going to have to die. And people have died. In that State and in other States throughout this country hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people are being thrown off Medicaid.

So what does that mean? What does it mean if you are a low-income worker and you are getting your health insurance through Medicaid and you lose Medicaid? What happens when you develop a pain in your chest and you think you may be having a heart problem but you cannot get to a doctor? What happens? Have our Republican friends thought that through when they proposed \$700 billion in cuts in Medicaid? What happens to the children by the millions who are thrown off Medicaid? We have 50 million people today who have no health insurance. If the Republican plan goes through, we are talking about tens of millions more. What happens to those people? As Americans are we content to see kids get sick because they cannot get to a doctor or people die because they don't get to a doctor on time? I don't think so.

I have learned and have been told throughout my whole life that education is the key to success. We hear that on the floor of this Senate every single day. Education, education. Kids have got to do well in high school so they will be able to go to college. The reality right now is hundreds of thousands of bright young people cannot afford to go to college because they don't have the money, and we are losing their intellectual capabilities to make us a stronger nation. If the Republicans get their way, and make savage cuts in Pell grants, no one has any doubt that hundreds of thousands more young people will never be able to walk into a college or a university. That is not only a tragedy for the individuals, for the young people themselves, it is a tragedy for this Nation. Every day we are involved in fierce competition in the global economy, and we are not doing well in educational levels. We are

seeing other countries graduate more of their students from college, and that gap is growing wider. If you cut back on Pell grants and other forms of college aid, it is clear that a bad situation will be made much worse.

Let's get even more basic, more basic than health care, more basic than education, and that comes to nutrition, whether people in larger and larger numbers in this country are going to go hungry. According to a 2009 study, there are over 5 million seniors who face the threat of hunger, almost 3 million who are at risk of going hungry and almost 1 million seniors who do go hungry because they cannot afford to buy food. In that context our Republican friends want to balance the budget on the backs of the hungry, cut back on food stamps, cut back on other nutrition programs. So what happens if you are 80 and food prices are going up and you don't have enough to eat? Well, apparently there are some people here in the Senate who don't worry about that, but I personally do not believe that is what America is about. I think the American people, by huge numbers, do not want to see hunger increase for our seniors or our children.

This is a lot of pain the Republicans are tossing out while at the same time they are vigorously protecting their wealthy and powerful friends. In my view, the President of the United States has to stand tall. He has to take the case to the American people and he has to hold the Republicans responsible if, in fact, the debt ceiling is not raised, and all of the repercussions that will occur if that happens.

I have given you just an inkling of what is going on in the real world, and I know all over this country, ordinary Americans, working-class people, have a lot more to say about what is going on in their lives. As we speak, people are fighting desperately to keep their homes from falling into foreclosure. They are struggling with 29 percent, 30 percent interest rates on their credit cards, which they are never able to pay off. Marriages have been postponed because the young people don't have the money to settle down, lives have been derailed, retirement savings have been raided to pay for college tuition or to keep businesses afloat or to simply put gas in the car at \$3.80 a gallon in order to get to work. That is what is going on in the real world. That is what it means when we talk about the middle-class collapsing and poverty is increasing.

While all of that happens, it is important to note there is another economic reality taking place in this country. Poverty is increasing. We have the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth. We are seeing an increase in senior citizens who are going hungry, more and more families unable to send their kids to college. But there is another reality out there, and that is that the gap between the wealthiest people in this country and everybody else is growing

wider and wider and has not been this wide since before the Great Depression of 1929 began. Let us be very clear, and there is nothing to be proud about, but the United States today has, by far, the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on Earth.

Today, the top 1 percent earns over 20 percent of all income in this country, which is more than the bottom 50 percent. One percent owns more income than the bottom 50 percent. Over the recent 25-year period, 80 percent of all new income created in this country went to the top 1 percent. Even more dramatic, even more incredible, even more unfair in terms of distribution of wealth, which is accumulated income, as hard as it may be to comprehend, in America today the top 400 individuals own more wealth than the bottom 150 million Americans. Again, 400 Americans own more wealth than the bottom 150 million Americans.

Given those realities, it doesn't take a Ph.D. in economics to suggest that when we move forward with deficit reduction, that deficit reduction must include shared sacrifice. The wealthy and large corporations also have to help this country deal with record-breaking deficit.

The reality is simple but unfortunate. That reality is that the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the middle class continues to disappear. That is what is going on in this country, and there is no hiding it. We have to acknowledge it. We have to go on from there.

Everyone knows that in our country today we are facing a major deficit crisis, and we have a national debt of over \$14 trillion. What has not been widely discussed and what must be discussed is how we got into that deficit situation in the first place. If we are going to deal with the deficit, we have to know how we got into it. What is very clear is that this huge record-breaking deficit and a \$14 trillion national debt did not just happen overnight, and it didn't happen by accident. It happened, in fact, as a result of a number of policy decisions made over the last decade and votes that were cast right here on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

When we talk about the deficit and the national debt, let's never forget that in January of 2001—a little over 10 years ago—when President Bill Clinton left office, this country had an annual Federal budget surplus of \$236 billion with projected budget surpluses as far as the eye could see. That was when Clinton left office some 10 years ago. Now we have a \$1.5 trillion deficit and a growing national debt.

It is totally appropriate as we talk about deficit reduction that we ask some simple questions: How did we get to where we are today in terms of the deficit? What happened in that ensuing 10 years? How did we go from huge projected surpluses into horrendous debt? The answer really is not complicated,

and there is not a lot of disagreement. We know exactly what has happened. The Congressional Budget Office has documented it. There was an interesting article on the front page of the Washington Post on April 30 talking about it as well, and here is what happened. I don't think there is a lot of disagreement about this.

When our Nation spends \$1 trillion on wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and forgets to pay for those wars, we run up a deficit. When we provide over \$700 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country and choose not to offset those tax breaks, we run up a deficit. When we pass a Medicare Part D prescription drug program written by the drug companies and the insurance companies that does not allow Medicare to negotiate prescription drug prices and ends up costing us far more than it should—\$400 billion over a 10-year period—and we don't pay for that, we run up a deficit. When we double military spending since 1997, not including the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we don't pay for that, we run up the deficit.

Now, I always find it amusing when some of my Republican colleagues come to the floor and lecture some of us about how serious the deficit is and how serious the national debt is. Yet, ironically, many of us voted against those proposals which, in fact, caused the deficit crisis we are in right now. I paid a lot of attention during the debate over the war in Iraq. I don't recall many of our friends on the Republican side or the Democrats who voted for that war saying: Gee, we can't go to war because it is going to cost this country a huge sum of money. I don't remember hearing that.

When we bailed out Wall Street to the tune of \$700 billion, I don't recall many of my friends saying: Oh, my goodness, we can't afford to do that. When we gave \$700 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country, where was the concern then about deficit reduction? Further, and maybe even most significant, the deficit we are in right now was caused by the recession we are in, which was, of course, caused by the greed and illegal behavior on Wall Street, which caused the economic condition of the moment: massive unemployment and loss of a very substantial amount of revenue that otherwise would have come into our tax coffers.

The end result of all of these unpaid-for policies and actions year after year of the deficits I just described is a staggering amount of debt. When President Bush left office, President Obama inherited an annual deficit of \$1.3 trillion with deficits as far as the eye could see, and the national debt more than doubled—more than doubled—under President Bush because of all of these policy decisions made by Republicans and some Democrats. The reality is, if we did not go to war in Iraq, if we did not pass huge tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, if we did not pass

a prescription drug program with no cost control written by the drug and insurance companies, and if we did not deregulate Wall Street which allowed them to do the things they did, which ended up in Wall Street's collapse and the ensuing recession, we would not find ourselves in the mess we are in today. It really is that simple.

In other words, the only reason we have to increase our Nation's debt ceiling today is that we are forced to pay the bills the Republican leadership in Congress—and some Democrats—and President Bush racked up.

Given the decline in the middle class, given the increase in poverty, and given the fact that the wealthy and large corporations have never had it so good, Americans might find it strange that the Republicans in Washington would use this moment to make savage cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, nutrition assistance, and other life-and-death programs, while at the same time pushing for even more tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country and the largest corporations. Unfortunately, while the average American may think this is pretty weird, inside the beltway that is exactly what happens, and this is very much part of the Republican ideology.

Republicans in Washington have never believed in Medicaid or in Medicare or in Federal assistance in education or providing any direct government assistance to those in need. They have always believed tax breaks for the wealthy and the powerful would somehow miraculously trickle down to every American despite all history and all evidence to the contrary. So in that sense it is not strange at all that they would use the deficit crisis we are now in as an opportunity for an ideological attack against some of the most vulnerable people in our country.

That is exactly what the Ryan Republican budget, passed in the House of Representatives earlier this year and supported by the vast majority of Republicans in the Senate just last month, is all about. It is a long budget, so let me give just a few examples of what the Ryan Republican budget would do.

The Republican budget passed by the House this year would end Medicare as we know it within 10 years. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that under the Ryan proposal, in 2022, a private health care plan for a 65-year-old equivalent to Medicare coverage would cost about \$20,500. Yet the Republican budget would provide a voucher for only \$8,000 of those premiums. Seniors would be on their own to pay the remaining \$12,500, a full 61 percent of the total. Now, how many of the 20 million near elderly Americans who are now ages 50 to 54 will be able to afford that?

So let's review what we have. Let's say when a person becomes 65 in 10 years and they are earning or living on \$15,000 in Social Security, they are going to be asked to pay \$12,500 more

for health care than is currently the case. How do they do that? What kind of health care plan are they going to buy when they are old and sick and are given an \$8,000 voucher? How many days in the hospital will they be able to have? You can run up an \$8,000 bill in 1 day, in 2 days. So this ending of Medicare as we know it, forcing seniors to somehow come up with all kinds of money that in many cases they don't have, will be a disaster for tens of millions of people.

The Republican budget would also force 4 million seniors in this country to pay \$3,500 more on average for their prescription drugs by reopening the Medicare Part D doughnut hole. That goes into effect as soon as that bill would be passed, if it were to be passed.

Under the Republican budget, nearly 2 million children would lose their health insurance over the next 5 years by cuts to the Children's Health Insurance Program according, again, to the Congressional Budget Office. At a time when 50 million Americans have no health insurance, the Republican budget would cut Medicaid by over \$770 billion, causing millions and millions of Americans to lose their health insurance, and it would cut nursing home assistance in half.

Right now, Medicaid pays the lion's share of nursing home care. If we make savage cuts in Medicaid, what happens to the elderly who are in nursing homes and what happens to their children in terms of trying to provide the help their parents desperately need?

The Republican budget would completely repeal the affordable health care act, preventing an estimated 34 million uninsured Americans from getting the health insurance they need.

At a time when the cost of college education is becoming out of reach for so many Americans, the Republican budget would slash college Pell grants by about 60 percent next year alone, reducing the maximum award from \$5,500 to \$2,100.

At a time when over 40 million Americans do not have enough money to feed themselves or their families, the Republican budget would kick some 10 million Americans off of food stamps. What kind of sense of morality is that, that when people today are struggling hard in order to feed themselves, we throw another 10 million people off food stamps?

It is no secret to anyone that our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The Republican budget passed in the House and supported by all but a handful of Republicans here in the Senate would slash funding for our roads, bridges, rail lines, transit systems, and airports by nearly 40 percent next year alone. One of two things would happen: Either, as a result of this, our infrastructure continues to deteriorate or else hard-pressed cities and towns are going to have to raise property taxes and other regressive taxes in order to come up with a differential. Yet, despite the fact—we talked about cuts in health

care, Medicare, Medicaid, education, nutrition, environmental protection—yet, despite all of those cuts, when it comes to military spending, which has tripled since 1997, the House Republican budget does nothing to reduce unnecessary defense spending. In fact, defense spending would go up by \$26 billion next year alone under the Republican plan.

Interestingly enough, at a time when the rich are becoming richer, when the effective tax rates for the wealthiest people—at 18 percent—are about the lowest on record, at a time when the top 2 percent have received hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks, at a time when corporate profits are at an alltime high and major corporations making billions of dollars in profits are not paying a nickel in taxes, my Republican colleagues, in their approach toward deficit reduction, do not ask the wealthiest people in this country or the largest corporations to tribute one penny—one penny—toward deficit reduction.

Poverty is increasing. Republicans cut programs for the most vulnerable people in this country. The middle class is disappearing, in need of great help. Republicans cut the safety line from them. The rich, who are getting richer, and large corporations, making huge profits and in many cases not paying anything in taxes at all, their requirement is to receive even more in terms of tax breaks.

Now, that may make sense to some people. It does not make sense to me. In fact, what the Republicans want to do is provide over \$1 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires by permanently extending all of the Bush income tax cuts, reducing the estate tax for multimillionaires and billionaires, and lowering the top individual and corporate income tax rates from 35 percent to 25 percent. The rich get richer. They get tax breaks. The poor get poorer. They lose their ability to send their kids to college or to have nutrition programs or health care.

The Republican idea of moving toward a balanced budget is to go after the middle class working families and low-income people, and to make sure millionaires and billionaires and the largest corporations in this country, which are in many cases doing phenomenally well right now, do not have to share in the sacrifices being made by everybody else. They will be protected.

The Republican approach to deficit reduction in Washington is the Robin Hood philosophy in reverse: We take from the poorest people and we give to the richest people. And it is not as if that approach is good for our economy. Mark Zandi, the former economic adviser to JOHN MCCAIN when he was running for President, has estimated that the Republican budget plan will cost 1.7 million jobs by the year 2014, with 900,000 jobs lost next year alone.

The House Republican budget is breathtaking in its degree of cruelty. But do not take my word for it. In a

letter to congressional leaders, after the House GOP plan was introduced, nearly 200 economists and health care experts wrote:

Turning Medicare into a voucher program would undermine essential protections for millions of vulnerable people. It would extinguish the most promising approaches to curb costs and to improve the American medical care system.

Ezra Klein, a columnist at the Washington Post, wrote last April:

The budget Ryan released is not courageous or serious or significant. It's a joke, and a bad one. For one thing, Ryan's savings all come from cuts, and at least two-thirds of them come from programs serving the poor. The wealthy, meanwhile, would see their taxes lowered, and the Defense Department would escape unscathed. It is not courageous to attack the weak while supporting your party's most inane and damaging fiscal orthodoxies. But the problem isn't just that Ryan's budget is morally questionable. It also wouldn't work.

The deficit we are struggling with right now has been caused by unpaid-for wars, tax breaks for the rich, a Medicare Part D prescription drug program written by the insurance companies, the bailout of Wall Street, a declining economy, and less revenue coming into our Treasury. The Republican "solution" is to balance the budget on the backs of the sick, the elderly, the children, and the poor, to cut back on environmental protection, to cut back on transportation, while providing even more tax breaks to those who do not need it. That is unacceptable, and that is what the American people have to stop.

It is not just wealthy individuals who are making out like bandits. As hard as it may be to believe, some of the largest, most profitable corporations in this country are not only avoiding paying any Federal income taxes whatsoever, but they are actually receiving tax rebates from the IRS. The Republican response to this reality is to provide even more tax breaks to these corporate freeloaders. That may make sense to someone. It does not make sense to me.

What I want to do, Mr. President—and I ask unanimous consent to do so—is to have printed in the RECORD a list of a number of corporations that are making huge profits and are paying virtually nothing in taxes and in some cases getting a rebate.

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

(1) Exxon Mobil. In 2009, Exxon Mobil made \$19 billion in profits. Not only did Exxon avoid paying any federal income taxes that year, it actually received a \$156 million rebate from the IRS, according to its SEC filings.

(2) Bank of America. Last year, Bank of America received a \$1.9 billion tax refund from the IRS, even though it made \$4.4 billion in profits and just a couple of years ago received a bailout from the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department of nearly \$1 trillion.

(3) General Electric. Over the past five years, while General Electric made \$26 billion in profits in the United States, it received a \$4.1 billion refund from the IRS.

(4) Chevron. In 2009, Chevron received a \$19 million refund from the IRS after it made \$10 billion in profits.

(5) Boeing. Last year, Boeing, which received a \$30 billion contract from the Pentagon to build 179 airborne tankers, got a \$124 million refund from the IRS.

(6) Valero Energy. Last year, Valero Energy, the 25th largest company in America with \$68 billion in sales last year received a \$157 million tax refund check from the IRS and, over the past three years, it received a \$134 million tax break from the oil and gas manufacturing tax deduction.

(7) Goldman Sachs. In 2008, Goldman Sachs paid only 1.1 percent of its income in taxes even though it earned a profit of \$2.3 billion and received an almost \$800 billion bailout from the Federal Reserve and U.S. Treasury Department.

(8) Citigroup. Last year, Citigroup made more than \$4 billion in profits but paid no federal income taxes, even though it received a \$2.5 trillion bailout from the Federal Reserve and U.S. Treasury.

(9) ConocoPhillips. ConocoPhillips, the fifth largest oil company in the United States, made \$16 billion in profits from 2007 through 2009, but received \$451 million in tax breaks through the oil and gas manufacturing deduction during those years.

(10) Carnival Cruise Lines. Over the past five years, Carnival Cruise Lines made more than \$11 billion in profits, but its federal income tax rate during those years was just 1.1 percent.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me briefly read from this list of corporate freeloaders.

No. 1, ExxonMobil, the largest oil company in the world. In 2009, ExxonMobil made \$19 billion in profits, and not only did ExxonMobil avoid paying any Federal income taxes that year, they actually received a \$156 million rebate from the IRS, according to its SEC filings. Well, do you think maybe we might want to ask ExxonMobil to pay a little in taxes so we do not have to throw children off their health insurance? Maybe.

Bank of America. Last year, Bank of America, the largest bank in America, received a \$1.9 billion tax refund from the IRS even though it made \$4.4 billion in profits and just a couple of years ago received a bailout from the Federal Reserve in the Treasury Department of nearly \$1 trillion. Well, what do you know about that? We are bailing out the largest banks in this country, whose greed caused the recession, and then they get a rebate from the IRS rather than paying any taxes. Yet our Republican friends think the solution to deficit reduction is not to ask Bank of America to pay its fair share but to end Medicare as we know it and force low-income seniors to pay substantially more for their health care.

No. 3, General Electric. Over the past 5 years, while General Electric made \$26 billion in profits in the United States, it received a \$4.1 billion refund from the IRS. I do not know. What do you think? Do you think we should ask GE maybe to help us out just a little bit with deficit reduction?

Chevron, a major oil company, received a \$19 million refund from the IRS after it made \$10 billion in profits.

Last year, Boeing, which received a \$30 billion contract from the Pentagon

to build 179 airborne tankers, got a \$124 million refund from the IRS.

And on and on it goes.

Valero Energy.

Goldman Sachs. In 2008, Goldman Sachs paid only 1.1 percent of its income in taxes even though it earned a profit of \$2.3 billion. Gee, most Americans would be pretty happy to pay 1.1 percent of their income in taxes. But then again, they are not Goldman Sachs.

Citigroup, ConocoPhillips, Carnival Cruise Lines.

On and on and on. You have large, extremely profitable corporations that either pay nothing in taxes or get a rebate from the IRS. Maybe—just maybe—when we talk about deficit reduction, we might want to ask those people to help us out rather than go after the elderly, the sick, the children, and the poor.

Large corporations today are sitting on a recordbreaking \$2 trillion in cash. The problem is not that corporations are taxed too much; the problem is that consumers do not have enough money to buy their products, and the Republican agenda would make that far worse. Corporate tax revenue last year was down by 27 percent compared to 2000 even though corporate profits are up 60 percent over the last decade. These guys make more and more money; their contribution to the Treasury goes down.

When we talk about how we can—in a fair way, in a responsible way—deal with our deficit and our national debt, man, here is one very clear example, as shown in this picture. Here you have, in the Cayman Islands, a building. I think it is a four-story building, and it looks like a normal-size four-story building. Yet it has 18,857 companies that call this building their home. Now, one of two things is going on: Either these guys are very, very crowded—18,000 corporations in this one four-story building; maybe they are very crowded, and we should call in the zoning people in the Cayman Islands to check that out—or maybe something else is going on. Of course, what is going on is this is a total, absolute fraud. This is a building that does not house anybody. It is a phony address that 18,000-plus corporations use for the explicit purpose of not paying taxes to the United States of America.

There are studies out there which suggest that large corporations and wealthy individuals are avoiding \$100 billion in taxes every year by setting up these offshore tax shelters in the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, and the Bahamas. Maybe, maybe, maybe, before we tell young people they cannot go to college or single moms they cannot get childcare for their kids or low-income seniors we are going to cut back on their nutrition, maybe, just maybe, we might want to end this blatant outrage, which costs us \$100 billion every single year.

In 2005, one out of four large corporations paid no income taxes at all even

though they collected \$1.1 trillion in revenue. What about looking there for revenue? Our Republican friends say: Oh, no, no, no. We can't do that. We have to force elderly people to pay more in Medicare, throw kids off Medicaid.

Now, what is a very interesting point—and, frankly, we are all politicians. You do not get elected to the Senate if you do not understand something about politics. What I do not understand—and certainly what President Obama needs to understand—is that the overwhelming majority of the American people do not agree with the Republican approach, which says: Give tax breaks to billionaires and go after the elderly, the sick, the children, and the poor. That is not just BERNIE SANDERS talking. I am not much into polls, to be honest with you, but I think it is important to just try to get a little bit of a reflection of where the American people are coming from.

According to a recent Boston Globe poll—a couple weeks ago, the Boston Globe did a poll in the State of New Hampshire and was mostly interested in the Presidential campaign, how Presidential candidates are doing in New Hampshire, but they asked some other questions. In New Hampshire—I know because they are a neighbor of mine—they are the big antitax State. They are the conservative State in New England. Here is what the folks in New Hampshire said in that recent poll.

Seventy-three percent support raising taxes on people making over \$250,000 a year, 78 percent oppose cutting Medicare, 71 percent oppose cutting Medicaid, and 76 percent oppose cutting Social Security.

The Republican approach is the opposite. They want to cut Medicare, they want to cut Medicaid, they want to cut Social Security, and they certainly do not want to ask the wealthiest people in this country to pay a nickel more in taxes.

That is one poll. Let's look at another poll. In fact, poll after poll has more or less mirrored what New Hampshire voters are saying.

A recent NBC News-Wall Street Journal poll found the following: 81 percent of the American people believe it is totally acceptable or mostly acceptable—that is how they frame these polls—to impose a surtax on millionaires to reduce the deficit. Let me repeat that. Eighty-one percent of the American people—in the Wall Street Journal-NBC poll—think it is totally acceptable or mostly acceptable to impose a surtax on millionaires to reduce the deficit.

Eighty-one percent of the American people think it is a good idea. Yet we cannot get one Republican to ask the wealthy to pay a nickel more in taxes. Talk about being out of touch with what the American people want.

Seventy four-percent—in that same poll—of the American people believe it is totally acceptable or mostly acceptable to eliminate tax credits for the oil and gas industry, and on and on it goes.

Seventy-six percent believe it is totally unacceptable or mostly unacceptable to cut Medicare to significantly reduce the deficit.

Here is an interesting poll that maybe some of my Republican friends want to pay attention to; that is, that while the leaders of the tea party here in Washington are fighting to dismantle Medicare and Medicaid, it turns out that in another poll done by McClatchy, 70 percent of those people who identify themselves with the tea party oppose cutting Medicare and Medicaid to reduce the deficit. That is the tea party.

Here is the last poll I wish to highlight. There are many more out there. It was done by the Washington Post and ABC News. Here is what that poll says. It says 72 percent of Americans support rising taxes on incomes over \$250,000 to reduce the national debt, including 91 percent of Democrats, 68 percent of Independents, and 54 percent of Republicans.

So here you have in Congress, surrounded by lobbyists and powerful special interests, a Congress heavily dominated by large campaign contributors, of Members of the Senate moving in exactly the opposite direction of where the American people want to go. The American people want shared sacrifice. The American people believe that when the wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well and the gap between the rich and everybody else is growing wider, yes, the wealthiest people have to contribute to deficit reduction.

The American people believe we have corporations making recordbreaking profits and not paying a nickel in taxes. Yes, they have to start paying taxes. The American people overwhelmingly believe it is bad for this country to go after Medicare and Medicaid and programs that working families desperately depend upon.

Instead of listening to millionaires and billionaires, it is time for our leaders in Washington to start listening to the overwhelming majority of the American people who do want the wealthiest people in this country and the most profitable corporations to contribute to deficit reduction. It is time for shared sacrifice.

The middle class, the elderly, the sick, the children, and the poor have already sacrificed enough. It is time for those people on top, the people who are doing extremely well, to also understand they are Americans, they are part of our country, and they have to contribute to deficit reduction. The fact is, moving toward deficit reduction in a way that is fair is not as complicated as some would have us believe. In fact, if you are not beholden to Wall Street, large corporations and wealthy campaign contributors and you are not frightened about the number of 30-second ads that may be thrown at you if you take these guys on, it is quite easy.

I know there are many people out there of good faith who have different

ideas about how we can move forward toward a balanced budget, toward deficit reduction. I am not saying I have all the answers. But let me just give you a few examples, a few examples as to how we can reduce the deficit by more than \$4 trillion over the next decade, and that includes, of course, asking the wealthy and large corporations to begin paying their fair share of taxes and does not do undue harm for ordinary Americans.

We can do it. We can do it. If you are concerned about deficit reduction, I am concerned about deficit reduction. But we can do it, calling for shared sacrifice and in a way that does not attack programs that millions and millions of children, elderly, and working families are terribly dependent upon.

Let me just give you a few ideas. I know other people have other good ideas. First, we simply repeal the Bush tax breaks for the top 2 percent. We can raise at least \$700 billion over the next decade. That is it. The rich are getting richer. Bush gave them huge tax breaks. You repeal that, \$700 billion.

I know some of my Republican friends say: Oh, my goodness. If you do not give tax breaks to the very wealthy, it will have a negative impact on jobs. This is the trickle-down economic theory. You give tax breaks to the rich, large corporations, and we create all kinds of great jobs. That idea has been tested. That idea was tested. That was the idea of former President George W. Bush. But during his 8 years as President, when that idea was in effect, the private sector lost—lost—over 600,000 jobs, and we had one of the worst economic decades, in terms of job creation, ever seen in this country. We tried that theory. We did give tax breaks to the rich and large corporations, and we lost 600,000 jobs during that 10-year period.

Meanwhile, when Bill Clinton raised taxes on the top 2 percent, you know what. The world did not quite cave in. In fact, during Clinton's Presidency, we created over 22 million jobs, and he left office with a huge budget surplus. But that is just one argument. You heard polls say we should impose a surtax on millionaires. The vast majority of the American people believe that. If you did a 5.4-percent surtax on millionaires and billionaires, that would raise \$383 billion over 10 years.

You want another idea? At a time when our manufacturing sector is collapsing, when 50,000 factories have shut down in the last 10 years, when millions of workers have lost good-paying jobs, the U.S. Government continues to reward companies that move U.S. manufacturing jobs overseas through loopholes in the Tax Code known as deferral and foreign source income.

That, clearly, from a financial point of view, in terms of revenue to our government, as well as policies which result in the loss of millions of good manufacturing jobs, is not something we should sustain. If we ended that absurdity, that policy alone, the Joint

Tax Committee has estimated we could raise more than \$582 billion in revenue over the next 10 years. So what about that—\$582 billion of revenue and we stop the outsourcing of jobs so maybe we can rebuild our manufacturing sector. Sounds to me like a pretty sensible idea.

My Republican friends think it is a better idea to throw poor children off Medicaid or force elderly people to pay far more than they can afford for Medicare. But ending this absurd policy, which encourages companies to throw American workers out on the street, makes a lot more sense to me than what the Republicans are talking about.

Fourth, if we ended tax breaks and subsidies for big oil and gas companies, we can reduce the deficit by more than \$40 billion over the next 10 years.

Fifth, if we prohibited abusive and illegal offshore tax shelters—what I just talked about a moment ago—we could bring in \$1 trillion over 10 years. That says to the corporations and the wealthy: Sorry, you are no longer going to be able to stash your wealth in the Cayman Islands and avoid paying taxes.

Sixth, if we established a Wall Street speculation fee of less than 1 percent on the sale and purchase of credit default swaps, derivatives, stock options and futures, we could reduce the deficit by more than \$100 billion over the next decade and also—also—tell Wall Street we are not going to tolerate their outrageous behavior which led us into this recession in the first place. We are going to try to get a handle on their speculation.

Seventh, if we tax capital gains and dividends the same way we tax work, ordinary work, we can raise more than \$730 billion over the next decade. Why should somebody who clips dividend coupons pay a substantially lower tax rate than somebody who is out working on our streets or is a nurse or is a teacher? Warren Buffett has often said he pays a lower effective tax rate than his secretary. Today, the effective tax rate of the wealthiest 400 Americans is just 18 percent, the lowest on record.

On and on. We have a number of ideas out there, not the least of which is taking a hard look at the military. There are debates as to how much we can cut, but certainly we should all be in agreement that it no longer makes sense to sustain weapons systems that were built in order to fight the Cold War against the Soviet Union. They are not our enemy right now.

I can tell you that I, my office, requested a GAO report that found that the Pentagon had \$36.9 billion in spare parts it does not need and which are collecting dust in government warehouses. We can do better than that. Frankly, in my view—I think I speak for the majority of the people in my State of Vermont, I suspect, in this country—it is time to begin bringing the troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan at an accelerated rate. We have

been in Afghanistan now for 10 years. It is time for the Afghan people and their military to take responsibility, in terms of defeating the Taliban. We should be supportive of those efforts. But we should bring our troops home a lot sooner than the President has suggested. When we do that, among other things, we are also going to save a substantial sum of money.

Further, I will not deny for one second that there is waste and fraud and bureaucracy in almost every government program out there. I think we have to take a hard look at them all. I believe that in addition to the Pentagon, we can save hundreds of billions of dollars a year by eliminating unnecessary bureaucracy.

The ideas I have enumerated, and some I have not but which will become part of the RECORD, if we did all or some of these things, we could easily reduce the deficit by well over \$4 trillion over the next decade, if not, in fact, much more. It would be done in a way that is fair, and it would not unnecessarily and needlessly ruin the lives of some of the most desperate and fragile and hurting people in our country today, millions of people who are just struggling to make ends meet. Those people would be spared.

The extreme rightwing agenda of more tax breaks for the wealthy, paid by the dismantling of Medicare, Medicaid, education, nutrition, and the environment, may be popular in the country clubs and cocktail parties of the wealthy and the powerful, but it is way out of touch with what the overwhelming majority of Americans want.

As you know, late last week Congressman CANTOR, the Republican majority leader in the House, and Senator JON KYL, the Republican whip, walked out of the budget negotiations being led by Vice President BIDEN. The reason they walked out was pretty clear. They were not willing to close one single loophole in the Tax Code that allows the wealthy and large corporations to avoid paying taxes by stashing their money in the Cayman Islands and all the other loopholes that currently exist.

My sincere hope is that President Obama will use this Republican walk-out, their unwillingness to talk about the wealthy and large corporations contributing anything toward deficit reduction—that he will use this as an opportunity to rally the American people and make it clear he will never support Republican demands to move toward a balanced budget solely on the backs of working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor. But I don't think the President will do it unless the American people send him a message that enough is enough.

The American people do not support the Republican agenda. The American people support the concept of shared sacrifice as we move toward deficit reduction. But the President has to hear from the American people. He has to hear that they will not accept deci-

ating Medicare, Medicaid, Pell grants, education, and the environment in order to give more tax breaks to the wealthy. The President has to stand up for the millions of Americans who have seen their homes, their jobs, and their savings vanish, instead of the millionaires who have never had it so good.

It is my belief if the American people make that demand of the President and tell the President not to yield on this issue, we can win this budget struggle. If people would like to sign it—and I hope they would—we have a letter to the President, which I will read in a moment, on my Web site, [sanders.senate.gov](http://sanders.senate.gov)—and, also, as I mentioned earlier, they can contact the White House directly by going straight through the White House Web site and sending a message.

If hundreds of thousands of people do that, the President, I hope, will have the strength and determination to say to the Republicans: Sorry, we are not going to balance the budget on the weak and the vulnerable.

This is the letter that is on my Web site, which I hope the people will sign. This is what it says, which encapsulates much of what I have been saying for the last hour:

Dear Mr. President,

This is a pivotal moment in the history of our country. Decisions are being made about the national budget that will impact the lives of virtually every American for decades to come. As we address the issue of deficit reduction, we must not ignore the painful economic reality of today—which is that the wealthiest people in our country and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well, while the middle class is collapsing and poverty is increasing. In fact, the United States today has, by far, the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any major country on earth.

Everyone understands that over the long term we have got to reduce the deficit—a deficit that was caused mainly by Wall Street greed, tax breaks for the rich, two wars, and a prescription drug program written by the drug and insurance companies. It is absolutely imperative, however, that as we go forward with deficit reduction, we completely reject the Republican approach that demands savage cuts in desperately needed programs for working families, the elderly, the sick, our children, and the poor, while not asking the wealthiest among us to contribute one penny.

Mr. President, please listen to the overwhelming majority of the American people who believe that deficit reduction must be about shared sacrifice. The wealthiest Americans and the most profitable corporations in this country must pay their fair share. At least 50 percent of any deficit reduction package must come from revenue raised by ending tax breaks for the wealthy and eliminating tax loopholes that benefit large, profitable corporations and Wall Street financial institutions. A sensible deficit reduction package must also include significant cuts to unnecessary and wasteful Pentagon spending.

Please do not yield to outrageous Republican demands that would greatly increase suffering for the weakest and most vulnerable members of our society. Now is the time to stand with tens of millions of Americans who are struggling to survive economically, not with the millionaires and billionaires who have never had it so good.

Respectfully yours.

That letter is at [sanders.senate.gov](http://sanders.senate.gov). I think we have many thousands of signatures on that letter already. I hope we can get more. If people prefer to go to the White House Web site, they can do that. That would be important. The main point is that the President has to know that we will not accept a deficit reduction package that just comes out heavily on working families.

The reason I raise these issues today is that I am, frankly, very worried because we have gone through this negotiating process two times in the last 6 months. That is why we need the American people to weigh in on this issue.

In fact, we have seen this movie before. The Republicans, led by their extreme right wing, have been successful in getting their way because of their refusal to compromise and willingness to hold the credit and economic security of the American people hostage.

As many people will remember, in December the Republican leadership was prepared to hold the middle-class tax cuts and unemployment benefits hostage in order to extend the Bush tax breaks to the top 2 percent. As we all know, the Republicans won. As a result, over \$200 billion was added to the deficit over the next 2 years. Not only did the Bush tax breaks for the wealthy get extended, they also got a reduction in the estate tax which benefits the top three-tenths of 1 percent.

Specifically, the December tax cut agreement extended the Bush income tax rates, and it cost us very substantially.

It is not just the Bush tax cuts that were extended. In March of this year our Republican friends said that unless we made very significant cuts, the Republicans were prepared to shut down the government, disrupt the economy, and deny paychecks to some 800,000 Federal workers—if they could not get their way. They said: We are going to shut down the government unless you make these Draconian cuts.

One of the cuts I was disturbed about—among many—was \$600 million to build new community health centers, which would keep people alive and end up saving money. There are other Draconian cuts, as well. They also cut Pell grants, making it harder for students to go to college. The point is, they acted as bullies and said: If we don't get our way, we are prepared to shut down the government.

Now we are back here again, and this is part 3 of the act. Part 1 was whether the middle class would get its tax breaks and whether unemployment benefits would be extended. The Republicans won. Part 2 is whether the government would be shut down. The Republicans mostly won and got almost everything they wanted.

Here we are, act 3, the biggest act of all; and the question is whether the Republicans will, in fact, not raise the debt ceiling. If they do that, it is quite possible that not only our country but

the entire world might be plunged into a major financial crisis.

This is what they are threatening: If we don't get everything we want, we are prepared not to pay our government's debt for the first time in the history of our country. We are prepared to see interest rates go up in a very fragile global economy. And we are prepared to see more and more instability.

In many ways, the Republicans in Washington are acting like schoolyard bullies. As we know, bullying is a very serious problem in our schools. Every educator worth his or her salt would tell us that when dealing with a bully, we must not give in to their tactics or tolerate their temper tantrums or allow them to hurt innocent people. We have to deal with them sternly and consistently. We cannot allow them to win by dictating the rules of the game and trampling over everybody else if they don't get their way.

We have a serious debt problem that must be solved, but it must be solved in a way that is fair and in a way that calls for shared sacrifice.

Let me conclude by suggesting that the American people are concerned about the deficit. They are also concerned about the economy, and they are also concerned that so many of our people—of all ages, in all parts of this country—are hanging on economically by their fingernails.

The American people understand that it is just not fair at all to come down on people who are already hurting and leave unscathed the wealthiest people in this country and large profitable corporations.

What I say today to the President of the United States is this: Mr. President, stand tall. Do not yield to Republican blackmail. Stand with the vast majority of the American people who believe that deficit reduction requires shared sacrifice—that everybody makes a sacrifice, not just working families, the elderly, the sick, and the poor.

With that, I yield the floor.

#### TRIBUTE TO OPAL OVERBEY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a devoted and hardworking Kentuckian. Ms. Opal Overbey has been honored in her hometown and will have her life story submitted to the Library of Congress for being an extraordinary woman who dedicated her life to her family and her work.

Born December 2, 1929, on Tom Cat Trail in Laurel County, KY, Opal was the fourth of eight children. Growing up, Opal remembers a childhood filled with love, laughter and hard work. Following the guidance of her parents—her mother, a committed housewife and her dad, a diligent farmer—she learned that a little hard work and determination goes a long way. Driven by a desire to be independent and earn her own money, Opal worked two jobs.

After many years at the local laundromat as well as working part time at the Crystal Kitchen, Opal moved into a small room in a house behind a jeweler with her cousins. Soon after, she met her husband of 62 years, Virgil Overbey.

When Opal was 17 she and Virgil got married. Together they had four children. Being a mother at a young age was a difficult feat to master, but Opal was determined to give her children a childhood similar to her own. As they got older, her eldest son Jim found a common interest with his mom, and together they built a greenhouse supplying flowers and crops for the community. After Virgil Overbey's unfortunate death on November 24, 2008, the greenhouse was a way for the family to stay together and enjoy each other's company while doing something they all loved.

Opal's greenhouse business continues today. She says that working at the greenhouse has always been a pleasurable experience, but it's the people and the customers that make it worthwhile: "I think in life you have to just work and treat people right, and be honest and the Lord will bless you." Her children have grown up and started families of their own, and Opal continues to help in any way that she can.

Kentucky is fortunate to have a hardworking and devoted woman like Opal Overbey. At 81 years of age, Opal has lived a lifetime of service to her community. I am sure her children Jim, Denver, Glenda, and Evelyn, as well as her whole family, are very proud of everything that she has accomplished and provided for her loved ones.

Mr. President, the Laurel County Sentinel Echo recently published an article highlighting Ms. Opal Overbey's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[FROM THE SENTINEL ECHO, LAUREL COUNTY,  
JUNE 8, 2011

#### LONDON'S LIVING TREASURES: PART 3

In the third installment of the Living Treasures project, we meet 81-year-old Opal Overbey, a fixture at Overbey's Greenhouse on Ky. 229. The only Living Treasure nominee who is a native of Laurel County, Overbey shared her life story, one that is characterized by love of family, love of the land and a tireless work ethic.

"I was born Dec. 2, 1929 here in Laurel County on Tom Cat Trail near Bush. My mother just raised all us youngin's, she was a housewife, and my dad farmed everything, tobacco, corn, whatever people grew then. He had about 80 acres of pastureland. He was a good, honest man. My mom was the same. There was eight of us, six sisters and two brothers. I was the fourth child down.

I had a happy childhood. Honey, we just played and had fun and worked also. Dad always made us hoe corn and whatever he was doing. He learned us to work. But we would play Hoopy Hide, tag, hopscotch, whatever kids played at that time. We used to take washes down to the creek where the water



was. And we'd swim, we had a good swimming hole place. That was fun-fun, we loved that. We had a childhood that was as normal as normal could be.

I went to Weaver School, a one-room school. We would walk to school, to and from it was probably about three miles. I wasn't in particularly a great student. I really didn't like school; I would rather stay home and wash clothes or something, if she would let me. I didn't really like any subject, except recess.

Whenever I was a kid you didn't go to the store to get what you needed, you put it up in the summertime. That was what she fed us on. She had a big garden, potatoes, corn, beans, cucumbers, just anything she could get seed for. She saved quite a lot of seed and kids used to go around and sell packets of seed back then and that's how she would get cucumber and beets and stuff like that.

My chores were milking, gathering the eggs, cleaning up, dishes, drawing water, we drew our water out of a well, you know. Mom caught her wash water when it came off the house. No plumbing, not when I was home, no electricity.

We had a big house with plenty of room. It was like everybody else's house then. It was made of weatherboarding. Our nearest neighbors were about a quarter of a mile away. A lot of them was my relatives. Uncle Perry and Aunt Rhilde Root and Ed and Polly Jones lived real close to us.

I had an uncle, Charlie, that got a radio, and we would go listen to the Grand Ole Opry at Uncle Charlie's on Saturday night. I was probably 6 or 8 years old. We would just sit around and listen at the radio.

We went to Flatwoods Christian Church. That was the only place we had to go. We went there quite a lot. I liked to go to church. Everybody in the community went, it was just a gathering place. You didn't have no movies or anything like that back then. Sometimes mom would take us all to a neighbor's house and we'd have dinner. Sometimes they went over with us. We had a real close neighborhood there, very good people.

Our mother basically made all of our dresses until we were big enough to work and earn them ourselves. I remember one dress in particular. Back then, I don't know if I was a state thing or something, anyway, we got some free clothes. That was my first ready-made dress and I never forgot that. It was just a solid brown, cotton summer dress, but it was made pretty and I loved it.

I was probably about 12 when I stopped going to school. I didn't get very much schooling. I wasn't interested in continuing. I just wanted to work.

I went to London and got me a little job in the laundry, and I worked there for Mr. Terry until me and Virgil got married. They had these presses and usually I pressed jeans and passed them on to somebody else. Me and a couple of my cousins, Eula Mao Smith and Deloris Smith, we got us a room in a big house that sat back from Barton's Jewelry Store and I worked, part-time now, not all the time.

London was pretty low back then. I remember when they had boards for the sidewalks. People tied their horses and their wagons at the foot of Manchester Street, where it started leveling out. Going out from London, it was on the left. Then they finally got Black Brothers buses running from Manchester to London, and then we still had to walk two or three miles down to catch that bus. A lot of walking went on back in them days. I went home every weekend on that bus.

I guess I got grown before my time and I wanted to work. I'm thinking I made about 20 cents an hour. I believe, best I can remem-

ber. I made \$18 to \$25 a week, but that was good money then. I always tried to buy me an outfit. You could buy one for a little bit of nothing, and I'd get me a new dress or a new something or other each week. I liked working. Honey, I liked making money, that's mostly what you worked for, ain't it? I worked off and on at the laundry for three or four years. I also worked at a restaurant part-time too, Crystal Kitchen. It was right by the bank, it was First National then. I would serve cheeseburgers and hot dogs and that's basically what we did. But when dad had gardening and stuff going on, I worked at home. That's why I only worked part-time. He'd let me work if we didn't have anything to do on the farm.

Honey, I met Virgil, who would become my husband, about three times. Before I even knew who he was, he'd always try to take me home. The first time I met him it was way on Blackwater or Cane Creek. We had took a cousin home and that's where I met him first. I was very young, probably 15.

When I first went out with him was probably maybe six or eight months after that. He was the nephew of my aunt that lived across the creek there. That was a great courtship. First place we went was to Renfro Valley. That was actually my first date with him. Honey, we got there too late for the first show so we just didn't wait for the second one, we come back home. Didn't even get to go in. I was sort of disappointed, but was having a good time. I knew right away that I liked Virgil. He was just a nice person. He was someone you was comfortable with.

I was barely 17 when we married. He was 23. He had just got out of the Army, he was in World War II. He asked me to marry him when I was 16, but I said, "Wait 'til I get 17." When I was, he just plain asked, we just set the date right after he asked me. I think maybe then I was staying with one of my aunts where she was having baby. I did that a lot when I was a kid. I worked all the time. I think that was my hobby.

We married Jan. 23, 1943. Lived here ever since. He had a couple of uncles that drove taxis and that's how we got to London to get married. Back then, you didn't have a big wedding. We got married by Morgan Williams, he was a preacher back then, at the courthouse. My aunt and uncle went with us to sign me. Honey, I wore a pretty, little, blue cotton dress, don't remember what I paid for it but it wasn't much. Then we took a taxi back.

We lived together almost 62 years. We stayed with his mother and dad for a week or two and we moved in this house. Virgil built it. Over the years, we just done things we wanted to the house. At the time, he went to work at a sawmill and worked there for a few years and then he went to Chaney's logging. Then he went straight into farming. That's basically what we've always done.

I was 18 when had my first child, my son Jim. Then three years later, I had Denver. Later on, I had two girls, Glenda and Evelyn was the baby. I had Evelyn six years after Glenda. I spread 'em out. I had little children there for about 20 years.

I remember having Jim. It was terrible. I had him at home, you know. Doctor Walthen, he came to the house. I think he was born about 2 in the morning. Doctor Walthen stayed I think a couple of nights because I had false labor. He hunted him a bed and went to sleep and stayed until Jim was born.

Once he was born, I just loved him to death—like any mother that's a good mother loves her children. Being a young mother, that took a little training. Virgil's mother, Nanny Overbey, she come every day and bathed the baby and did whatever needed to be done. I was grateful for her help because I didn't know the first thing.

I raised my children how I was raised. My kids played outside a lot. My days were getting up and cooking for them and doing my washing. I always cooked 'em three meals a day so that takes a good part of your day right there. Honey, I canned a lot, and potatoes saved a lot of lives back then. Of a morning, you'd fry eggs. Virgil always kept us plenty of meat in the freezer, so I'd fix meat and gravy, everybody always had gravy then, and biscuits. I cooked full meals then. That was how I was raised too. That's one thing you done, you ate good.

Honey, we had enough to get by on. You didn't have any bills back then. There was no bills to pay, so you just fed your family and bought what you had to buy and did whatever you had to do. We sure wasn't rich by no means, but we got by.

We got electricity the evening after Jim was born, on the 19th of October in '43. Oh, that was great. Got a refrigerator and a washer and the few things you had to have then. That beat washing on the board.

Jim was the leader. He always made sure they caught the bus on time; he was very reliable. They went to Camp Ground. They liked school pretty well. Well, Denver didn't, but Jim graduated from high school. My oldest girl got married about 15 and Evelyn started high school, and quit.

When Jim was about 9, he sold the first bushel of beans we ever sold. Set up on the road, it was just a gravel road back then. I think he got \$1.50 or \$2. Jim was like me, he liked to make money, he liked to have something going all the time. He was very inventive. From there, we just kept planting other stuff. It was right up my alley because we like to do the same thing. Selling, I was better at selling than anything else, that's what I liked to do. Both of my grandads had little country stores so I had that in me.

When Jim and his wife come back from Indiana, he started a greenhouse on the porch. Of an evening, we'd go and pick beans after we'd close from selling. We'd sell up near the road at first and several years ago, we backed off of the road when the main road come through, it got too dangerous. It got so hot that one year we put fans in the greenhouse there and that cooled us. It was a lot more comfortable when we moved off the road.

Having a greenhouse wasn't common back then, not in this community. It took a while. We even sold in the yard under a tree for a while. And we'd roll our wagon with the shade as the day wore on.

Virgil died Nov. 24, '08. We lived together 62 years and that was a great loss for me. He always farmed, that's what he loved to do. And he loved working in the greenhouse and he watered and did a lot of the greenhouse work. It was always a family affair, we all worked.

Jim still runs the greenhouse and I just help him a little whenever I can, which is basically every day, except Sunday. Honey, I still work anywhere from eight to 10 hours a day. I go over there at 8 and we was closing at 6, but now we're there 'til 7 or 7:30. But I don't do a lot of work back in the greenhouse. I like visiting with people. It's just what I like.

Since Virgil's gone, we don't do a whole lot of gardening. He was our plower, our planter, everything. He was a good farmer, Virgil was. I've worked ever since just for my children, help my youngin's, that's what I like to do. I like to talk and visit with people and I meet so many nice people. I do anything I can to help someone who comes along, that's my nature. I think in life you have to just work and treat people right, and be honest and the Lord will bless you.'

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## HAWAII 2011 NATIONAL HISTORY DAY WINNERS

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate a group of exceptional students and teachers from the State of Hawaii for their participation in the 2011 Kenneth E. Behring National History Day Contest. This year's theme, "Debate and Diplomacy in History: Successes, Failure, Consequences," was the starting point for student projects nationwide.

The National History Day, NHD, is a highly regarded academic program for elementary and secondary school students. Each year, over a half a million students participate in the NHD contest where students choose historical topics related to a theme and conduct extensive primary and secondary research through libraries, archives, museums, oral history interviews and historic sites. Once students draw their conclusions about their topics' significance in history, they present their work in original papers, Web sites, exhibits, performances and documentaries. The projects are entered into competitions in the spring at local and state levels where they are evaluated by professional historians and educators. National History Day culminates with the Kenneth E. Behring National Contest at the University of Maryland at College Park each June.

This year, two student teams from Hawaii received national honors. Kamaile Aluli, Kaylee Alana Miller and Truman Spring from Laie Elementary School placed first in the junior Web site competition with their entry titled, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: the Battle over Hetch Hetchy." Their teachers are Serena Tuliloa and Colleen Spring. Moanalua High School students Janal Kim, Keri Ann Nagaishi and Kelly Zakimi took second place for their senior group exhibit, "Creation of Pakistan." Their teacher is Angela Brooks.

As a former educator, I am pleased to see our keiki succeeding on a national level. Throughout my career in Congress, I have worked closely with my colleagues to ensure that students in Hawaii and the nation have quality teachers, schools and academic programs. The Kenneth E. Behring National History Day Contest is one such program that offers children who have a passion for history, a way of rewarding them for their hard work.

Once again I offer my sincere congratulations and aloha to all the students and teachers who participated in the 2011 Kenneth E. Behring National History Day Contest and wish them all success in their academic futures.●

## AWWA PIPE TAPPING CHAMPIONS

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Honolulu Board of Water Supply, HBWS, women's team that won the American Water Works

Association, AWWA, Pipe Tapping Contest in Washington, DC, on June 15, 2011. Known as the Wahine, the HBWS women captured the first place title for a second year in a row at the 130th AWWA Annual Conference with a time of 2:35.81 minutes. This was the third AWWA Championship for the team, having won in 2010 and 2005.

The Wahine faced off against four rivals in a contest where top utility teams race to tap a cement-lined, ductile iron pipe. The women of HBWS demonstrated amazing skill and showcased the expertise of AWWA members.

The HBWS Wahine includes Cat Sawai, setter, Susan Oda, copper, and Danielle Ornellas, cranker. The team was led by coach Gary Fernandez.

I congratulate the Honolulu Board of Water Supply Wahine on their accomplishment, and I wish all of them the best in their future endeavors. I extend the same congratulations to all members of the Honolulu Board of Water Supply who participated in this year's AWWA Conference on a job well done.●

## TRIBUTE TO LARRY AND BARBI WEINBERG

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Winston Churchill once said, "We make a living by what we get, but we make a life by what we give." Today I honor two great Americans who have made a wonderful life by what they have given. Lawrence and Barbara Weinberg, or Larry and Barbi as their family and friends know them, have given much to their faith, to their country, and to their family and friends. Today I call attention to their service that the good life they have made can serve as an example to us all.

Larry answered our Nation's call to duty and served in the U.S. Infantry in France during World War II. He was nearly killed by the explosion of a landmine. While he was injured on the ground, a German soldier bayoneted him in the stomach. He remained motionless and isolated for over thirteen hours. Against all odds, he was rescued by a Catholic Army Chaplain and spent a year recovering in the hospital.

After Larry was discharged from both the hospital and the Army, he met Barbi. It was the summer of 1946. They married 6 months later. Larry then started a Los Angeles home-building business. He began with just four houses, but built his company to become the Larwin Group Companies, the largest privately owned single-family housing producer in the United States. He later became the principal owner and CEO of the Portland Trailblazers from 1975-1988, and served on the board of governors of the National Basketball Association from 1980-1983.

Together, Larry and Barbi have been unwavering supporters of the Jewish community and Israel. In 1973, Barbi was elected president of the Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, becoming the first woman to be elected president of a major federation

in the United States. She used her position to expand the previously secular Foundation to Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed Jewish congregations.

Larry also continued his work supporting the American-Israeli relationship. He was elected president of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, AIPAC, in 1976 for 5 years, later serving as its chairman from 1982-1987. He is known as the founder of modern AIPAC.

Larry established the Jewish Foundation Barbi Weinberg Chai Award to honor individuals who have made an outstanding contribution to the enhancement of and appreciation for Jewish life. Barbi sponsored a program to prepare junior and senior high school students with the knowledge, confidence, and training to speak up for themselves and for Israel, and to fight anti-Semitism and anti-Israel bias on college campuses. These programs are so important for our Nation's youth.

In 1984, Barbi founded the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. This research foundation has become one of the most influential think tanks in Washington, advising policymakers on Middle East issues.

Larry and Barbi have lived a life of dedicated public service. They are most proud, however, of their loving dedication to their family. During their 64 years together, Larry and Barbi have 4 children, 12 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren. All are hardworking, successful Americans that share Larry and Barbi's commitment to public service.

Larry and Barbi truly have made a good life by what they have given. I am proud to consider myself a friend. And may their service be an example to us all.●

## LUBEC, MAINE

• Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, Lubec, ME, is the easternmost town in the United States, the place where the rising Sun first shines on America. That unique geographic location has special meaning in this, Lubec's bicentennial year. Today, as they have for two centuries, the people of Lubec greet every day with the optimism and determination each dawn brings.

Located on a slender peninsula that separates Passamaquoddy Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, Lubec is more than a town on the sea. It is a town of the sea. Its 95 miles of shoreline once were lined with cargo-filled docks, shipyards, sail makers, canneries, smokehouses, and tide-powered sawmills. Its namesake, Lubeck, Germany, was chosen to emulate that ancient seafaring city's role as a center of open and free trade. The magnificent sea captain homes throughout the town stand as monuments to Lubec's role as an early hub of America's global commerce.

Now, it is a shoreline of aquaculture pens, lobster traps, and urchin and scallop boats. For those seeking a genuine downeast Maine experience, the

former “Sardine Capital of the World” has become an outdoor recreation paradise, an ecotourism destination, and a haven for artists. The West Quoddy Lighthouse, with its iconic red and white stripes, is recognized the world over. The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Bridge, the link to Campobello Island, New Brunswick, gives Lubec an international flavor.

The town of Lubec was incorporated on June 21, 1811, but its origins lie in prehistory. For 12,000 years before the first European settlers arrived, the land was home to the Passamaquoddy Tribe, and the original “People of the Dawn” still are part of the community today.

Lubec is a town of the first light and of the first patriots. One early settler was Colonel John Allan who in 1777 was charged by General George Washington with defending the remote yet vital region. He repelled a British amphibious invasion and forged an alliance for liberty with the Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, and Micmac tribes. Another early resident was Hopley Yeaton, who served in the Continental Navy. In 1790, he was appointed by President George Washington as the first commissioned officer in our young Nation’s maritime security and safety service—he is known today as the “Father of the United States Coast Guard.”

During the War of 1812, Lubec stood strong against a British occupation just 2 miles across the bay. In the Civil War, 200 young men—one-eighth of the town’s entire population—answered the call of freedom. Lubec’s commitment reaches from the front lines to the home front—during World War II, the workers at the R.J. Peacock Canning Company received a special citation from the War Food Department for their untiring efforts and patriotic service.

And the town has found itself on the front lines in the conflicts of our time. On September 11, 2001, Jackie and Robert Norton were flying to California for a family wedding. They perished at the World Trade Center. The people of Lubec will always remember those dear neighbors who, from their beautiful gardens to their community service, gave so much to the town.

The spirit of Lubec is exemplified in the life of Myron Avery. From the tiny North Lubec Grammar School and the village high school, he went on to Bowdoin College and Harvard Law School to become a jurist of national renown. He served our Nation in both world wars as a Navy officer. In between, he turned the vision of the Appalachian Trail into reality and was the first to hike its entire 2,000 miles in one effort, from Georgia to Maine. Commitment to service, reverence for nature, and building for the future—that is the spirit of Lubec.

On this Fourth of July, Lubec, ME, will hold its Grand Bicentenary Jubilee. It will be a day of great food, music, and fun. It will be a day for the people of this wonderful town to look

back at the past two centuries with pride, and to look ahead at the century to come with optimism and determination.●

#### ARMOUR, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I recognize the community of Armour, SD, on reaching the 125th anniversary of its founding. Armour is a energetic community, which serves as the county seat for Douglas County, and will be celebrating its quasiquicentennial July 1 through 4.

The town Armour, being founded in 1886, has the notable distinction of being a city before South Dakota achieved statehood. On the day that President Benjamin Harrison’s proclamation of statehood for South Dakota reached Armour, the residents rang the brand new school bell to celebrate and alert the town. The children of Armour have always come first in the eyes of the residents; the first school was built just 1 year after the city was founded. Armour also claims to be home to the first Boy Scout Troop in the State of South Dakota.

Today the town of Armour still holds education and children in high regards, and in 2008 Armour was one of only 320 schools in the Nation to be honored as a blue ribbon school for academic excellence. Armour will celebrate its 125th anniversary by holding an all-school reunion, as well as many other community events such as trolley rides, a 5K race, and chili cook-off.

Armour is a thriving community that maintains small town values. Even 125 years after its founding, Armour remains a vital community and a great asset to the wonderful State of South Dakota. I am proud to publicly honor Armour on this historic milestone, and congratulate the people of Armour on their achievements.●

#### CLAREMONT, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I recognize the 125th anniversary of the founding of Claremont, SD. Claremont, home of the Honkers, is a thriving community located in Brown County. The city of Claremont is a town that contributes greatly to the identity of rural South Dakota.

Located along the Great Northern Railway, the vibrant community of Claremont was founded in 1886 and formally incorporated in 1903. Claremont’s rich history began with its prosperous farmers and railroad workers. The creation of the railroad was essential to the survival of the town. Claremont thrived thanks to the rich soil and accessibility to clean water. Like many frontier towns, the residents endured blizzards, droughts, and fires. The commitment of the early settlers to the land truly embodied the pioneer spirit, and can be seen in the actions of the residents even today.

The men’s softball team, the Honkers, calls Claremont home. They

are the pride of the town and bring the community together to celebrate America’s pastime. Along with sports, Claremont is well known for the ample geese that fly over the town, providing enjoyment to hunters and nature enthusiasts alike.

Claremont will be commemorating its quasiquicentennial celebration with softball and volleyball games, a parade, a 5K road race, food, dancing, and fireworks. To wrap up a fun-filled weekend, Claremont has planned an outdoor church service and potluck lunch. Other festivities include an all school reunion, old time photos, and a historical display.

Mr. President, 125 years after its founding, Claremont is still a wholesome, rural community with true South Dakota values. I am proud to recognize the achievements of Claremont and to congratulate its residents on this memorable occasion.●

#### FERNEY, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the community of Ferney, SD, on reaching the 125th anniversary of its founding. Ferney, located in Brown County, truly is a community born from the railroad and will be celebrating its quasiquicentennial the weekend of July 2-3.

Named after the French hometown of the wife of a railroad official, Ferney is a community with a colorful past. For many German families, Ferney was a treasure they could call home. The local Lutheran Church even held services in both German and English into the 1930s. During prohibition Ferney was one of the few cities in South Dakota to continue the sale of alcohol. Ferney’s past was born from the Chicago Northwestern Rail Road, but the town was sustained through agriculture.

Today agriculture still plays a major role in the life of the residents of Ferney. The local co-op provides the area with the farming needs to keep the crops fertile. While small, Ferney continues to prosper with local business such as the Ferney Farmers Bar and Grill and Harry Implements, Inc. These small businesses make each and every town in South Dakota a unique treasure. Ferney plans to celebrate this milestone by holding numerous events, including a parade, tractor pull, softball tournament, and street dance.

South Dakota has a reputation for kindness and hard work. The residents of Ferney embody this wholesome reputation that makes South Dakota a place you want to call home, and I congratulate the citizens of Ferney on their accomplishments over the last 125 years and look forward to their future endeavors.●

## HARROLD, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I recognize the community of Harrold, SD, for the tremendous milestone of reaching the 125th anniversary of its founding. Harrold is a close-knit community located in Hughes County, and represents the small town spirit that makes South Dakota stand out in the Midwest.

Named after Harrold McCullaugh, an officer of the Chicago and North Western Railroad, people began settling in the Harrold area around 1883 thanks in part to the newly built railroad line and rich farm land. Harrold was incorporated in 1886. The town thrived with the creation of a post office, new businesses, churches, and a school. Through adversity over the years including crop failures, blizzards, and tornadoes, the people of Harrold have shown resiliency and maintain pride in their community.

Today the town of Harrold has become a hunter's paradise. Many hunting lodges call Harrold home and offer visitors and community members the thrill of hunting game such as pheasant. Even with the great hunting opportunities, agriculture still exists as the lifeblood of the community. In more recent years, the Global Harvest Birdseed Company has expanded their business and brought needed jobs to this Midwest community.

Harrold will be celebrating its quasiquintennial the weekend of July 2-3. The town will celebrate this milestone with many community activities including a parade, antique tractor pull, nickel in a haystack scramble, rib fest, and street dance.

Even 125 years after its founding, Harrold remains as a shining example of the steadfast spirit of small-town South Dakota. Harrold was built on hard work and solid values, and serves as a reminder of South Dakota's rich heritage. This grand achievement will serve to bring this close-knit community even closer. I am proud to honor the people of Harrold on this memorable occasion, and to extend my congratulations to them.●

## TRIPP, SOUTH DAKOTA

• Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of Tripp, SD. Tripp, a small town located in Hutchinson County, will be celebrating its quasiquintennial the weekend of July 1-3.

Tripp was incorporated in 1888 and named after Judge Bartlett C. Tripp. On his way to California, Judge Tripp fell in love with the area and chose to make it his home. Judge Tripp was later appointed chief justice of the Dakota Supreme Court in 1885 by President Cleveland, and also served as the U.S. Minister to Austria-Hungary. Although a diplomat, Judge Tripp identified with the possibilities that South Dakota offered.

Today, the importance of community to this vibrant town is evident in the presence of their well-maintained school, local businesses, and churches. The Veteran's Memorial is a popular tourist attraction and brings community pride to the residents and honors the military members that served their country. Tripp will celebrate its 125th anniversary with many activities including a race on the local fairgrounds.

Tripp is a thriving town that maintains true South Dakota values. I congratulate the citizens of Tripp on their accomplishments over the last 125 years and look forward to seeing their future endeavors.●

## SCHLOSSBERG COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, any of us who have been in public life have learned—sometimes the hard way—the virtues of something our late colleague Ted Kennedy believed was a secret to success particularly in the U.S. Senate, which is the importance of taking our work seriously but not taking ourselves too seriously. We still miss the booming laughter of Ted Kennedy that seems still today to echo through the Democratic cloakroom. It was a trait Ted shared with his brother, President Kennedy, whose quick wit is still celebrated today, the self-deprecating humor which summarized his World War II exploits on PT 109—“they sank my ship”—and described the joys of the Presidency—“the pay is good and I can walk to work”—which too often is missing in a modern day Washington where self-importance can sometimes trump the important work to be done. As President Kennedy himself once said, “There are three things which are real; God, Human Folly and Laughter. The first two are beyond our comprehension so we must do what we can with the third.”

A sense of humor is not genetic, but apparently in the Kennedy family it can be inherited. In President Kennedy's grandson, Jack Schlossberg, this quality seems to abide.

I got to know Jack well when he spent time here in the Senate both as a page and as an intern in my office. It was a difficult time for the Kennedy family when Teddy himself couldn't be here as he was battling illness, but Ted enjoyed very much the stories he heard and the photos he cherished of his great-nephew hard at work in the Senate Ted loved. When Jack wasn't busy with his page duties, particularly during the late night votes when in previous years Teddy himself would have been found regaling his colleagues with stories and laughs, I enjoyed hearing from Jack about all the lessons he had learned from his uncle.

One of those lessons—the importance of humor—was clearly taken to heart by young Jack—something I learned last week reading Jack's valedictory address this month to his classmates at the Collegiate School and delivered his

speech as valedictorian. Jack's speech is flavored with all the inside jokes that will forever be the shorthand history of the 13 years he and most of his classmates spent at Collegiate—the cello body slam, the sumo wrestler videos, the ballad of Bubba Grandoo, when Carlo broke the silence—all the absurdity and antics of years fully enjoyed while learning. Jack's speech is also defined by a deep understanding of what holds real value in this life—teachers who care, friends who share, parents who love—truths that Jack and his classmates will surely carry in the years ahead after graduating from Collegiate.

Mr. President, particularly for all of us who know it is important to stop and laugh from time to time, Jack's speech really is required reading, and I would like to have printed in the RECORD, with congratulations to Jack, and the knowledge that Teddy's booming laughter could be heard echoing all over heaven following along with every word.

The information follows.

## COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

(By Jack Schlossberg)

Faculty, parents, students, esteemed guests, present clergy, Mr. Rosenthal, I thank you for your warm welcome and for being here today. I wanted to discuss my time at Collegiate and my class, but this is neither the time nor the place. But really, it is with great honor that I make my speech as your valedictorian, looks like my hard work paid off.

I want to begin with our teachers. My class would not be sitting here, heading to the fantastic places we're going next year, without our teachers. The curiosity, the energy, the devotion . . . the tolerance that you bring to this school is what makes it so great . . . Doctor Clarke and Mrs. Heard taught us history and her story. Doctor Bresnick, Mrs. Beresford and Mrs. Hansen have introduced us to characters and explored philosophy. Mrs. Foley has taught us, well actually on the smart kids, how to understand things that I never will, and Dr. Sigismondi has brought us to appreciate the high levels math has to offer. We also thank the maintenance staff and those administrators who make our school run smoothly despite the mess we make.

We understand that we do not come by the strength and unity of our school by ourselves. Our teachers encourage us just as much as we encourage each other to—get weird. In what other school, I ask you, could El Hajj and Todd Layton be clapped offstage for no apparent reason? The things we say at Friday night games would not be tolerated on any TV show or in any public venue. We're able to act this way because our teachers love us no matter what. And, although some are more lenient than others, Hola Senor, each teacher entertains our absurdity because they understand how important it is for us to have the freedom to be ourselves. Sometimes we go too far, Hola Mrs. Aidoo, and for this we apologize, but we are grateful for all the love and support of our antics.

On a different note, Collegiate has provided me with something truly irreplaceable: a second set of parents, and a third, and a fourth, and a fifth, and I think this is true for all of us. While my mother and father provide me with more than enough parenting, who wouldn't want 54 other sets of parents watching over their every single move?

You, the Collegiate parents, are what make this day possible. You have you each raised one of the greatest children of all time, you have dealt with all of us during the most stressful times of our lives, you have helped each other through hardships, you have taught us so much of what we know; we can only hope to grow up to be nothing like you.

Surprisingly, now I would like to say a few words about my class. For many of us, Collegiate has been our life since the age of 5. That's 13 years, or 91 in dog years, looking at you Bresnick, you dog—probably the longest time most of us will ever stay in one place. So condense with me, if you will, those thirteen years into a time span of but a week here at school. On Monday morning, under this standard, we arrived at school, some of us potty trained, and some of us not quite there, Spaznick you dog, and began our Collegiate careers.

Things started fast that Monday morning. Star Sawyer introduced us all to the language of love. Abby Newlan renamed Pinsky, "Mikey" but was soon left due to a job opening at Oprah's famed girls school in South Africa. Wait, no, wrong joke. K1 ran train on K2, a trend that has since continued. And that afternoon, after nap time, we entered First grade. Sadly, Eliot Snyder overslept and missed moving up day.

Under the reign of Beth Tashlik, our serious academia began. We counted and estimated the number of peanut M&M's in a jar, getting our first proverbial nut. Then, Mrs. Hutchinson met Andrew Newhouse, and it took her less than a month to literally "hit the roof" after his contagious laughter got the better of our entire grade in an assembly featuring several videos of sumo wrestlers. That afternoon we went home, entirely unsuspecting of the rude awakening Tuesday morning and Second grade would bring us.

Second grade was a roller coaster of a year, let me tell you. I had my first kiss, and no, not with Martha Miasaka as the legend suggests, instead it came from the wonder from down under, Mrs. Brydon on Kissmiss eve. We went on "mini-trips" and hit all New York's hotspots. Some went to the Statue of Liberty; some went to Dannie and Eddie's, and some to the Empire State building. We also got our first new kid, a great addition to our grade, William Janover. But, it wasn't all fun and games. We learned to writeursive, which none of us can still do, and we lost some real good men out there: Drew Glicker and Spensor Ong left Collegiate for the greener pastures of . . . God knows where.

We then went to lunch in the third floor cafeteria, came upstairs, and were wonderfully surprised with what the lower school handed us: Mrs. Dopp, Mrs. McCauley, Mrs. Thompson and Mrs. Mullis taught us 3rd grade. All were great, but only one gave Doug Gleicher the finger. We learned our times tables and got separated into reading groups. During music, Chris Cargill was crowned our major-minor king, but was soon usurped by his twin, the evil Courtland.

By the end of Tuesday, we were the seniors of the lower school. I finally had final cut on my Iktome story, and Abowitz couldn't do a thing about it. Science got interesting when Mr. Duarte mixed one of his own pellets in with the owls'. Oddly enough, that group still found a mouse's skeleton.

On Wednesday, we were thrown into the world of Tashjiniian metaphors: the Canada Goose, the Pythagorean theorem, Phil the Lobsterman, and the Purple Cabbage provided us all with limitless inspiration. Needless to say, things were different in 5th grade. We were at the mercy of a new set of teachers. We were asked to turn in homework. We got four new kids, four studs, Ola,

Darien, Adam, and Billy Janover. We almost got one more, but instead we were left with the four first names that still make our fingers tingle: Aaron Ashley Marshall Bob.

We then began 6th grade and had a ball. Rolling Thunder Heard our Cry when we were forced to spend three days with the George Jackson School on a wilderness trip. May Mandeep Singh rest in peace. And, in the funniest memory I have of Collegiate, David Wilks body slammed a cello, I kid you not. David felt badly, but Mr. Lastraps kindly turned his blind eye to the wreckage.

Many of us became men on Wednesday afternoon, as Bar Mitzvah season quickly changed our lives. At the time, I was not built for the hora. A portly young man with a sweet tooth, I had trouble with the chocolate fountains, the neckties, and the dance floor. Many of you felt my pain, looking at you Jeff Wilks, but others capitalized on it. Nissan moved well to hip-hop and Lynfield was built for slow songs. Still, I danced with a few cuties on those fine evenings, and all too often the party went from 6 all the way to midnight. Things got even crazier during school, we had sports teams and final exams. I never got above a B in either. Plus, no one felt safe in the lunch room, as Henri MacArthur's ridicule knew no bounds.

Finally, Wednesday afternoon and 8th grade provided our first taste of entitlement. We didn't get away with much though, as Ms. Bell made men of us boys. By then Alvin, Will Grant, Yuri David Yan and Bill Janover had joined us due to the gigantic void left by Cary Jones. Alvin and Grant sang us the ballad of Bubba Grandoo, at first this and their other songs seemed impressive, but later we found out they stole all but the nonsensical lyrics from Madonna. The other two were even more controversial. Yan took away Sam Bresnick's only claim to fame: height. And Yuri made us all look like morons.

Hump day had passed and when a new day dawned, 9th grade slapped us all across the face. Along with 11 new kids, William included, Mrs. Hansen joined our grade in entering the Upper School, and she loved everything about us from day 1. Things definitely changed for us, grades started to matter, which gave Mr. Rubin way too much leverage. The work was more demanding, but our classes and teachers were more dynamic. Yes, Biology and Mr. Wong intrigued us all, but you all know that's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about our Geometry teacher, whose name I am not permitted to say. I cannot begin to describe him to younger grades, I dare not make fun of his table manners, teaching style, physique or general disposition in front of his colleagues, and uncovering the truth behind he and Dustin Satloff's SatBat contract may require legal action. So, I decided it best to leave him out entirely. Some things didn't change though. Maybe it was something in the water, or maybe it was the fertility pills hidden in the Muenster bagels, but French teachers came and went like they had since Middle School. And even though school took over my entire life starting Thursday morning, I truly believe it was the start of a great four years, an endeavor that improved and matured us all.

There was a fire drill on Thursday afternoon. That was 10th grade.

TGIF had a whole new meaning as Junior year began. You all remember the constant work, the SAT prep, and the terrors of applying to College looming at all times. If it weren't for the constant influx of cheerful show tunes from Dr. Maglione I doubt I would have made it through the year. But we all did make it through, and we came out much stronger than we went in. We learned a lot about each other and our grade came together, especially after our trip to Shelter

Island. In fact, I think the 4 time champion Collegiate Basketball team owes a lot to Shelter Island and to Matt Roth. Finally, Friday nights were filled with spirits, spirits that cheered our team to victory.

Friday afternoon was our turn to show Collegiate what we were made of. With Nissan at the helm, we made use of our final year. At first though, our future was uncertain. Overwhelmed with College apps, we rarely made time for fun or games. Some just couldn't take the stress. After his year of fine women and tanning, Jamie broke out in hives upon his first glance at the common app. But we all calmed down after a while. We slowly recuperated and got back to our roots. We cared and we shared. Cared about each other, and if you're Jesse, shared Taxis with girls. We then emerged as a talented bunch. The debate team, with outstanding speaker Hunter Ford competed valiantly at Yale and the Science Olympiads made states and traveled to West Point. Eric Judge finally decided to get a freakin' job and the basketball team made us all so proud when they brought back a 4th consecutive championship. And finally, let us not forget, we produced Upper West: the duo that has been called Sultry meets Punk meets Rap meets Tectonique meets . . . Dub Step meets Flogenic meets a lot of criticism.

To top it off, one more extraordinary thing happened, joking aside. When Carlo broke the silence last year, I thought I'd never see something more moving or inspirational. This is not something to be overlooked. It is rare. It is powerful. It is a testament both to the strength of Carlo and of our entire school. We hope we've risen to the occasion, and we thank you for your example.

I never thought we would be seniors, and certainly never imagined we would graduate, not because we're not smart—we're geniuses, and not because we're bad people—we're saints, but because 2011 was always the year that was miles away.

That brings us to this moment, Friday afternoon of our final day at school. Collegiate has made us who we are today, and we will strive to live by the values we learned here. We leave Collegiate with the hopes of a fun weekend ahead—a weekend that should last the rest of our lives. Thank you.●

#### WISCONSIN TECHNICAL COLLEGE

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am honored to have the opportunity to congratulate the Wisconsin Technical College System on their centennial celebration marking 100 years of contributing to my State and our Nation.

The early 1900s brought the Industrial Revolution and marked the onset of what would ultimately become a pivotal time in our Nation's history. In Wisconsin, our paper, shipbuilding and steel industries were poised for growth and required workers who were highly skilled and educated in these burgeoning trades.

It was this critical need that inspired one of Wisconsin's foremost educational pioneers, Dr. Charles McCarthy, the first director of what is now known as the Legislative Reference Bureau, to suggest a new model of education for Wisconsin. Dr. McCarthy's idea was based on the belief that, for many in Wisconsin, higher education could be obtained through a new model of learning. This model of learning would not only assist in meeting the

new workforce demands of the Industrial Revolution, but would also provide expanded access for all residents to a higher level of education. In 1911, my home State of Wisconsin became the first State to establish a system of support for technical, vocational and adult education.

What ensued in the following decades through the first World War and the Great Depression emphasized the importance of vocational skills training and propelled the growth of the technical system. By the time that World War II began, Wisconsin's Technical College System had garnered a national reputation for excellence, prompting the Federal Government to allocate over \$4.6 billion into the State to aid the war effort. By the 1960s, the success and value of the system had been firmly established and the State legislature mandated that vocational districts be established throughout Wisconsin by 1970.

What began with an idea more than a century ago, the Wisconsin Technical College System has continued to set the standard for our Nation. The system currently serves 400,000 students on 47 campuses every year, helping to shape the future of our State and prepare the workers for tomorrow. Even in these difficult economic times, access to high quality education for all people remains crucial in ensuring that not only Wisconsin but the Nation, moves forward. I am very proud to recognize the Wisconsin Technical College System on its centennial celebration and for all it has done for the State of Wisconsin and its citizens.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1249. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

H.R. 2279. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University: Mr. YODER of Kansas and Ms. WOOLSEY of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Speaker reappoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Mr. Jeffrey W. Thomas of Columbus, Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 194 of title 14, United States Code, Mr. MICA, Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the United States Coast Guard Academy Board of Visitors: Mr. FRANK GUINTA of New Hampshire, Mr. ANDY HARRIS of Maryland, and Mr. RICK LARSEN of Washington.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1276. A bill to repeal the authority to provide certain loans to the International Monetary Fund, the increase in the United States quota to the Fund, and certain other related authorities, to rescind related appropriated amounts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2021. An act to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1249. An act to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2279. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cloquintocet-mexyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 8877-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2280. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Diethylene glycol mono butyl ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 8876-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2281. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Propylene Oxide; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 8877-7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2282. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67)(Docket No. FEMA-2011-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2283. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Nashville, TN" (MB Docket No. 11-29; RM-11622) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2284. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Brackettville, Texas)" (MB Docket No. 09-219) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2285. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "West Virginia Regulatory Program" (Docket No. WV-117-FOR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2286. A communication from the Chief of the Endangered Species Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Tumbling Creek Cavesnail" (RIN1018-AW90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2287. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and Delisting Branch, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Listing Protections for the Virginia Northern Flying Squirrel in Compliance with a Court Order" (RIN1018-AX80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2288. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and Delisting Branch, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Nonessential Experimental Population of Bull Trout in the Clackamas River Subbasin, Oregon" (RIN1018-AW60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2289. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designations of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Alabama: Birmingham; Determination of Attaining Data for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Standard" (FRL No. 9426-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2290. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana—Air Quality, Subchapter 7 and Other Subchapters" (FRL No. 9223-1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2291. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision" (FRL No. 9323-4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2292. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska" (FRL No. 9317-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2293. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois; Royal Fiberglass Pools, Inc. Adjusted Standard" (FRL No. 9319-2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2294. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—July 2011" (Rev. Rul. 2011-14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 23, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2295. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Time for Filing Returns" (RIN1545-BH88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2296. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Optional Standard Mileage Rates" (Announcement No. 2011-40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2297. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Under Section 956 for Determining the Basis of Property Acquired in Certain Nonrecognition Transactions" (RIN1545-BH56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2298. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers: Rules Relating to Internal Claims and Appeals and External Review Processes" (RIN1210-AB45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

EC-2299. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to support Proton Rocket Launch Vehicle integration and launch of the EchoStar 16 commercial satellite in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2300. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to the Commonwealth of Australia for Enhanced Position Location Reporting System (EPLRS), EPLRS Extended Frequency (EPLRS-XF) and MicroLight Radio Equipment in the amount of \$25,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2301. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to support the design, manufacturing and delivery phases of the Azerspace/Africast-1a Commercial Communications Satellite Program for Azerbaijan in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2302. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to support the manufacture of SPY1-D/F Components for the United States Navy Fleet and the United States Navy Foreign Military Sales Program in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2303. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Japan for the manufacture and assembly of parts and components for the Strapdown Inertial System and the HDC301 Computer; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2304. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a manufacturing license

agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Spain for the collaboration on new designs and other engineering efforts related to the design of sporting guns and rifles and associated components; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2305. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services for the manufacture of military flex and rigid circuit assemblies for use in defense systems in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2306. A communication from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report for 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2307. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers: Rules Relating to Internal Claims and Appeals and External Review Processes" (RIN0938-AQ66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 24, 2010; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2308. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. 1279. A bill to prepare disconnected youth for a competitive future; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 1280. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 1281. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1282. A bill to expand the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium to include the SUNY National Center for Security and Preparedness; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WEBB (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. INOUE):

S. Res. 217. A resolution calling for a peaceful and multilateral resolution to maritime territorial disputes in Southeast Asia; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 89

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 201

At the request of Mr. COONS, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 201, a bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the C.C. Cragin Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 411

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into agreements with States and nonprofit organizations to collaborate in the provision of case management services associated with certain supported housing programs for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 414, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 507

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New

York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 507, a bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid abuse, diversion, and deaths.

S. 510

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 510, a bill to prevent drunk driving injuries and fatalities, and for other purposes.

S. 534

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 534, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain small producers.

S. 571

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend subtitle B of title VII of the McKinney—Vento Homeless Assistance Act to provide education for homeless children and youths, and for other purposes.

S. 630

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 630, a bill to promote marine and hydrokinetic renewable energy research and development, and for other purposes.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a definition under that Act.

S. 868

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 868, a bill to restore the long-standing partnership between the States and the Federal Government in managing the Medicaid program.

S. 951

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 958

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 958, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to prevent online threats to economic creativity and theft of intellectual property, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, *supra*.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1013, a bill to renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1061

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor



of S. 1061, a bill to amend title 5 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the award of fees and other expenses in cases brought against agencies of the United States, to require the Administrative Conference of the United States to compile, and make publically available, certain data relating to the Equal Access to Justice Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to reauthorize the Combating Autism Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-416).

S. 1228

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to prohibit trafficking in counterfeit military goods or services.

S. 1263

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1263, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Silver Alert plans throughout the United States and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S.J. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 20, a joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya.

S.J. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 21, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S. RES. 185

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 185, a resolution reaffirming the commitment of the United States to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, reaffirming opposition to the inclusion of Hamas in a unity government unless it is willing to accept peace with Israel and renounce violence, and declaring that Palestinian

efforts to gain recognition of a state outside direct negotiations demonstrates absence of a good faith commitment to peace negotiations, and will have implications for continued United States aid.

S. RES. 213

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 213, a resolution commending and expressing thanks to professionals of the intelligence community.

AMENDMENT NO. 512

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 512 proposed to S. 679, a bill to reduce the number of executive positions subject to Senate confirmation.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 217—CALLING FOR A PEACEFUL AND MULTILATERAL RESOLUTION TO MARITIME TERRITORIAL DISPUTES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. WEBB (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. INOUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 217

Whereas, on June 9, 2011, 3 vessels from China, including 1 fishing vessel and 2 maritime security vessels, ran into and disabled the cables of an exploration ship from Vietnam, the VIKING 2;

Whereas that use of force occurred within 200 nautical miles of Vietnam, an area recognized as its Exclusive Economic Zone;

Whereas, on May 26, 2011, a maritime security vessel from China cut the cables of another exploration ship from Vietnam, the BINH MINH, in the South China Sea in waters near Cam Ranh Bay;

Whereas, in March 2011, the Government of the Philippines reported that patrol boats from China attempted to ram 1 of its surveillance ships;

Whereas those incidents occurred within disputed maritime territories of the South China Sea, including the Spratly Islands, composed of 21 islands and atolls, 50 submerged land atolls, and 28 partly submerged reefs over an area of 340,000 square miles, and the Paracel Islands, a smaller group of islands located south of China's Hainan Island;

Whereas China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Brunei have disputed territorial claims over the Spratly Islands, and China and Vietnam have a disputed claim over the Paracel Islands;

Whereas the Government of China claims most of the 648,000 square miles of the South China Sea, more than any other nation involved in those territorial disputes;

Whereas, in 2002, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and China signed a declaration on the code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea;

Whereas that declaration committed all parties to those territorial disputes to "reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and overflight above the South China Sea" and to "resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force";

Whereas the South China Sea contains vital commercial shipping lines and points of access between the Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean;

Whereas, although not a party to these disputes, the United States has a national economic and a security interest in ensuring that no party uses force unilaterally to assert maritime territorial claims in East Asia;

Whereas, in September 2010, the Government of China also deliberately provoked a controversy within the waters of the Senkaku Islands, territory under the legal administration of Japan in the East China Sea;

Whereas the actions of the Government of China in the South China Sea have also affected United States military and maritime vessels transiting through international air space and waters, including the collision of a fighter plane of the Government of China with a United States surveillance plane in 2001, the harassment of the USNS IMPECCABLE in March 2009, and the collision of a Chinese submarine with the sonar cable of the USS JOHN MCCAIN in June 2009;

Whereas, like every nation, the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation and open access to the maritime commons of Asia;

Whereas the Government of the United States expressed support for the declaration by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and China in 2002 on the code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea, and supports a collaborative diplomatic process by all claimants for resolving the various territorial disputes without coercion;

Whereas the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation and in unimpeded economic development and commerce;

Whereas, on October 11, 2010, Secretary Gates maintained "The United States has always exercised our rights and supported the rights of others to transit through, and operate in, international waters.";

Whereas, on June 3, 2011, at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Secretary Gates stated that "[m]aritime security remains an issue of particular importance for the region, with questions about territorial claims and the appropriate use of the maritime domain presenting on-going challenges to regional stability and prosperity";

Whereas, on June 4, 2011, at the Shangri-La Dialogue, Liang Guanglie, the Defense Minister from China, said, "China is committed to maintaining peace and stability in the South China Sea.";

Whereas, on June 11, 2011, the Government of Vietnam held a live-fire military exercise on the uninhabited island of Hon Ong, 25 miles off the coast of Vietnam in the South China Sea; and

Whereas, on June 11, 2011, Hong Lei, the Foreign Ministry spokesman of China, stated, "[China] will not resort to force or the threat of force" to resolve the territorial dispute: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the strong support of the United States for the peaceful resolution of maritime territorial disputes in the South China Sea, and pledges continued efforts to facilitate a multilateral, peaceful process to resolve these disputes;

(2) deplors the use of force by naval and maritime security vessels from China in the South China Sea;

(3) calls on all parties to the territorial dispute to refrain from threatening force or using force to assert territorial claims; and

(4) supports the continuation of operations by the United States Armed Forces in support of freedom of navigation rights in international waters and air space in the South China Sea.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 519. Mr. REID (for Mr. DEMINT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 15, supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria as a critical component of the President's Global Health Initiative.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 519.** Mr. REID (for Mr. DEMINT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 15, supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria as a critical component of the President's Global Health Initiative; as follows:

On page 4, strike line 19 and all that follows through "by the United States" on page 5, line 25 and insert the following:

(5) recognizes the goals to combat malaria in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-293);

(6) supports continued leadership by the United States

#### NOTICES OF HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration will meet on Wednesday, June 29, 2011, at 10:30 a.m. to hear testimony on the nominations of Gineen Bresso, Thomas Hicks, and Myrna Pérez to be members of the Election Assistance Commission.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Lynden Armstrong at the Rules and Administration Committee.

##### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, June 30, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on S. 1262, the Native Culture, Language, and Access for Success in Schools Act—Native CLASS.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to advise that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold a business meeting on Thursday, July 14, 2011, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The purpose of the business meeting is to consider pending legislation.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler or Allison Seyferth.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three of Senator BINGAMAN's interns, Paco Vanneri, Haley Murphy, and Elizabeth Reese, be extended the privilege of the floor during tomorrow's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 2279.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2279) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### WORLD MALARIA DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 57, S. Con. Res. 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria as a critical component of the President's Global Health Initiative.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the DeMint amendment to the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the concurrent resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 519) was agreed to, as follows:

On page 4, strike line 19 and all that follows through "by the United States" on page 5, line 25 and insert the following:

(5) recognizes the goals to combat malaria in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-293);

(6) supports continued leadership by the United States

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

##### S. CON. RES. 15

Whereas April 25th of each year is recognized internationally as World Malaria Day;

Whereas malaria is a leading cause of death and disease in many developing countries, despite being completely preventable and treatable;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 35 countries, the majority of them in sub-Saharan Africa, account for 98 percent of global malaria deaths;

Whereas young children and pregnant women are particularly vulnerable and disproportionately affected by malaria;

Whereas malaria greatly affects child health, with estimates that children under the age of 5 account for 85 percent of malaria deaths each year;

Whereas malaria poses great risks to maternal health, causing complications during delivery, anemia, and low birth weights, with estimates that malaria infection causes 400,000 cases of severe maternal anemia and from 75,000 to 200,000 infant deaths annually in sub-Saharan Africa;

Whereas heightened national, regional, and international efforts to prevent and treat malaria over recent years have made measurable progress and have helped save hundreds of thousands of lives;

Whereas the World Health Organization's World Malaria Report 2010 reports that in 2010, more African households (42 percent) owned at least one insecticide-treated mosquito net (ITN), more children under 5 years of age (35 percent) were using an ITN compared to previous years, and household ITN ownership reached more than 50 percent in 19 African countries;

Whereas the World Health Organization's World Malaria Report 2010 further states that a total of 11 countries and one area in the African Region showed a reduction of more than 50 percent in either confirmed malaria cases or malaria admissions and deaths in recent years (Algeria, Botswana, Cape Verde, Eritrea, Madagascar, Namibia, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zanzibar, United Republic of Tanzania), and that in all countries, the decreases are associated with intense malaria control interventions;

Whereas continued national, regional, and international investment is critical to continue to reduce malaria deaths and to prevent backsliding in those areas where progress has been made;

Whereas the United States Government has played a major leadership role in the recent progress made toward reducing the global burden of malaria, particularly through the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) and the United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

Whereas on World Malaria Day in 2009, President Barack Obama stated, "The U.S. stands with our global partners and people

around the world to reaffirm our commitment to make the U.S. a leader in ending deaths from malaria by 2015. . . . It is time to redouble our efforts to rid the world of a disease that does not have to take lives.”;

Whereas under the Global Health Initiative (GHI), the United States Government is pursuing a comprehensive, whole-of-government approach to global health, focused on helping partner countries to achieve major improvements in overall health outcomes through transformational advances in access to, and the quality of, healthcare services in resource-poor settings; and

Whereas recognizing the burden of malaria on many partner countries, PMI has set the target for 2015 of reducing the burden of malaria by 50 percent for 450,000,000 people, representing 70 percent of the at-risk population in Africa: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, including the achievable target of ending malaria deaths by 2015;

(2) recognizes the importance of reducing malaria prevalence and deaths to improve overall child and maternal health, especially in sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) commends the recent progress made toward reducing global malaria deaths and prevalence, particularly through the efforts of the President’s Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria;

(4) welcomes ongoing public-private partnerships to research and develop more effective and affordable tools for malaria diagnosis, treatment, and vaccination;

(5) recognizes the goals to combat malaria in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–293);

(6) supports continued leadership by the United States in bilateral and multilateral efforts to combat malaria as a critical part of the President’s Global Health Initiative; and

(7) encourages other members of the international community to sustain and scale up their support and financial contributions for efforts worldwide to combat malaria.

#### PEACEFUL AND MULTILATERAL RESOLUTION TO MARITIME TERRITORIAL DISPUTES IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 217) calling for a peaceful and multilateral resolution to maritime territorial disputes in southeast Asia.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 217

Whereas, on June 9, 2011, 3 vessels from China, including 1 fishing vessel and 2 maritime security vessels, ran into and disabled the cables of an exploration ship from Vietnam, the VIKING 2;

Whereas that use of force occurred within 200 nautical miles of Vietnam, an area recognized as its Exclusive Economic Zone;

Whereas, on May 26, 2011, a maritime security vessel from China cut the cables of another exploration ship from Vietnam, the BINH MINH, in the South China Sea in waters near Cam Ranh Bay;

Whereas, in March 2011, the Government of the Philippines reported that patrol boats from China attempted to ram 1 of its surveillance ships;

Whereas those incidents occurred within disputed maritime territories of the South China Sea, including the Spratly Islands, composed of 21 islands and atolls, 50 submerged land atolls, and 28 partly submerged reefs over an area of 340,000 square miles, and the Paracel Islands, a smaller group of islands located south of China’s Hainan Island;

Whereas China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Brunei have disputed territorial claims over the Spratly Islands, and China and Vietnam have a disputed claim over the Paracel Islands;

Whereas the Government of China claims most of the 648,000 square miles of the South China Sea, more than any other nation involved in those territorial disputes;

Whereas, in 2002, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and China signed a declaration on the code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea;

Whereas that declaration committed all parties to those territorial disputes to “reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and overflight above the South China Sea” and to “resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force”;

Whereas the South China Sea contains vital commercial shipping lines and points of access between the Indian Ocean and Pacific Ocean;

Whereas, although not a party to these disputes, the United States has a national economic and a security interest in ensuring that no party uses force unilaterally to assert maritime territorial claims in East Asia;

Whereas, in September 2010, the Government of China also deliberately provoked a controversy within the waters of the Senkaku Islands, territory under the legal administration of Japan in the East China Sea;

Whereas the actions of the Government of China in the South China Sea have also affected United States military and maritime vessels transiting through international air space and waters, including the collision of a fighter plane of the Government of China with a United States surveillance plane in 2001, the harassment of the USNS IMPECCABLE in March 2009, and the collision of a Chinese submarine with the sonar cable of the USS JOHN MCCAIN in June 2009;

Whereas, like every nation, the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation and open access to the maritime commons of Asia;

Whereas the Government of the United States expressed support for the declaration by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and China in 2002 on the code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea, and supports a collaborative diplomatic process

by all claimants for resolving the various territorial disputes without coercion;

Whereas the United States has a national interest in freedom of navigation and in unimpeded economic development and commerce;

Whereas, on October 11, 2010, Secretary Gates maintained “The United States has always exercised our rights and supported the rights of others to transit through, and operate in, international waters.”;

Whereas, on June 3, 2011, at the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore, Secretary Gates stated that “[m]aritime security remains an issue of particular importance for the region, with questions about territorial claims and the appropriate use of the maritime domain presenting on-going challenges to regional stability and prosperity”;

Whereas, on June 4, 2011, at the Shangri-La Dialogue, Liang Guanglie, the Defense Minister from China, said, “China is committed to maintaining peace and stability in the South China Sea.”;

Whereas, on June 11, 2011, the Government of Vietnam held a live-fire military exercise on the uninhabited island of Hon Ong, 25 miles off the coast of Vietnam in the South China Sea; and

Whereas, on June 11, 2011, Hong Lei, the Foreign Ministry spokesman of China, stated, “[China] will not resort to force or the threat of force” to resolve the territorial dispute: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the Senate—*

(1) reaffirms the strong support of the United States for the peaceful resolution of maritime territorial disputes in the South China Sea, and pledges continued efforts to facilitate a multilateral, peaceful process to resolve these disputes;

(2) deplores the use of force by naval and maritime security vessels from China in the South China Sea;

(3) calls on all parties to the territorial dispute to refrain from threatening force or using force to assert territorial claims; and

(4) supports the continuation of operations by the United States Armed Forces in support of freedom of navigation rights in international waters and air space in the South China Sea.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2021 AND S. 1276

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call two bills to the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for a second time.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1276) to repeal the authority to provide certain loans to the International Monetary Fund, the increase in the United States quota to the Fund, and certain other related authorities, to rescind related appropriated amounts, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2021) to amend the Clean Air Act regarding air pollution from Outer Continental Shelf activities.

Mr. REID. I would object to any further proceedings with respect to these two bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The bills will be placed on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST  
TIME—H.R. 1249

Mr. REID. Mr. President, H.R. 1249 has been received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

Mr. REID. I ask for a second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 28,  
2011

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until tomorrow morning, Tuesday, June 28, at 10 a.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order; and that following disposition of the Cole, Seitz, and Monaco nominations, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly caucus meetings; finally, that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate resume consideration of the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. The first vote will be tomorrow at noon on confirmation of James Cole to be Deputy Attorney General. We are working on an agreement to complete the Presidential Appointment Efficiency and Streamlining Act, so additional rollcall votes are expected tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:47 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 28, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SUNG Y. KIM, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.

ADRIENNE S. O'NEAL, OF MICHIGAN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAPE VERDE.

FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL

S. ROY WOODALL, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS. (NEW POSITION)