



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 2009

No. 61

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 27, 2009, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 2009

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ROLAND W. BURRIS, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of our destinies, guide our Senators this day by Your higher wisdom. Watch over them and use their work for Your glory. Lord, replace fear with faith, pessimism with hope, and error with truth. May these lawmakers become Your instruments for enabling justice to roll down like waters in this land we love. Give them serenity to accept what can't be changed, the courage to change what they can, and the wisdom to know one from the other.

Lord, we also ask You to comfort the many who mourn Steve Mosley's death. Be near to Michelle and Steven, Jr., and all of his loved ones.

We pray in the Redeemer's Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable ROLAND W. BURRIS 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. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 24, 2009.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ROLAND W. BURRIS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BURRIS 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 leader remarks, if there be any, there will be a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each. There will be no rollcall votes today. The next vote will occur at 5:30 on Monday. That vote will be on the motion to invoke cloture on the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act.

We have a few matters of business today. I am going to rule XIV a housing bill. I have spoken with the Republican leader as to how we are going to move forward on that, and I think that has been fairly well determined. We will do that as soon as we get rid of the fraud enforcement legislation and a

nomination or two. We should be able to move to this on Wednesday or so of next week. It is something we have been wanting to go get to for some time. There will be a vote on the bankruptcy aspect of housing—the so-called cramdown language. Senator McCONNELL and I have spoken about how to proceed on that and the rest of the bill.

Next week should be an interesting week. Wednesday, sometime, we will interrupt whatever we are doing to complete the conference report on the budget. Senators GREGG, CONRAD, and MURRAY were appointed as conferees on that, and they will be working over the weekend. Most issues have been resolved, but there are some that have not.

Mr. President, 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. REID. 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. REID. Mr. President, I assume the Chair would want to announce the morning business hour.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4707

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

COMMEMORATING THE 94TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I rise in honor of the victims of the Armenian Genocide, as we mark the 94th anniversary of this horrific tragedy.

On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire began a campaign of forced deportation against the Armenians. Around 2 million Armenian men, women, and children were driven from their homeland, 1.5 million of whom were killed. Hundreds of thousands were massacred outright, while others perished from forced marches, deliberate starvation, and epidemics that ravaged through concentration camps. Yet despite an outcry of condemnation by Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States, no action was taken against the Ottoman Empire, as the first genocide of the 20th century continued.

Today, the thriving, vibrant Armenian community in the United States is a testament to their endurance and strength. Yet we can never forget the loss and sacrifice of previous generations. Earlier this week, we also paid tribute to those killed in the Holocaust, and together, these anniversaries mark this week as a solemn reminder of what can occur when prejudice and hatred go unchecked. Just as we cherish the memories and stories of the Armenians persecuted by the Ottoman Empire and their survivors, so must we also honor them by recommitting ourselves to combat intolerance in all its forms.

In my own home State of Nevada, I am proud to represent thousands of Armenian-Americans, many of whom gathered to commemorate the 94th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide this past weekend in Las Vegas. I congratulate the Armenian American Cultural Society of Las Vegas for yet again organizing such a successful and meaningful event. This is a wonderful opportunity for the Armenian-American community and their supporters to come together in our State, which I am pleased is one of at least 40 other States who have recognized the Armenian Genocide.

I extend my best wishes to the Nevada Armenian-American community back home and thank them for their many contributions to our great State.

I thank the Chair, and 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. NELSON of Florida. 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. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I would like to address the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

NASA

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, there are so many things I would like to talk about, not the least of which—which I will not confine my remarks to—is our space program, which is adrift.

The White House continues to deliberate on who should be the administrator of NASA. The previous administration starved NASA to death by asking it to do too much with too little. The result of that is that now NASA is coming to the end of the life of the space shuttle, as we complete the construction of the International Space Station. With the remaining nine flights—and those nine flights NASA thinks it can get in during the next year and a half, but they can't—we are going to have to fly the space shuttle into 2011, and we ought to do that deliberately and slowly to make sure we don't sacrifice safety.

At the end of that time, upon the completion of the space station—the International Space Station, with components from a number of countries around the world and something that is larger than two football fields long, 200 miles into the cosmos, circling the globe at 17,500 miles an hour, with research laboratories, with habitation modules for the astronauts and cosmonauts on board—the United States, when we shut down the space shuttle, will not have a manned vehicle because we didn't have enough money for the development of the new vehicle—the new rocket, the Aries—and so we are going to have a gap and we will have to rely on the Russians. We will have to buy a ride on their spacecraft in order to get to our space station, which is a \$100 billion investment.

Now, that is the sad state of affairs, and that is where NASA finds itself. NASA is adrift because it doesn't have a vigorous leader, appointed by the Obama administration, to take charge; someone who understands space flight, who understands management, who understands aeronautics. By the way, aeronautics is the first "A" in NASA—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA does not have a leader as yet who understands how to motivate people and capture the spirit of the American people, which is that we are explorers and adventurers by nature. There is not a heart in America that does not beat more quickly when they think of the potential we have in the cosmos and the exploration of new worlds.

Look at what the Hubbell space telescope has done for us. How do you think we have been able to have the

revelations from the Hubbell space telescope? It is because we have been able to send astronauts out there when it could not even see because it had an incorrectly ground lens when we launched it, over a decade and a half ago. We sent astronauts there to repair it in orbit.

Lo and behold, in 2 weeks another flight with astronauts will go to the Hubbell space station, will repair it, will give it new instruments, and for the next 2 decades it will continue to peer into the universe and unlock those secrets about where did we come from and when did it happen and how are we positioned in this universe that is so vast, so infinite that our human minds cannot even grasp. That is the excitement of the future.

Yet NASA is adrift. I call on the White House to please put in an administrator of NASA who is a leader, who understands space, who understands how to motivate people and who can capture the American spirit and help inspire, standing by our President who wants it, a vigorous space program.

I did not come here to speak about that, but I get pretty exercised because I have been the beneficiary of being a part of this space program. I do not like what I see now and I do not like what I have seen in the last 5 years. I have said so on the floor of this Senate, over and over. The more we try to get additional funding in the budget to develop this new rocket—and we were successful in the Senate—the more we would have our legs cut out from under us by the previous White House budget office because they kept starving NASA of funds. That has led us to where we are today.

I personally know our President is a space aficionado. We have talked about it hours on end. I know he wants us to have a vigorous space program. I know President Obama understands how to accomplish the very thing he wants to do with young people, in getting them educated and particularly educated in math and science and engineering. Look to history. Look at what happened in the Apollo program when young people by the thousands starting going into math and science and engineering because they were challenged by what we were doing in the cosmos. We can do that again if the President will give the full support to the space program and if he will put the right leader in NASA.

I came today to speak about another subject, but I do not think there is a much more important subject at this time. With all the problems facing this country—the economy, the national security situation—you have to tend to your knitting. America's space program and America's preeminence in space—that we do not lose the high ground—is a highly important issue, high among the items on the agenda to which this country must attend.

CHINESE WALLBOARD

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I wish to talk about something else that is afflicting this country. A lot of people don't know about this, but we have to get it front and center. One of the exports coming from China into the United States has been drywall. Drywall is the boards that you put up on the studs when you build a house. Normally what it is is a material called gypsum. Gypsum is a byproduct in the mining and manufacturing of phosphate. A lot of that phosphate goes into fertilizer but a byproduct of that is gypsum. And gypsum, put into the form of a flat sheet with thick paper on either side, in boards about 10 feet high and about that wide, is called wallboard. In the modern construction of houses, when you build a house and you divvy up the rooms and you put up these studs to be a wall and you put insulation in there, and then on the outside of the studs you put the wallboard and then you put a finish over the wallboard and you paint that, that is the wall of a house.

The problem is that wallboard that has been imported into this country from China is defective because it has contained some kind of organic compound that is having absolutely disastrous effects in people's houses. When you compare a piece of this wallboard from China with wallboard from America that is gypsum, you can actually see the difference. Gypsum is dry. It is absorbent, which is what you want for a wall if there are contaminants or vapors in a house. But this Chinese wallboard is giving off vapors.

What do we find in our houses? This is not only in Florida, this is all over the southern United States. They have discovered it in Louisiana. They have discovered it in California, in Texas, they have discovered it in Georgia, and some people are now discovering it in the Atlantic coast, the north Atlantic region of the United States. What they are discovering is that, first, you walk into a house with Chinese wallboard and you notice a smell. It is a different smell. It is pungent. Some people call it like a rotten egg smell. As I have gone into these homes over the course of the Easter break back in Florida, to me the smell is not so much rotten eggs but you detect the smell of sulfur, but it starts searing the nasal passages.

I am kind of like a canary in the coal mine because my respiratory system is very sensitive to these kinds of things, for example, mold and mildew. I will get congested if I walk into a home with mold and mildew and I will start coughing. When I walked into those homes a week and a half ago in Florida, the same thing happened to me. I would only be in the home 10 minutes and my nasal passages started to constrict, my voice got scratchy. I started to get what we call getting clogged up. I started hacking and wheezing, my eyes started watering.

Lo and behold, that is happening to these homeowners. This is their home.

This is their life investment. Now, through no fault of their own, they are finding out they have a part of their home that is now irritating their respiratory system and in some cases their family members have had to go to the hospital and in other cases their pediatricians are telling them to get their children out of those houses. The family has vacated the home, their life investment—vacated. Hopefully they have some relatives they can go live with, and in some cases they do not. You can imagine the financial burden.

What else are these homeowners telling me? They are telling me that in the homes, these vapors that are being emitted are suddenly corroding any kind of metallic substance in the home. I went into homes where I looked at the air conditioning unit and the coils on the air conditioner are completely corroded and the homeowners tell me over the course of the last 4 years they have had to change the air conditioner three times because it is not only a corrosion, it is eating through the coils.

I took a screwdriver and I went over to one of the copper pipes on an air conditioner unit and I started scraping it. It was completely soot black. Copper, when it ages, turns green. Not this. I started scraping off that soot black exterior and, sure enough, there was the copper underneath. And the coils that were metallic on the air conditioner, of some other metal, had been corroded through. And here is this homeowner and that homeowner and that one over there who have had to replace the air conditioner three times in the last 5 years. It is unbelievable.

I talked to a husband and wife in one of the homes. In this case I went to homes down near Fort Myers. I went to homes near Bradenton. I went to homes near West Palm Beach. The couple had been on a cruise to Mexico in January. They bought a beautiful silver bracelet. You know that silver will tarnish over time. You have to polish it up. In this case, that silver bracelet had been in the house for 1 month and it was black as soot. These vapors that are coming off whatever this organic material is in the Chinese drywall are making people sick, their houses are uninhabitable, their appliances, including the dishwashers, are corroding, and their life investment in their home is going up in smoke. That is not right.

Needless to say, there is a bunch of lawsuits. But who are they going to sue? They are going to sue a Chinese wallboard manufacturer who is in China. Maybe there is a distributor here. We have a U.S. Government and there is an arm of the U.S. Government called the Consumer Product Safety Commission. This, by the way, is the same Consumer Product Safety Commission that was letting in all of those defective Chinese toys that were killing our children, 2 and 3 and 4 years ago. So last year the Congress, bipartisan, reformed the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The Consumer

Product Safety Commission, in the reform of this legislation, has the authority, No. 1, to stop the import of this Chinese drywall and also exact a recall of this product.

But has the Consumer Product Safety Commission done it? No. To their credit, they sent in an investigation team, and that investigation team reported to the staff of the Senate yesterday. I happened to go and talk to them. So I asked them three questions yesterday. I said: How harmful is this stuff?

And they said: We do not know.

And I said: Well, you are doing an investigation.

Well, it is going to take us a while.

Well, did you see the same effects?

A member of that investigation team concurred with what I have just shared about how it affected his respiratory system, his eyes were watering, he was clogging up, and so forth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. So as of yesterday, they did not have a conclusion. I would urge them to hurry their conclusion. They ought to be doing this in conjunction with the EPA and the Centers for Disease Control because if this thing is in what we think it is, 100,000 homes in this country—and perhaps half of those are in Florida because that is where a lot of the building was going on in the aftermath of the four hurricanes that hit Florida in 2004—if this is in 100,000 homes, we have a real problem.

You cannot get the home builders. Look, most of them are financially, if not bankrupt, down to their last pennies as it is. There has to be someone financially responsible, and you cannot expect the homeowner to bear this cost. But what about the effects on their health?

Well, as of yesterday, they did not have an answer. So then I asked them: Well, you have done an investigation. How widespread is it?

They said: We do not know.

Well, we better start knowing.

So I said: Well, since you do not know how harmful it is, and you do not know how widespread it is, what are you going to do about helping homeowners?

They said: We do not know.

Well, a number of us, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator VITTER, both of them from Louisiana—because a lot of this drywall came into Louisiana through the Port of New Orleans, they are getting the same kind of complaints from their State that I am getting from the State of Florida.

We can file legislation that will suggest what to do. It is too bad we have to file legislation because the CPSC has the legal authority under the law to ban the import of this wallboard and

to exact a recall and to freeze the assets of the companies that are attributable to that drywall that is manufactured in China. They have that authority.

If they are not going to act on that authority, then the Congress is going to have to act for them. That is the bill Senator LANDRIEU and Senator VITTER and I and others also who have joined have filed.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, our dear friend. I did not even know this, but the Senator must have heard some of this problem in his State of Oklahoma. This is a problem of monumental proportions.

I will close by saying, because of that report yesterday from the staff of the commission to the staff of the Senate committees, there are a couple of news articles today: "Drywall Clamor Is Intensifying." Another headline cries out, "Agency Outlines Strategy To Deal With Chinese Drywall." Another headline cries out, "Efforts On Chinese Drywall Fix Too Slow."

I close with this: Put yourself in the place of the poor homeowner. They are there with their children. This is their dream home. They have put all of their assets into their home. They are current on their mortgage, and suddenly they start realizing the symptoms they and their children have had over the last several months, and in some cases years, is attributable to this. They now understand why they have replaced their air-conditioning unit three times. They now see why they cannot keep their silver polished. They now know why the refrigerator metal and the dishwasher metal is constantly corroding, and their pediatrician is telling them to get their child out of that house. As a result, they have vacated their dream home.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. So I close by saying my plea to the Senate is to insist, if we have to, through the passage of this legislation, to address this problem head on. It is a major problem facing the people of this country.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I have 1 hour. I did not mind the Senator going over. I was enjoying the comments of my friend from Florida. But I want to make sure I still have that hour.

I ask unanimous consent that I do.

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

GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. INHOFE. Let me say this to my friend from Florida. Coincidentally, I was talking to my friend, Senator VITTER, who went over this with me. I have instructed my staff to add me to the Senator's bill as a cosponsor.

As the Senator from Florida will remember, he and I have agreed on a lot

of the problems we are having today with China; for one thing, the threat that is out there, both in terms of energy and military buildup. I have been very much concerned as I go through—and my friend from Florida and I are both very active in trying to get things done in Africa—as we go through Africa, individually or together, we notice one of the major things we see taking place there, particularly in the area of the Sea of Guinea and other places in Nigeria where they have huge oil reserves, is the Chinese are building all of these new and shiny bridges and all that, which is competing with us since we have the same problem they have in terms of a lack of energy.

So I would enjoy joining him in some of these problems we see that we are having with China.

I wanted some time this morning. I actually have four causes going on right now. I am not going to have time to address all four of these. But I will just briefly say what they are, then I will start with the one I think is the most critical right now. First of all, one of my causes is having to do with Guantanamo Bay.

The fact that people are talking about closing it, President Obama has stated—actually in his inaugural address he did not, but then later on said, yes, we are going to close it in spite of the problems that would come to us if we did close it.

I am anxious to have time on the floor to talk about the frequent visits I have made to GITMO. One of the few good deals the Government has today is Guantanamo Bay. It might be that the Presiding Officer is not aware of the fact. It is one of the good deals out there. We only pay \$4,000 a year, the same thing we paid in 1903, for the use of this great facility.

There has been no evidence of any kind of abuse of prisoners or detainees. They have a judicial center that is unlike anything in the United States. These are tribunals.

We cannot put these terrorists, these detainees, into our prison system. That is not going to work. If it does, I would like to know which Member of the Senate wants to have those detainees housed in their own State. I am sure the Presiding Officer is not excited about having them in Illinois. I am not excited about having them in Oklahoma.

What would happen is, anyplace where they would be detained in the United States would be a magnet to terrorist activity. But I hope I will have a chance to talk about that.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The next thing would be on some of the recent developments in what they used to call the global warming problem. Since we are in the fifth year of a cooling period, they are trying to change that to "climate change." But this is something a lot of people in this body are pursuing.

I would say this: There are not the votes for a major tax increase. A cap and trade on carbon would now constitute somewhere between \$350 and \$400 billion each year as a tax increase,

and it is something that would not accomplish anything.

In fact, if there are a few people still remaining out there who believe global warming is caused by carbon dioxide and we need to restrict it in some way, let's keep in mind, if we do something unilaterally in the United States of America, then what few manufacturing jobs we have left in this country are going to go to places where they can provide energy in places such as China and Mexico, where they have no restrictions on emissions on CO₂.

So I would only say I hope we have time to talk about that.

TARP

The last thing is TARP, the program that started here. I was critical of the Bush administration back in October when then the Secretary of the Treasury came along and talked about, well, we have to have \$700 billion to buy damaged assets. I looked at that thing and read it. There was nothing in there that compelled the Secretary of the Treasury or the President to use that \$700 billion for anything. There is no accountability to Congress. It is unprecedented.

So I was criticizing the Bush administration, only to find out it was Tim Geithner, who is now the Secretary of the Treasury, who was behind this whole thing. He started the Bear Stearns problem. So I no longer criticize the Bush administration and Hank Paulson.

But, nonetheless, if you stop and think, it is so hard for me and for other people to envision what \$1 trillion is or \$100 billion is. The \$700 billion, if you will do your math, you take the number of households who file tax returns and pay taxes and that is \$5,000 per household. That is shocking when you tell people.

A lot of people who voted for that in the first place, in fact, 75 of the Senators who voted for that monstrosity back in October now are regretting that they did. Their comments are, well, they lied to us. They said that was going to be used for damaged assets.

They did lie to us. They flat lied. They never had any intention of using that money to buy damaged assets. Now, after they have bailed out several banks and put billions of dollars in banks, now they are saying, well, we need to buy damaged assets. Well, where were they when the problem was there?

I do want to talk about that and will be talking about that in a lot of detail as time goes by.

MILITARY BUDGET

Last Monday, I did not have much time on the Senate floor to get into the problem that I see, and the problem was with the announcement that was made by Secretary Gates, the Secretary of Defense. It happens by coincidence that I was in Afghanistan when that happened. I was looking around

and I saw the Bradleys going back and forth and the helicopters and these kids getting ready to go on their patrols and I was thinking: Wait a minute. Why is the President of the United States gutting the military right at a time when we are at war? This has never happened before.

So I did a YouTube from there. I talked about the problems I had with the announcement made by Secretary Gates. I had to say, and I will repeat it over and over during the course of this discourse, it is not really Secretary Gates. He is in a position where he is given a number—I know he cannot say this, and he will probably deny it—he is given a number to say: You try to defend America within the confines of this number.

So what do we have? We have the F-22, the only fifth generation fighter that is being stopped. We have China and Russia, both of them, with vehicles that are fifth generation, but our kids are not going to have that if they are successful in making these cuts, and I do not think they are going to be successful in making these cuts.

The C-17—we all remember the C-17 is the best high-lift vehicle this country has ever seen or that the world has ever seen. We need many more of them, but they have stopped this. The national missile defense system—we will get into all of this, the future combat system, the fact that we are sending kids out there with equipment that is not as good as some of the prospective adversaries.

Nonetheless, I happened to be responding to the Gates statement from Afghanistan. This new thing—I don't understand all the technology, but I was using YouTube. They said: Just talk on this, and they will pick it up. And I mean, it hit the fan. I came back, and every liberal journalist in America was just outraged.

MSNBC's Ed Schultz featured my video as part of his regular beat, the so-called "Psycho Talk." He said: INHOFE is as wrong as he could be. Keith Olberman said I should do the math. And his guest, an unbiased guest, was Speaker PELOSI. And they said my criticism of Obama's defense budget was simply desperation, and on and on and on.

Not to be left out, Rachel Maddow used the same talking points and said, once again, the budget was actually going to increase. Then she brought on a guest, Eugene Robinson, associate editor and columnist, who is supposed to be some unbiased party, saying: INHOFE is making this stuff up. He is lying.

Rich Sanchez didn't want to be outdone. That is CNN. He came on and talked about: I am going to do a fact check and it is ridiculous.

It is interesting how hateful these extremists are. All you have to do is say: We need to put America in a position where we have the best of everything because we don't know what contingencies are coming, and they go crazy.

Fortunately, there are more responsible people around. I enjoyed the editorial, after getting all this criticism, in the Wall Street Journal where they are talking about how the Navy is left with a fleet of fewer than 300 ships. Is that adequate? I don't think it is. I can remember when it was 700. Now we see the piracy, all the problems. We know there is a need for more carriers, and yet this cut is being made.

They criticized the Gates decision for killing the stealthy F-22 fighter. That is true. Originally, we were going to have 750 F-22s. Now he wants to stop it at 187—totally inadequate—saying that the F-35 is going to be cheaper. That is technology down the road. The mission isn't the same. It certainly can't compete with the F-22.

They criticized the Gates budget priorities as giving no indication as to how the Pentagon is going to ensure military dominance and extend the battlefield to the future in outer space. Outer space is where the future battles are going to be fought, but not according to this report, \$1.4 billion cut. This is out of the Wall Street Journal editorial. I already have this in the RECORD. I put it in last Monday.

This is something we are talking about. Many of us were concerned over the ability, in some places such as Iran—could be Serbia, someplace else, Syria perhaps—of being able to hit Western Europe and then, with the longer range, hit the east coast of the United States. So we went to the Czech Republic, talked personally with the President Vaclav Klaus. He is one of the best Presidents in the history of Eastern Europe. Their Parliament agreed to let us put radar in there. And then next door in Poland, their Parliament agreed to have us put in a launching system. Now we are coming along and pulling the rug out from under them, and this is all covered.

By the way, if you don't like the Wall Street Journal, there is an organization called the Center for Strategic and International Studies. I defy anyone to criticize this organization. The chairman of that organization is Sam Nunn. We all remember him. I served with Sam Nunn. If you look at the people on this—Richard Armitage, former Defense Secretary Bill Cohen, Bill Frist, Henry Kissinger—you can't find a heavier list of people. James Schlesinger, Brent Scowcroft were a part of this organization. They came through and talked about all of the systems proposed for termination by Secretary Gates as very valid missions and real requirements. None of them is a wasteful program. These are Democrats and Republicans. This is not partisan.

They go on to say that Congress should legitimately question spending priorities and perhaps take the next step, which we intend to do. I am second ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. Certainly, the Presiding Officer is serving on that. I will be looking for his support to try to look at these cuts and see what is real-

ly necessary for us to keep to defend America.

They talk about the B-52 bomber. By stopping the advanced bomber, which is in this program, the Obama program, we are going to be relying upon this B-52 that has been in existence for 50 years. It is twice the age of the pilots who are flying it. We can't continue to do this.

I want to go ahead, after the conclusion of my remarks, and put in this report, which is the report of the CSIS, the Center for Strategic and International Studies. I ask unanimous consent that it be 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. INHOFE. The problem is focused on one number. If they talk about that this is not a cut in defense spending, we need to look and examine that, which I will do in a few minutes. Actually, thanks to the Obama administration, overall defense spending has been cut by \$10.7 billion in 2009. You might say 2009 was not his year. It was. The second half of the emergency supplemental fell under his jurisdiction, so that is an accurate figure. It would be cut again in fiscal year 2010, based on projected inflation and the potential use of what is now being called overseas contingency. I call that the global war on terror. They want to rename it now. It sounds a little more palatable to some of these editorial liberals to whom I have already referred.

We have reached a crossroads where we will have to choose to either invest in the modernization and readiness of our military or kick the can down the road. That is what we have been doing for a long time.

We had a hearing yesterday in the Readiness Subcommittee, chaired by EVAN BAYH. The ranking member is RICHARD BURR. We went over all of this with some of the top people in the military. Quite frankly, they agreed with all these comments that I am making today and I made yesterday on this committee. Based on the projected defense budget for the next 10 years, it looks as though the administration is taking us down the same path that led to a weaker and poorly equipped military.

It is interesting that a lot of the people over the years who have been critical of defense spending—talking about liberals who are here in this Chamber—are the same ones now saying: Wait a minute, our Guard and Reserve can't handle the op tempo. That is a term used, "operation tempo," number of deployments and all this. The problem we have is that we gone through—and I will show this in a minute—a period of time in the 1990s where we downgraded the military, and then we turned around and along comes 9/11. All of a sudden, we have a President who has to prosecute a war, at the same time trying to build a military.

The plan he announced is intended to reshape the priorities of America's defense establishment and profoundly reform how DOD does business. I agree that we need to have procurement reforms in the Pentagon. There is no question about that. But let's don't use that for an excuse to cut modernization programs.

I was in Afghanistan at the time this decision was announced, and it comes at a time in our history when we have dramatically increased our domestic spending in trillions of dollars under the umbrella of emergency bailouts and stimulus packages and all of that. If you stop and think about the amount of money this administration has really spent—look at the \$700 billion bailout. Then you have the \$789 billion stimulus package. Then you have the omnibus bill that is \$410 billion. That adds up to \$2 trillion. That is in the first 3 months. So when you look and think of the stimulus package, how much better would it have been if we could have had more defense spending at that time. There is nothing that employs more people, that better stimulates the economy than defense spending. We tried to do that. Of course, that was defeated. So this President is on track to grow this country's obligations to 22 percent of our GDP while he shrinks defense spending probably down to 3 percent. Right now, it is at 4 percent of GDP. As I calculate, it will be down to 3 percent.

Let's see the chart. I would like to show people so there is no question about this. The chart we have here shows what happened back in the 1990s. The black line on top is when Bill Clinton came into office. That is fiscal year 1993. As it is projected forward for the next 8 years, the black line would say—let's say we want to keep defense spending in terms exactly as it is today, back in 1993, except for inflation. That black line is where it would be if we had kept that level of defense spending. The red line was the Clinton budget. That is what I am saying. We are going through the same thing now percentage-wise, almost the same thing that we went through there. So the difference between the Clinton budget and what would have happened with the level of spending is \$412 billion. So you can say that is a \$412 billion cut.

Many of us on the floor of the Senate in the 1990s—me probably more than anybody else—talked about these dramatic, massive cuts in procurement and modernization. With very few exceptions, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines have been using the same weapons systems while fighting a two-pronged war for 8 years, weapons and weapons systems from back during the Cold War, the same ones we are using today. We have been unsuccessfully trying to get past this bow wave created in the 1990s when the military budget was cut by \$412 billion and acquisition programs and research and development were pushed to the right.

That is a term we use that means if you are going to delay something, you push it to the right.

The cost of kicking our military modernization down the road is twofold in that the increase in the cost to modernize and the increased cost to develop and fuel new weapons is an increased cost to operate and maintain. It gets to the point where it is like the car you drive. You buy a new car. You drive it for 20 years. At least that is what I do. You finally get to the point where you are paying more to maintain that car than if you would get a new one. A lot of that is because of the accounting system that Government has. It is somewhat guilty of forcing this type of thing. But that is what has happened. We have forced ourselves to use older and older stuff.

Our major combat systems that our troops are using today are those developed and procured during the 1980s. Some of them go all the way back to the 1950s. The Reagan administration was handed a military, everyone agrees now, that was a hollow force. No one questions that. At that time, people thought: There is not going to be any problem now. And then when the Cold War was over, everyone had this euphoria: We no longer have a threat out there. The Cold War is over. The term they used, if you will remember, was—I can't remember what it was now. It was a great benefit to put that money into social programs, which is what we are doing today. A peace bonus, that is what it was.

So anyway, our combat systems are older and older, and the Reagan administration expanded the military budget, increased troop size, reenergized weapons procurement, revived intelligence capabilities, and returned this country to its superpower status that it had been in the past. He guaranteed the superiority of the U.S. military's weapons systems capabilities through long-term investments and ensuring that our troops were provided with the most advanced equipment available.

Secretary Gates said in January of 2009:

Our military must be prepared for a full spectrum of operations, including the type of combat we are facing in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as large-scale threats that we face from places like North Korea and Iran.

I want to say one more time that I don't blame Secretary Gates. I am glad he is the Secretary of Defense. I just wish he had a better hand dealt him so he could do a better job. I think he is operating under the limitations of a White House that is just not a prodefense White House. Far too often, we have learned the hard lessons that we don't have a crystal ball to precisely predict what our needs will be in the future.

This actually happened to me. The last year I served in the House was 1994.

I was on the House Armed Services Committee at that time. I will always remember we had someone come in and

testify and say that in 10 years we will no longer need ground troops. They were talking about all the precision stuff the Air Force does and the technology that was coming. That was testimony a lot of people rejoiced to hear so they could start cutting the Marine Corps and the Army, which is exactly what happened. Then what happened? Then we had Bosnia and we had Kosovo and we had Iraq and we had Afghanistan. Now, after 7 years engaged in the war on terror, we know he was wrong.

The strategic environment has become increasingly complex, dynamic, lethal, and uncertain. Today, our military is fighting with equipment that is decades old and with a force structure that is 40 percent less than it was in the 1980s. That is essentially what was cut during this timeframe right here. It was a cut of about 40 percent, if we take the budgets at the beginning and the end of it.

So we are talking about force structure and modernization. Right now, the Air Force has 2,500 fewer aircraft. The Navy has cut its fleet size in half. The Army has reduced its force to half the number of divisions it had during the first gulf war. This all happened in the 1990s. For the past 17 years, our military has been asked to do more with less.

One of the concerns I had back during the 1990s, when they were cutting the force strength—that was back during the time they were all rejoicing with this euphoric attitude I mentioned that the Cold War was over and we do not need a military anymore—so they were cutting it back at that time and believing we were not going to have to have the needs we were going to have. Unfortunately, what took less than a decade to field in the 1980s will now take us several decades to field. In the case of KC-X, the KC-X was supposed to be online. We were supposed to actually have it by this time. Right now, our fueling capability is done with KC-135s.

I will say this: At Tinker Air Force Base, they do a great job of taking these ancient aircraft and continuing them in service. But there will come a point where we can no longer continue to do that. In the United States, we are going to have to build and sustain military capabilities required to respond to possible future threats across the spectrum.

Wouldn't it be great if we knew what the next war was going to be like? We have never been in that position. We have tried to guess, but we have always been wrong. The next war will not be like the past one or even like the one we are in now. History has taught us that very hard lesson. It also does not mean the next war will be like the one we might have to fight 5 or 10 years from now. The decisions we make today on the Senate floor will set the stage for what happens in the next 40 years. I wish there were time. I wish we could instantly determine what our needs will be 20 years from now and not

have to prepare in advance. We cannot do that. Does anyone want to hazard a guess what the world will be like in 20 years?

There is a Marine Corps general. I have his name down here somewhere. In just this past February, he made this statement to a bunch of young marines. I was over there at the time he made it. This is a quote I want to read:

You say the next conflict will be a guerrilla conflict. I say, it depends. In my lifetime, we have been in 5 big fights and a bunch of little ones. In only one of those 5 big ones—

And Desert Storm is what he was referring to—

had we prepared for the type of war we wound up having to fight.

That is one out of five.

It is one thing to say that a certain type of fight is more or less likely; it is quite another to say it is certain to be one or the other. In war, the only thing certain is uncertainty.

He went on to say:

It may be that nobody can beat us in a conventional fight today, but what we buy today is what we will have to fight with in 2020.

Furthermore, advertising that our focus of effort is on the low-to-mid intensity fights of the future reduces the deterrence that powerful conventional capabilities demonstrate to traditional state actors. Non-state actors, guerrillas, terrorists are not likely to be deterred by our capabilities. Nation-states are.

See, we are used to that. He is dead right in this case. We knew during the Second World War who the enemies were: Germany and Japan. We knew their capabilities. During the Cold War, we knew the capabilities. I sometimes look wistfully back on the days of the Cold War because at least then it was predictable. We knew how they thought, their thinking process. We knew their capabilities.

He goes on to say:

We had better well have the capability to fight the guerrilla and the nation-state, regardless of which of these is more or less likely.

That is a very wise man. He is advising his young marines, and they listened, and it makes sense.

We were not able to predict the fall of the Soviet Union, the rapid growth of the ballistic missile capability of North Korea, or the rise in the asymmetric warfare in which we are currently engaged. It does not matter how great our military leaders or intelligence is, our strategic thinking will always be imperfect. We have a lot of smart generals out there, and they are going to try to tell us what we are going to need 10 or 15 years from now, and they are going to be wrong because they have always been wrong. They understand that, as that Marine Corps general stated.

In order to provide stability, America is going to have to be able to deter or defeat any threat, be it an insurgency or a challenge from a near-peer competitor. We cannot any longer fool ourselves that we are still sending our sons and daughters out with the best equipment.

When I talk to people around the country, there is an assumption out there that when we go to war, regardless of what kind of war—asymmetrical or conventional warfare—we are sending our kids out with the best of equipment. That is not true.

In a minute, I am going to show you that there are other countries that have things that are better than what we have in our defense capability, in our effort to conduct warfare. But before I do that, let me at least address what all these critics of me were saying when we talked about how much less money right now we are going to be projecting into our force structure, in our military spending, if we do the math. So let's go ahead and do it.

As I stated earlier, we need to look at the total defense budget—what DOD actually spends on all its operations.

During the Bush administration, the sources that funded our defenses were not all just DOD or the Department of Defense, appropriations and authorizations. They were also the DOE funds. DOE has a lot of funds for nuclear ships and weapons. We have certainly wartime supplementals. All of those added up to what we spent on defense. What they are trying to do now is say, well, the DOD appropriations are actually going to be greater today than they were in fiscal year 2009. Well, that may be true, but that is not the total amount of defense spending. That is just a small part of it.

I think the best evidence of that is to see what systems we have to cut in order to act under the confines of this budgeting.

First, there is a net loss in defense spending in 2009 of \$10.7 billion. This is the second increment of the supplemental that came under the jurisdiction of the current administration, the Obama administration. President Bush increased the total defense budget in 2009 by \$37.2 billion.

He also approved \$65.9 billion in supplemental funds for the first part of fiscal year 2009.

President Obama's supplemental request of \$75.5 billion for defense needs funds an increase of 21,000 troops. Well, I agree with his message that we need to increase the number of troops and increase the number of troops in Afghanistan. That is very reasonable. But we are going to have to pay for those troops, and we cannot pay for those troops with the same amount of money we had when we had 21,000 fewer troops.

The GAO report on the cost of the Iraq withdrawal said it will be a "massive and expensive effort" . . . that costs would more often increase in the near term. In other words, as you draw down in Iraq, that is going to increase the actual cost.

It went on to say that the cost of equipment repairs, replacements, closing, and turning over 283 military installations in Iraq and moving troops and equipment home "will likely be significant."

Unfortunately, defense spending actually decreases in 2009 by \$10.7 billion

due to President Obama's decreased total supplemental request from \$189 billion to \$141 billion.

So let's compare 2009 to 2010, where I have been accused of not being able to do the math.

Defense spending does increase from 2009 to 2010 by \$14.9 billion. But according to President Obama's letter to Speaker PELOSI, there will be no more supplementals. If we take the supplementals out, then it is a dramatic reduction in spending. That would mean DOD would have to fund all wartime operations out of the hide to the tune of \$100 billion-plus.

However, President Obama does fence off \$130 billion for "Overseas Contingency Funds." Well, that is within the budget, and I guess that is what he now calls the war on terror. Even adding the \$130 billion to defense spending—which is never the case with supplemental funding—the overall increase in defense spending for 2010 is \$3.5 billion.

I say that because we know when we have an emergency supplemental, everybody puts everything they can into it, and that is where the effort is taking place.

Now, we add the accelerated growth of the Army and Marine Corps—a 65,000 and 22,000 increase, respectively—at a cost of approximately \$13 billion to cover pay and health care costs, and we start to see the beginnings of how our military modernization gets gutted.

The DOD has certain "must pays," things they have to pay. They have to pay personnel, operations and maintenance, ongoing wartime, and contingency operations. With a zero supplemental fund, the money to pay for these "must pays" will be taken from the base Defense budget, and the areas that are always hit are research and development and acquisition. There we are talking about modernization.

So what I would like to do—well, first of all, just look at what is being cut. We know about the Future Combat System. I am going to cover these in a minute, but there are the F-22s, the C-17s, the national missile defense system, the future bombers, and it does not stop in 2010.

As we look at the projected defense budget through 2019, we see a decreasing defense budget compared to GDP starting at 3.8 percent in 2010 and ending with 3 percent in 2019.

This is interesting to compare, to use the percentage of GDP. If we go back and look at what happened in the entire 20th century—for 100 years—and we take the average of defense spending as a percentage of GDP, it is 5.7 percent—5.7 percent. I have been asking to just keep it at no less than 4 percent. Right now, it is a little under 4 percent, but it would go down to 3 percent with the budget expectations we are looking at right now.

So when compared to a sustained annual defense investment of 4 percent of GDP to recapitalize and modernize our military, the 10-year proposed Obama defense budget is \$1.3 trillion in the

red. It is so similar to what we went through in the 1990s. I do not like to be overly critical, but there are a lot of people who are liberal people who generally, in their own mind, do not think we need a military. I have listened. They will never admit it. But they say, well, if all nations would stand in a circle and hold hands and unilaterally disarm, all threats would go away.

I respect people who have this opinion, even though the opinion is wrong.

So we have ships and naval aircraft that currently average being 18 years old, and Marine Corps aircraft that now average being over 21 years old. Refueling tankers—I am talking about the KC-135s—are over 44 years old; Air Force fighter aircraft, 19 years old; special operations aircraft, over 27 years old. Special ops—everyone realizes what a great job they are doing. It is kind of like the Marine Corps. They always have to make do with older equipment but never complain about it.

In order to keep 40-year-old KC-135s in the air, the DOD had to reprogram almost \$3 billion from the KC-X to repair KC-135s. For the KC-X, we might remember—that was kind of confusing—a contract was let, and that contract was challenged. That would have given us—not immediately, certainly, but over the next 20 years, we would be able to replace the KC-135s.

I think it is easier—rather than to spend any more time talking about very complicated things in terms of budgeting—to just look and see service by service. The Army's current fleet of combat vehicles was developed and procured between 30 and 60 years ago.

We have the M1 Abrams tank, which has done a great job, that was developed back in the early 1970s and fielded in the early 1980s. The M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicle—we are still using that right now, and it is 25 years old. It is on its third significant modification, and it has been crucial in defending our troops against the IEDs the RPGs. Both of these combat-proven vehicles continue to undergo fleetwide resets. Yet they are so old.

So let's look at another particular one, the best artillery piece we have in the U.S. Army. It is called a Paladin. The Paladin is a technology developed in World War II. You actually have to get out after each shot and swab the breech.

Now, it has gone through some new reiterations, and currently there is another one that is taking place. But again, this is what we have. There are five countries now, including South Africa, that make a better artillery piece than our Paladin. This is one of the programs that is a part of the FCS program that is going to be cut. Secretary Gates didn't say it was completely cut; he just said it is delayed. That is a nice way of saying it is cut, it is gone.

So I would hope one thing: That when we are going through what they call the PIM Program—the Paladin Integrated Management Program—we keep these running, to upgrade them so they

will be somewhat competitive in the battlefield. I would say at the very least we should keep that PIM Program going if we cut the future combat system. We should keep the future combat system on track, but if we dump the FCS, we don't want to dump the PIM with it. So even with that PIM update, the Army expects to keep the Paladin in use until 2060, and that is 100 years on the battlefield.

Our Army is long overdue for a thorough and comprehensive modernization. I would just go back again to 1994 when we had people testifying that in 10 years we would no longer need ground capability or ground fighters. The proposed Defense budget would cancel the Army's future combat system and the modernization programs intended to replace the Paladin. FCS would bring improved armor and would save lives. Nonetheless, that was one of them that was cut.

Let's go to the Air Force. For nearly two decades, our Air Force has dominated the skies and ensured air superiority. But a recent GAO study stated that air sovereignty alert operations—the post-9/11 operations that protect our homeland—are at risk due to aging aircraft and insufficient procurement. The Air Force grounded 259 of its 441 F-15 Eagles from November 1997, and last May the service parked 500 of its T-38 Talons, the trainers. A lot of those were taking place at Vance Air Force Base in my State of Oklahoma. They don't have quite enough of them yet, but again, that is part of the problem we are having right now. Our aging fleet is out of service. Last October, the Air Force ordered more than half of its 356 A-10 fighters to stay put because of cracks inside the wings. While we have enjoyed the benefit of investment during the 1980s of the F-15, the F-16, the A-10, the F-117, which is now out of service, the service is talking about retiring 137 F-15s, 177 F-16s, and 9 A-10s. I say that creates a problem.

We had a very courageous general named John Jumper. John Jumper ended up being the Chief of the Air Force, but before he was Chief of the Air Force—and this was about 1998, so it was during the Clinton administration, and it took a lot of courage for a uniform to stand up and admit publicly, with his background that no one would question, that now—back in 1998—he said the Soviets—the Russians—are making the SU series that are really fifth-generation fighters and we don't have anything that can really compete with them that is better than our F-15s or F-16s, which is all we had at that time. So in spite of all of the above, President Obama is shutting down the F-22, the only fifth-generation fighter we have. Remember, we were going to have 750 of them, and he is going to stop at 187. If you stop the production line at 187, we are not going to be able to produce any more of these things.

If some President comes along in 4 years and says: No, they made a mis-

take 4 years ago, we are going to have to get that line going again, the first ones would cost about twice. So this is one of the problems we are having.

They are talking about increasing the F-35s—that is the Joint Strike Fighter—but that is a different mission. It certainly can't compete with the F-22.

Well, we have a very serious problem. Again, it gets down to, do we really have an expectation in America—we send our kids into battle in the air or on the ground—that we are going to get them the best equipment to work with? I wish that were the case, but it is not the case.

The Navy. At a time when the U.S. Navy is being called on to project its presence in more parts of the world than ever before, the recommendation that is coming from the White House is that the Navy shrink its carrier fleet to 10 aircraft carriers by 2012 and delay the acquisition of the other portions of its fleet. We see what is happening now. We have these aircraft carriers staged all over the world, and to be cutting that fleet, to me, is totally irresponsible.

I remember when I was first elected to the House. My first year was 1987. The first weekend I was in the House of Representatives, and I was going to be on the House Armed Services Committee, I spent the weekend down off the coast of Virginia on the USS Coral Sea. I went out there and landed on the carrier. I thought I had died and gone to heaven, it had such capability. At that time, in 1987, as we looked as the Sun was coming up, we could see the Soviet ships that were going around with their periscopes, the submarines, looking at what we had. Now that is out of commission; the Coral Sea is gone. These things don't last forever. The opposition—China, right now, is building these things. We have to stay better than they are. Yet we are cutting our carrier fleet.

This reduction of aircraft carriers goes further below the previous QDR—that is the Quadrennial Defense Review—of 12 carriers required for moderate risk. So we have a situation where we need 12 carriers—not 10 but 12—for moderate risk. Moderate risk is a term that is used in the military as to lives. If you have no risk, you are not going to lose human lives. If you have high risk, you are going to lose a lot of human lives. This is moderate. So we are saying we are willing to cut two aircraft carriers below what we call moderate risk or loss of life. I am not willing to do that.

In the last few weeks, we have seen how important the Navy is in watching some of the pirate counterterrorism operations off the coast of Africa. I was over there in Somalia and in that area just a week ago. We are having some successes in our battle with the pirates, but again, a very critical part of that is our carrier capability.

Meanwhile, Russian and Chinese submarines continue to be a threat to our

forces, with China operating over 60-something quieter subs. Since the 1990s, China has been unilaterally hedging its maritime power to exclude the U.S. Navy from the Taiwan Straits and along China's coasts. We all know that. Now we have China, Japan, Australia, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Singapore, Bangladesh, and South and North Korea either now or planning to acquire submarines to compete against ours. In all, we now have found it acceptable in this budget that is coming out of the White House to cut our total ships down to 300. I remember when there were 700 ships.

Missile defense. This is something I think everyone should understand now. We think about the tragedy of 9/11. We think, as bad as that was, how much worse it would have been if they had had the capability of the nuclear warhead on a delivery system, hitting a major city in America. We wouldn't be talking about 3,000 deaths; we would be talking about 300,000 or maybe 3 million deaths.

On February 3, Iran launched a satellite on the 30th anniversary of the 1979 Islamic revolution, demonstrating key technologies of propulsion, staging, and guidance. This is what they did. We are talking about just 2 months ago in that demonstration. Then, going all the way back to 1979, I recall in—I was concerned in 1998 as to what the capability was going to be for North Korea in terms of having a multistage rocket capability, and the administration at that time, the Clinton administration, said it will be from 8 to 10 years, on August 24 of 1998. Seven days later, even though they said it would be 8 to 10 years before they had the capability, they fired one, and that demonstrated the capability they had.

It makes you wonder how accurate we are right now in our assessment of their capability. Nonetheless, this budget recommended a 16-percent cut in the missile defense budget by \$1.4 billion, and this is something that is totally unacceptable. We are going to have to reverse this.

It wasn't long ago that we recognized we had to have a capability in the Czech Republic and in Poland. We wanted to have a radar capability in the Czech Republic and an interception capability in Poland, next door. Why do we need this? Because as they develop their capability in Iran and they want to come and shoot something at Western Europe and possibly to get to the east coast of the United States of America, the only place we can reliably, with our technology, shoot that down would be in that area of Eastern Europe.

So we went and negotiated with the Parliaments. I was there. Vaclav Klaus, the President of the Czech Republic, who happens to be one of my favorite people in the world—and he is one who helped us get this through Parliament. It wasn't easy. The thinking was: Well, is this going to be a threat? Are we going to have Russia

coming down and complaining, saying this is an act of aggression? No. We are just trying to knock down a missile that might be coming from a place such as Iran or Syria or someplace else going toward Western Europe and the United States. Well, they finally agreed. The Parliaments of Poland and the Czech Republic agreed, and now we pull the rug out from under them with this proposed budget.

The airborne laser—where is the chart on the missile defense?

All right. I know this is heavy lifting, and this is not an easy thing to understand. But if you look at a missile defense system—let's keep in mind, this is the 26th anniversary of Ronald Reagan, saying SDI—members of the Strategic Defense Initiative—everyone criticized them: No one will ever be able to hit a bullet with a bullet. Well, they hit a bullet with a bullet. We have had several tests demonstrating that we can do it. Well, how do you knock down a missile coming in? You have three phases. There is a boost phase, a midcourse phase, and a terminal phase. We are currently in good shape on the midcourse phase and the terminal phase, but the main area where we are stark naked is in the boost phase. We don't have anything.

We have the airborne laser. That is getting very close to being able to deploy a system to knock down an incoming missile when it is easiest to hit them. That is the boost phase, before they are going all that fast. And they cut that out of this budget.

We need to have—we decided on a policy several years ago, and certainly the Senate Armed Services Committee as well as on the House Armed Services Committee that was headed at that time by DUNCAN HUNTER and I think agreed to by the Democrats and Republicans at that time, that we need to have redundancy in all three areas if we are going to be able to knock down an incoming missile.

I don't think there is anyone in America today who denies that the capability of, No. 1, hitting America is there and, No. 2, of being able to knock it down is there if we continue with this program. But we have to have that capability in the boost phase, and this budget takes that out. I am just as concerned about that as I am about the fact that we really lied to the Czech Republic and to Poland and put them in a very awkward position.

So I guess in conclusion I agree with the President and Secretary Gates that we are going to have to reform our Defense acquisition system. There is a lot of waste in that. The Presiding Officer and I both serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and we know we need to do some work, but we don't want to be doing this at the risk and at the expense of properly modernizing our services. I have stated many times in this Chamber that the greatest trust placed upon Congress by the American people is to provide for their security by maintaining a strong national defense.

TOM COLE, a House Member from Oklahoma, said it best the other day. He said that eloquence and charm are a poor substitute for a strong national defense. You can be very eloquent, as our President is, and very charming, as our President is, and talk about these things and act as if the threat is not there, but we need to have a strong national defense.

I think Ronald Reagan said it better. He said just to be sure we are prepared. He said: Trust but verify. Trust but verify. We trust these guys over there that they are not going to attack us, but let's verify it.

We can avoid this far too frequent debate on the defense budget by ensuring a minimum level of funding for our military.

So this is where we are today in our situation. I again look at something totally unprecedented. I have something here, if I can find it, that is rather interesting to compare. What we have done—and this is something no one has seen yet because we are still working on it, but we are taking a comparison of 1993 and today. That was the year President Clinton was elected. He also had control of the House and the Senate and the White House, just as the Democrats do today. And we went through the election process. We understand that. But the things they are doing, that President Clinton did at that time and President Obama is doing today, are just remarkably similar.

In the military, the Army was cut back in the Clinton administration by 18 divisions down to 12 divisions, and here we are doing the same thing today. At that time on health care—right now, the President is talking about a universal Government-run health care system. Back then, they called it Hillary health care.

They called it Hillary health care, the same thing. Gun control, the same type of thing. I will wait and do this all at once. I am trying to get to the amount of money. I was on the floor criticizing President Clinton because he proposed \$243 billion in tax increases. The current President is talking about \$1.4 trillion in tax increases. The budget they are operating with right now—I don't have it here—at that time, he talked about a budget of \$1.5 trillion. That was Bill Clinton in 1993. Now it is over twice that much. These are numbers we never thought about before. If you add together the \$700 billion bank bailout, the \$789 billion stimulus plan, and the \$410 billion omnibus spending bill, that adds up to over \$2 trillion, which is unheard of. It is very similar. It is just on a larger scale than that of 1993.

That is the concern I bring to the floor today. I have only a few minutes left. I will cover one of my other three concerns. I have talked about the TARP funding on the floor. The TARP funding was supposed to be used to buy damaged assets. At that time, in October of 2008, the Secretary of the Treasury promised that if we would give him

\$700 billion, he would spend it to buy damaged assets. Some in this Chamber believed him. I didn't. I said put it in writing, let's get it into the law. But they were in too big a hurry and said: We have to do it now or we will have another Great Depression. He spent the money to bail out many banks that didn't even want to be bailed out and banks that previously both Geithner and Paulson were associated with. So that was a problem and we should now try to salvage what we can out of that program. So that is another subject—one I have spent quite a bit of time on over the last 7 years.

Seven years ago, when the Republicans had a majority in the Senate, I became chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. At that time, we were very close to ratifying the Kyoto Treaty. We remember this all started with the United Nations and then, of course, the people in Hollywood, the Hollywood elitists, moveon.org, and the Michael Moores of the world—and they had a right to do it—were saying we are going to have to stop emissions of greenhouse gases, and that the anthropogenic gases and man-made case gases were causing global warming.

I remember so well, in 1975, in the State legislature, at that time the same magazines that are putting on the front page this idea that global warming is taking place—they are not doing it now, but they were up until about 5 years ago. Back then, they were saying: Get ready, another ice age is coming, we are all going to die. I remember using the term that this has to be the greatest "hoax" ever perpetrated on the American people.

Fast forward to the late 1990s, when Kyoto was there, when I was chairman of the committee and I believed that manmade gases were causing global warming, until the Wharton Business School came out with the Wharton econometric survey. They showed clearly that if we were to sign on and ratify the Kyoto Treaty, it would cost the American people in the range of between \$300 billion and \$330 billion a year. Then, if you fast forward that to the next McCain-Lieberman bill, it was even more than that, and the Warner-Lieberman bill was even more than that.

When I looked at it at that time, back when we were very close to ratifying the treaty, I found out that the science was not there. A lot of scientists were saying it was there, but it wasn't. Today, if anybody wants to get into my Web site, inhofesenate.gov, you can see all of the scientists. We have over 700 of them who used to be on the other side of this protecting their grants. They had to play this game to do it. They are now coming over to the skeptic side.

As we listen to the current administration, they are now going to try to, by regulation, impose this giant tax on the American people because they know they cannot get it through this

Chamber. We defeated it a year ago today—the last effort to have a cap-and-trade tax on the American people—by almost a 2-to-1 margin. They are going to try to do it again. When you talk about the \$700 billion bailout and the stimulus bill, at least that is a one-shot deal. With this, you are talking about a regular annual tax increase on the American people of about \$350 billion. The estimates are between \$3,000 and \$4,000 a year per family. What good would that do? Even if it is true, if people listening to me today, including fellow Members, believe manmade gases are causing global warming—if they believe that to be true, what good would it do us in the United States to unilaterally say we are going to impose these restrictions and pay \$400 billion a year? And what good will it do if we do that, because our manufacturing base will go into countries where they have no restrictions. That would happen.

I inquire as to the time remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 40 seconds.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I think the other speakers are here. Later on, I will talk about the assets we have, and that we have to keep Guantanamo Bay—Gitmo, as it is referred to. It has performed well for us since 1903. I cannot think of one statement, other than political statements, as to why we have to get rid of that great asset.

With that, I thank the Chair for his tolerance and I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

To: CSIS J. Board of Trustees, Advisers, and Friends

From: John J. Hamre

Date: April 13, 2009 (Number 298. Two pages)

Re: Cancelling weapons systems

I was out of the country last week when Secretary of Defense Gates announced his recommendation for wholesale termination of a large number of weapon systems. This was such a big deal that he skipped the 60th anniversary celebrations of the founding of NATO in order to prepare for the announcement.

Secretary Gates epitomizes what Americans want in public service—fairness, decisiveness and decency. And he clearly captured broad public support with his recommendations. In dozens of conversations, I always heard some version of "it is about time we had a leader that did this." This is usually followed up by a question "do you think he will be reversed by Congress?"

There is a myth in American politics, that defense contractors are powerful manipulative forces in Washington. Ever since President Eisenhower coined the term "the military-industrial complex" the popular sense is that defense companies manipulate the Department and the Congress to get whatever they want. I have been in and around the defense business for 30 years. My experience has been that they are not the all-powerful force of popular imagination. Defense contractors are hugely vulnerable because they are entirely dependent on the attitude of one customer—the Defense Department. If the Secretary of Defense decides we don't need something (and the Joint Chiefs go along with the decision—a crucial factor), defense contractors have virtually no recourse.

Yes, Congress has occasionally reversed the decision of a defense secretary. I remem-

ber when the Congress kept the B-1 bomber alive after President Carter recommended its termination. But the B-1 would never have been built had it not been for President Reagan who used it to symbolize his different approach to defense policy.

I suspect that most of the Secretary's recommendations will hold. Every year the Congress receives the president's defense budget, tears it apart and puts it back together, and usually approves 97% of what is requested. A powerful member of congress can add \$10-20 million here or there for something, but adding billions of dollars to reverse the Secretary's decision on a single weapon system is almost impossible. We are again returning to an environment when adding something to the defense budget must be offset by cutting something out. A congressman can strongly plea to add \$2 billion for program X, but very rarely offers offsetting cuts in other programs. And with each instance, the pleading congressman has to ultimately argue "my judgment is superior to that of the Secretary of Defense".

BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND COUNSELORS

CSIS trustees are drawn equally from the worlds of public policy and the private sector. They contribute a wealth of expertise to the Center's mission and management. One asterisk (*) denotes a member of the Executive Committee and two asterisks (**) denote a CSIS Counselor.

Chairman: Sam Nunn* **—Cochairman & CEO, Nuclear Threat Initiative since 1999.

Vice Chairman & Co-Founder: David M. Abshire—President, Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress.

Chairman of the Executive Committee: William A. Schreyer*—Chairman Emeritus, Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.

President & CEO: John J. Hamre*—President & CEO, CSIS.

Trustees: George L. Argyros—Chairman & CEO, Arnel & Affiliates; Richard Armitage—President, Armitage International; Reginald K. Brack—Former Chairman & CEO, Time, Incorporated; William E. Brock**—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Harold Brown**—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Zbigniew Brzezinski**—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; William S. Cohen—Chairman & CEO, The Cohen Group; Ralph Cossa—President, Pacific Forum/CSIS; Richard Fairbanks—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Henrietta H. Fore—Former Administrator of the USAID; William H. Frist—Trustee, CSIS; Michael P. Galvin*—President, Harrison Street Capital, LLC; Helene D. Gayle—President & CEO, CARE USA; Linda W. Hart*—Vice Chairman & CEO, The Hart Group, Inc.; Ben W. Heineman, Jr.—CSIS Trustee and Senior Adviser; Thomas O. Hicks—Chairman, Hicks Holdings LLC; Carla A. Hills**—Chairman & CEO, Hills & Company; Ray L. Hunt—Chairman of the Board, President and CEO, Hunt Consolidated, Inc.; E. Neville Isdell—Chairman, The Coca-Cola Company; Muhtar Kent—President and CEO, The Coca-Cola Company; Henry A. Kissinger**—Chairman & CEO, Kissinger Associates, Inc.; Kenneth G. Langone—President & CEO, Invemed Associates, LLC; Chong-Moon Lee—Chairman of Board of Directors, Nara Bancorp, Los Angeles; Donald B. Marron—Chairman & CEO, Lightyear Capital; Joseph Nye—Distinguished Service Professor, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government; Thomas Pritzker—Chairman & CEO, The Pritzker Organization, LLC; Joseph E. Robert—Chairman and CEO, The J.E. Robert Companies (JER); Felix G. Rohatyn—Vice Chairman, FGR Associated, LLC; David M. Rubenstein—Cofounder and Managing Director, The Carlyle Group; Charles A. Sanders—Former Chairman & CEO, Glaxo Inc.; James R. Schlesinger**—Former Secretary of Defense and Energy; Brent Scowcroft**—President, Forum for International Policy; Rex

Tillerson—Chairman & CEO, Exxon Mobil Corporation; Frederick B. Whittemore*—Advisory Director, Morgan Stanley.

Trustees Emeriti: Betty Beene—Former President & CEO, United Way of America; Amos A. Jordan—President Emeritus, CSIS; Murray Weidenbaum—Hon. Chair, Weidenbaum Center, Washington University; Dolores D. Wharton—Retired Chairman and CEO, Fund For Corporate Initiatives, Inc.

Counselors: William E. Brock—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Harold Brown—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Zbigniew Brzezinski—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Frank C. Carlucci—Counselor, CSIS; Richard Fairbanks—Counselor and Trustee, CSIS; Carla A. Hills—Chairman & CEO, Hills & Company; Zalmay Khalilzad—Counselor, CSIS; Henry A. Kissinger Chairman & CEO, Kissinger Associates, Inc.; Theodore McCarrick—Counselor, CSIS; Sam Nunn—Co-Chairman & CEO, Nuclear Threat Initiative; James R. Schlesinger—Former Secretary of Defense and Energy; Brent Scowcroft—President, Forum for International Policy; John Warner Counselor, CSIS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 897 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. I must interrupt the Senator from Utah. There is an emergency.

The Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:41 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair until 12:47 p.m. and reassembled at 12:47 p.m., when called to order by the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. BURRIS.).

REMEMBERING STEVE MOSLEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn about the passing of a man who gave many long years of dedicated service to this Capitol.

If you only know this Senate through C-SPAN, it is likely you never saw Steve.

But if you had the privilege to work in this beautiful building, Steve's work was indispensable.

Steve was a valued member of the Senate Sergeant at Arms' Capitol Facilities team for 32 years—since he was 20 years old.

He was part of the team of hard-working men and women who care for this historic building.

If a room in the Capitol needed to be set up for a meeting, set up again an hour later for a hearing, and set up again for a reception, you knew you could count on Steve to do the work right, and on time.

When a filibuster seemed imminent, Steve was part of the crew that would retrieve the cots from storage and set them up in the Capitol—just in case.

Steve's willingness to be helpful was invaluable. Not long after I moved into

my office on the third floor of the Capitol, Steve was in my office to install a rug.

He saw that there was a problem. He told my staff that he had seen the problem in another office—the way the rug was to be laid out, visitors would trip on the corner of the rug and might fall.

This was just one example of how Steve cared for this institution and the people who visited this building every day.

Whatever it took to make this Capitol work for visitors and employees, Steve did—with pride and professionalism.

Steve was a friendly man who liked almost everyone—except the Dallas Cowboys.

He was a generous man who never called attention to his generosity. If a coworker needed a ride, Steve was the first to offer. He brought Easter baskets to his friends' children.

Steve Mosley died suddenly and unexpectedly Wednesday night of a heart attack.

I join my colleagues and all who work in this Capitol in offering our deep condolences to Steve's wife of 26 years, Michelle, and their only child, Steven Jr., whose 25th birthday is today.

He was much admired and he will be much missed, in this Capitol and among those who knew him.

TRIBUTE TO THE CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the great national parks in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, located southeastern Kentucky, near Middlesboro. The park will celebrate its 50th anniversary this year.

In the 1920s, the idea of creating the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park was formed, and after 30 years of planning and hard work, the park was finished and dedicated, 50 years ago this coming July.

The park will hold several special events in July celebrating the anniversary of the historic dedication, including the gathering of oral histories from people who were present during the creation, early days, and dedication of the park.

At the time of the dedication, Cumberland Gap National Historical Park included 20,184 acres—10,679 in Kentucky, 7,478 in Virginia, and 2,027 in Tennessee. Until 1980, it was the largest historical park in the country. It is estimated that more than 1 million people will visit the park this year.

Efforts have been made by the National Park Service since 1997 to prevent surface coal mining in the area surrounding Fern Lake. In cooperation with my friend in the House, Congressman Hal Rogers, we were able to pass legislation that authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Fern

Lake and the surrounding watershed to preserve this natural resource.

I value the importance of this park and have consistently secured funds to help acquire and preserve the lake. Located just southeast of Middlesboro, Fern Lake serves as the primary water source for the community and is visible from the Pinnacle Overlook, which is a popular visitor attraction at the Cumberland Gap National Park.

This park shows the importance Kentuckians place on our natural environment, and I applaud the work of the individuals who helped make this park a reality and those who continue to safeguard its natural beauty for many generations to come.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join with me in celebrating the 50th anniversary of the dedication of one of our Nation's most beautiful historical parks.

94TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 94th Anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Ninety-four years ago today, the Ottoman Empire—now modern-day Turkey—began the systematic destruction of the Armenian people. Armenians were driven from their homes and villages, marched to their deaths in the deserts of the Middle East, and slaughtered in cold blood. Before it was over, approximately 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives in the first genocide of the 20th century.

Recently, the Armenian and Turkish Governments announced important progress toward achieving the full normalization of relations between their two countries. I support this effort, and am hopeful that this process will lead the Turkish Government to finally acknowledge the irrefutable truth of the Armenian genocide and also to greater peace and prosperity for the people of Armenia.

As President Barack Obama has said, "The Armenian Genocide is not an allegation, a personal opinion, or a point of view, but rather a widely documented fact supported by an overwhelming body of historical evidence. The facts are undeniable." There is no need for further study or debate because we must never legitimize the views of those who deny the very worst of crimes against humanity.

On this solemn anniversary, we remember those who were lost in the Armenian genocide, while honoring the survivors and their descendants who have done so much to make America and the world a better place. I am personally grateful that so many of those individuals have chosen to call California home.

We also take pause to acknowledge that such crimes are continuing today. There is perhaps no more fitting example than the genocide that is raging in the Darfur region of Sudan.

Since 2002, the Sudanese Government has attempted to exterminate the African Muslim population of Darfur with horrific acts of brutality. Villages have been burned to the ground, innocent women and children slaughtered by helicopter gunships, and rape has been used as a tool of genocide. What happened to the Armenians is genocide. What is happening today in Darfur is genocide, even though the Government of Sudan denies this.

Genocide is only possible when people avert their eyes. Any effort to deal with genocide—in the past, present or future—must begin with the truth. By acknowledging the truth of the Armenian genocide, we can end the phony debates and strengthen our ability to stand up against mass killing today.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I join with my colleagues, my fellow Rhode Islanders, and the Armenian-American community to observe the 94th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Each year, on April 24, it is fitting that we pause to remember and reflect on one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century, the systematic killing of Armenians. From 1915 through the end of 1923, nearly 1½ million Armenians were killed and over half a million survivors were exiled.

The Armenian genocide demonstrated the evils humans are capable of, and unfortunately, it was only the first of several 20th century tragedies.

As we reflect and recall this tragic time, let us call for our own country to recognize the Armenian genocide, just as my own State of Rhode Island has done, along with many other States and governments.

Menk panav chenk mornar—We will never forget.

SOMALI PIRACY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I was glad earlier this week to join Senator LEAHY in passing a resolution commending Captain Richard Phillips for his brave conduct, and those members of our armed services, particularly members of the Navy and Navy SEAL teams, who rescued Captain Phillips. I also commend the leadership of the President and the efforts of many U.S. Government departments and agencies in their response to this crisis. These many acts of bravery and leadership are deeply inspiring, and we should recognize them.

However, while the episode involving the Maersk Alabama was resolved, we are likely to see more such episodes if we do not take comprehensive measures to address not only piracy on the waters but also conditions on land that enable it. We cannot ignore the fact that piracy off the coast of Somalia is an outgrowth of the state collapse, lawlessness, and humanitarian crisis that have plagued the country for over a decade. In recent congressional testimony, both Director of National Intelligence Blair and Defense Intelligence

Agency Director Army LTG Michael Maples cited lawlessness and economic problems on land as the cause of the rise in piracy at sea. Until we address those conditions, we will be relying on stopgap measures, at best, to deter this piracy problem and we are unlikely to succeed in reversing the growing violent extremism in Somalia.

For years I have been calling for the development of a comprehensive, inter-agency strategy to help establish stability, the rule of law, and functional, inclusive governance in Somalia. This is the only sure and sustainable solution to address the problem of piracy—and the instability in Somalia—over the long term. Moreover, I am convinced that we have a unique window of opportunity for progress as a result of the Ethiopian troop withdrawal earlier this year and the establishment of a new unity Government relocated back to Mogadishu. This Government has the potential to unite Somalia if it demonstrates a genuine commitment to inclusion and begins to make a real difference in people's lives—in terms of security and basic services, such as protection, trash collection and job creation. Helping the Government to find tangible solutions to expand effective and inclusive governance must be a central part of our overall strategy to stabilize Somalia and address the threats of piracy and terrorism.

To that end, I continue to urge the Obama administration, as it develops its response to piracy, to make it a priority to engage at a high level with the new Somali Government. I have written to President Obama, asking him to personally call Somali President Sheikh Sharif and indicate a clear commitment to work with his Government not just on maritime insecurity but also on establishing security and governance within the country. We have been engaging with President Sharif at the ambassadorial level for quite some time now, and I met the President in Djibouti in December. In addition, there needs to be a stronger and more sustained diplomatic push to engage with a wide range of actors within Somalia and stakeholders in the wider region—both in the Horn of Africa and the Middle East—if we are going to address the underlying problems that have contributed to piracy and rising extremism.

The events with the Maersk Alabama earlier this month have finally brought increased attention to the problem of piracy in Somalia's waters. But it will be insufficient if our response only deals with the symptoms and not Somalia's central problems. I urge my colleagues and the different committees who will examine this issue over the coming weeks and months to take this seriously. For if we do not finally deal with Somalia's lawlessness and instability, we will continue to see them manifest themselves in activities—be they acts of piracy or terrorism—that threaten U.S. and international security.

IDAHOANS SPEAK OUT ON HIGH ENERGY PRICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in mid-June, I asked Idahoans to share with me how high energy prices are affecting their lives, and they responded by the hundreds. The stories, numbering well over 1,200, are heartbreaking and touching. While energy prices have dropped in recent weeks, the concerns expressed remain very relevant. To respect the efforts of those who took the opportunity to share their thoughts, I am submitting every e-mail sent to me through an address set up specifically for this purpose to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not an issue that will be easily resolved, but it is one that deserves immediate and serious attention, and Idahoans deserve to be heard. Their stories not only detail their struggles to meet everyday expenses, but also have suggestions and recommendations as to what Congress can do now to tackle this problem and find solutions that last beyond today. I ask unanimous consent to have today's letters printed in the RECORD.

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

Thank you for providing your constituents the opportunity to share our thoughts and ideas regarding energy with you. Your willingness to listen is yet another reason I am glad you represent me in Washington.

For my family, the ridiculous cost of fuel has affected almost every area of our lives. My husband pastors a church here in Twin Falls and we have always lived within our means. We are not in debt and have put away a tidy amount toward our children's university education.

However, with gas prices rising toward \$5 a gallon, we have had to rethink our budget and spending on items like groceries, clothing, dental insurance and home remodeling and repairs. We had planned to repair the sidewalk in front of our home since it has cracked and chipped over many years and presents a hazard to passers-by. My husband decided not to go ahead with the project this summer because he is afraid gas prices will continue to soar and we will be left in a precarious position this coming winter.

Our children usually participate in some form of athletic activity over the summer, and this summer was supposed to be golf. We have cut back on the frequency of their golf rounds and did not purchase a set of clubs for our younger daughter as we had planned. In addition, we cancelled plans to spend two weeks at a resort in Sun Valley in July and will instead go camping near home.

If things do not improve soon, we will have to cancel our weekly ski trips this winter as well, because the high cost of fuel will prohibit us from making the drive to Ketchum each week.

Perhaps these cutbacks sound frivolous to some who surely have it much harder than we do, but when we consider that there are alternative, less costly energy sources available, and when we read that once again, the democratic machine has stalled drilling for existing oil, and when we combine that with the fact that our government can afford to promote initiatives for credits on the manufacture and purchase of alternative energy sources, it makes no sense.

Surrounded by naysayers, a wise little boy once remarked, "Momma! The emperor is naked!" It is high time those of us feeling

the pinch of escalating fuel prices cry out, "The emperor is naked!" All the rigmarole and double-talk thrown at us from politically savvy liberals does not keep us warm in winter, nor get us to work on time.

Please use your position to support offshore drilling, research and develop alternative sources of energy including nuclear, and push for tax credits and rebates on the manufacture and purchase of solar panels and other energy alternatives.

Thank you again for representing me with dignity, wisdom and courage in Washington D.C.

SUMMER, *Twin Falls.*

Simply put, I stopped driving. I ride my bike, telecommute, and use mass transit. I carpool when I can and am considering purchasing a smaller, diesel engine vehicle and converting it to run on vegetable oil. Sounds crazy, but it is better than supporting the big oil companies.

For those of us who have been paying attention the past few years, the high price of oil (and consequently gas) is no surprise. It is about time that Americans started valuing oil and gas as the precious commodities that they are. We could continue to build an economy based on a non-renewable fuel. And that would validate our history of shortsighted solutions for complex problems. Need more oil, ally with the Saudis, no problem. Befriend African rogue nations, they've got plenty. Who cares if they commit atrocious human rights violations. It comes down the cheap price of oil, right?

OK, so let us drill in our own backyards. How would you like an oil rig in your wilderness area or off your coastline? Ask the residents of Pinedale, Wyoming, who not only deal with the high price of housing spurred by the natural gas drilling in the area, but have also contended with near unacceptable ozone levels throughout three of the past four winters (March 13, 2008 Casper Star Tribune). Keep in mind, this is a county in rural Wyoming, approximately 5,000 square miles, with about 6,000 residents (as of the year 2000) in which there exists not a single spotlight!

Or ask those who lived in Santa Barbara in 1969 (June 23, 2008 NPR website). I remember my first trip to the beach as a kid . . . and cleaning the oil off the bottom of my feet with olive oil at the end of the day.

Or ask those who live near the tar sands in Canada about their quality of life and health concerns (http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/01/20/60minutes/main1225184_page1.shtml)

Or we could look for a solution that addresses the truly complex nature of this issue. Our economy and way of life are based on petroleum, a non-renewable resource. Some predict we have even reached the critical "peak oil" point, yet we insist on continuing to look for more of something that will eventually, without a doubt, run out. Maybe the high price of gas is a blessing in disguise. Maybe it will force us to take a serious look at alternatives before it really is too late.

KIM, *Boise.*

The following is my response to Senator Bingaman (thus to Congress) regarding his comment about energy in his newsletter. This pretty much says it all, and thus sums it up for us, the taxpaying citizens of this nation—those paying over \$4.00 a gallon for gas, and consequently outrageous prices for food!

"You are 'working to get a clear picture what actually is going on in oil and gasoline markets . . . ? Where have you been? And, you are the chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee?"

"The citizens of this nation have been trying to get Congress to drill for oil for years,

only to have Congress [miss the mark due to special interest and environmental lobbying]. Consequently, ten years later, you are still studying the problem . . . and we are paying through the nose for gasoline, and consequently for food.

"We need to drill on land and sea, wherever the oil may be!

"Congress [has failed] to provide short-term as well as long-term energy solutions. [It seems that partisan finger pointing is all that goes on.]

"Yes, We need to drill on land and sea, wherever the oil may be!

"Drill, drill, drill, and drill some more! And do not forget to process that oil shale that everyone said, 'when the price of oil hits \$50 a barrel, it would be profitable!'

"The rising price of gasoline, consequently food, is hurting every family in America. We are tired of Congress doing nothing but finger pointing and bowing down to the environmentalists and special interest groups.

"Oh sure, there is a problem with the oil companies, but the real problem is Congress! Congress must lead and demand drilling commence immediately in Alaska, North Dakota, the western states, and oil shale must be processed, too! If the oil companies need an incentive, simply tell them to choose between paying a huge windfall profits tax or invest that money in drilling immediately!

"It is time for Congress to implement a program, which allows for the exploration of America's energy sources without being overly concerned about the environment. Yes, we should be concerned about any reckless exploration, and not permit such folly, but remember, you have asked the balance of the world to drill, while overly protecting our environment . . . and yes, to our detriment. Because of you our economy and citizens suffers—suffering needlessly! Because of Congress' inaction, for years, Congress has put this nation in a position whereby OPEC and speculators can, and do, extort exorbitant prices for oil out of this nation!

"And, about the 'excuse' that it will take a few years to get the oil into the pipeline. [With the many years of foot-dragging, our country is paying dearly for inaction.]

"As you very well know, once this country commences drilling, seriously, for oil . . . and we do have a huge supply, the price will immediately drop, and then we will be on the road to becoming self-sufficient! Yes, if we announced that we were going to drill in the gulf, in Alaska, in North Dakota and in our western states, as well as process oil shale, the price of oil would drop 50 to 70 dollars a barrel overnight!

"Inaction has cost this country dearly, and our economy suffers because of it—but, even worse, the working man is finding it difficult to make ends meet! You must stop playing petty, partisan politics and put our families, the citizens of this nation, and the welfare of our country first!

"We need to drill on land and sea, wherever the oil may be!" . . . Now! No more excuses!

BRUCE.

After having read the stories on your site, and myself feeling the same pain, I would just like to ask a few questions. One, what is our current president doing? [While he may not have financial worries, he needs to pay attention to the rest of the country.] Two, what are all of you politicians, senate leaders and other elected officials doing to help solve all of these problems in our country. And I mean what are you doing about it, not just talking about what could be done. I could tell my story, but it would be the same as all others. Pretty soon none of us will be able to afford to drive to work, except of course the bigwig making all the bonus bucks execs at the oil companies. Pretty

soon we will not have to worry about how many overweight people there are in our country because people will not be able to feed themselves. We will become one of the foreign nations with starving people living on the streets and killing children because people cannot afford to have a family. I am sure the suicide rate is going up as we speak. So I am asking you along with all other elected officials, please do something! Take action! Let us know there is hope!

LYNN, *Star.*

This is the 3rd response I have sent to you in regards to saving energy. I want you to know that we have several new long-haul trucking companies using the Ferox Fuel Tabs with great success. I am enclosing one of the testimonial trial runs for your view. Ferox is different from anything on the market as it is a catalysis and was developed in 1986 from work done on experimental burn rate modifiers for solid rocket propellant systems use in the aerospace industry. With a near 100% burn rate, significant changes in normal circumstances change for the better: Increased gas mileage up to 20% or more; emissions are reduced by 95% (this is as green as you can get for the environment); oil life is extended by 80%; horsepower increased by 15%; octane requirements are reduced and it is very easy to use, cost can get as low as .07 cents per gallon. This is as professional product as it can get having been used in the commercial industry for more than 20 years with documented success. If everything I am saying is true, why would you not give it some attention so you can see for yourself. I realize there are many out there that are claiming something similar, but many questions remain as to them working as they claim. This one is for real and would make a tremendous difference in many respects. Please respond as I would like to know where to go from here to try to help make a difference.

GORDON, *Twin Falls.*

I am a student at Brigham Young University of Idaho. Each summer I take the time to earn money for education and reduce my amount of loan-borrowing. The city of Rexburg is rather small and has a shortage of job opportunities for college students. Naturally, many students in my same situation seek employment in Rigby or Idaho Falls. The commute may only be about 30 miles. Nonetheless, after the cost of gasoline was subtracted from my paycheck, it was barely worth commuting out of town. This year I intend to work within Rexburg in an effort to save money on gas. I hope to make slightly more than minimum wage, but that is negotiable to circumstance. As was mentioned in national news, many BYU-Idaho students donate their plasma to help pay for groceries, dates and, of course, gasoline. Many of my friends donate plasma on a weekly basis. I suppose this is one way to buffer the effect of gas prices now, but it can only last so long. It is also unfortunate for those whose health impedes them from selling their plasma. It is ridiculous to think of how much money I spend at the pump on my little Honda Accord. I do not know how some people afford to drive their huge SUVs or trucks! I am starting to worry because the prices do not appear to be stopping or slowing. Not every semester of classes will allow for an evening job due to their academic rigor and demand of time. Education remains very expensive even after receiving government financial aid (which, by the way, I am very grateful for). Bottom line, the price of gas is really hurting me and my classmates. Thanks for listening.

MATTHEW, *Rexburg.*

Our energy independence is easily bought by reducing the usage, or waste. We as Americans drive around in our SUVs and pickups when there is no need to do so, we have only one person in a vehicle and it is a huge waste of energy to drive it helping only the ego of the person driving it. We would do a lot better if we had some sort of mass transit and drove smaller cars instead of some huge dinosaur eating toy. If a person wants to drive that sort of vehicle it is up to them to pay the penalty for it.

As far as gas prices go I personally would not mind to pay five dollars a gallon if a much larger percentage of the cost of the fuel was a tax that went straight toward a mass transit system to get us all where we need to go in an efficient manner, it is done in Europe so it is possible here!

As for all those complaining about the high fuel prices, buying a vehicle that gets poor mileage is like not putting money in the bank for retirement or hard times. You reap what you sow!

Maybe we should do a better job educating to enable people to be able to think through a decision.

JOHN, *Meridian*.

Our lives are suddenly controlled by the energy prices we have to pay. Our summer vacations consist of going 200 or 300 miles to see our children and grandchildren. We are not extravagant and travel frugally. This summer our trips have been slashed in half or more because we cannot afford the gas to get there. We filled our propane tank to be prepared for winter, and are already \$1000.00 in debt for heating. This amount will not last all winter, by February or before we will need to fill it again, that is if it is a mild winter. Our heating bill has tripled in the last year and a half. Our food bill has gone up at least one third. We have to drive 8 miles one way to work; we have to have money for gas to get to work, so everything else has to go. We are trying to find ways to cut back on other things, because we do not have enough money to reach the end of the month.

We need to have common sense regarding our energy resources. We can develop fuel sources and be smart about it at the same time. Our dependence on foreign oil has got us around the throat.

ARLENE.

You know all the stories that us Idahoans could send you would not make any difference. The difference will be when the elected officials of this country start doing the right thing for the American public. Only you and the other elected officials can put a stop to all the hullabaloo that is going on at our nation's capital.

It has been said time and time again that a democracy can only last a couple of hundred years until [corruption takes root]. I think we are pretty close to that now. We cannot even take care of the American citizens properly!

JACK, *Idaho Falls*.

I thought you would like to know of our experience with the increasing prices of gasoline and how our family has been affected. A few months ago my husband was diagnosed with esophageal cancer. We live in a small farming community with the nearest center for chemotherapy and radiation being just over 100 miles round trip. His cancer treatment was administered five days per week for 6½ weeks. We had to make this 100-plus mile trip Monday through Friday 28 times. As if the financial burden of the medical treatment and the loss of work was not enough, the price of gasoline did not help. We spent well over \$500 on fuel to drive him

to receive his cancer treatments. Although he is finished with the treatment he will have several follow up visits over the next few months. There is no public transportation in this area, and the rising cost of fuel makes it difficult to want to leave your home! I sincerely hope that a solution can be found to lower the cost of fuel and make life affordable once again.

AMBER, *Grace*.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING WINNERS OF CORPORATE-SPONSORED NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIPS

• Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Kentucky students who have received corporate-sponsored National Merit Scholarships. The National Merit Scholarship Program presents this award to over 1,000 high school seniors and I am very proud that eight recipients of this award reside in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The corporate-sponsored scholarships are a partnership between the National Merit Scholarship Corporation and local companies who wish to support students in their communities. In order for a student to receive a corporate-sponsored scholarship the student must advance to the finalist level of the National Merit Scholarship competition and meet the criteria set forth by their individual corporate sponsor.

The eight students from Kentucky who received this award are Meaghan M. Sanders of Assumption High School, Austin C. Brownlow of Kentucky Country Day, Allan J. Hsiao of DuPont Manual High School, Victoria Greenstone of Sacred Heart Academy, Matthew R. Seabold of St. Xavier High School, Elliott W. Rosenberg and Kyle R. Rosenberg of Paul Laurence Dunbar High School, and Matthew S. Miller of Beechwood High School.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating these students on their outstanding achievement. It is students like these who will provide Kentucky and the United States with our leaders of tomorrow.●

REMEMBERING COLONEL JOHN L. HOWLETT

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize a man who lived a life of honor, serving his country, his community and his family. John Leo Francis Howlett, Ph.D., U.S. Army, retired, served our country in the Army for 30 years and retired at the rank of colonel. Dr. Howlett served in Vietnam and then in the Army Officers Reserves. Upon completion of his Active Duty time, Dr. Howlett obtained his Ph.D. in education and became involved in his community through teaching at the college level, first in Michigan and Wisconsin, and then Washington State, Oregon, and Minnesota. He returned to Spokane, WA, where he finished out his teaching career and retired in 1999.

While vocation tends to determine our geography, our lives are defined by our character. Dr. Howlett was a man of strong faith, high integrity, commitment to challenges, and a true family man. It is said that he never missed a game, meet, tournament or even practice in the sports lives of his five children. He taught his children to respect our tremendous natural resources and imparted his love of hunting, fishing, sailing, and camping to them. The example he set—high achievement, attaining goals, and excellence—lives on in the lives of his children, all high achievers and highly educated in their own right.

John managed to fight the cancer that took his life for 5 years, and passed on July 4, 2005. His son, Mark, described his father thus: "In today's world this is what America needs, a hard working patriot that believed in family, his country, and bettering the children of tomorrow. He was one of a kind, a family man, outdoorsman, husband, father, brother, son, teacher, coach, Catholic and most importantly my best friend!"

I am honored to reflect on this life well-lived.●

REMEMBERING MIDGE MILLER

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, on April 17, Wisconsin bid farewell to a pioneer in politics. Midge Miller was a remarkable woman, and I want to take a few moments to honor her service, her activism, and her extraordinary spirit.

Midge arrived in Madison, WI, in 1957. By that time in her young life she had served as a missionary in Japan after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, had lost her husband to a tragic shipwreck, and was about to begin graduate school in Madison. She was also the mother of four young children.

She went on to serve as assistant dean of UW's College of Letters and Science, one of Wisconsin's most effective State senators, a 9-year member of the Democratic National Committee, and a founder of the National Women's Political Caucus. Along the way she found time to volunteer for a host of causes, all of them aimed at advancing peace and equality and giving hope to people who too often found themselves outside the "system." She defended civil liberties, expanded civil rights, protected the environment, and fought for consumers.

Always mindful of her many roles, Midge could all at once be a remarkable leader, active constituent, and a responsible steward of everything, and to everyone, she touched. When the phone rang and her gentle voice came through on the other end, no matter on what subject or cause, listening, learning, and being compelled to action were the only obvious responses when she was finished with you. From my first days in office right up until recently, Midge was always there to advise me but also hold me accountable. She showed her loved ones in her family and those she came to love in her

community what it meant, in the words of Gandhi, to be the change we want to see in the world. Countless people, especially women in our State, credit her for the opportunities and inspiration she provided that helped them reach their potential.

She was an extraordinary mentor, motivator, and mother. She was tireless and tenacious. She never lost her zeal to make the world a better place. Throughout her life, Midge Miller exemplified public service, social responsibility, goodness, and grace. For all those reasons and many more, I am honored to have known Midge Miller and send my heartfelt condolences to her family.●

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I remember a good friend, a great Wisconsin progressive, Midge Miller, who recently passed away at age 86.

Midge was famous for many things, including her vital work on Eugene McCarthy's Presidential campaign, her efforts to help found the National Women's Political Caucus and the Madison Institute, and her service on the Democratic National Committee, in addition to her many years of service representing the west side of Madison in the Wisconsin State Assembly. Above all, though, Midge was known for who she was rather than the many things she accomplished. She was, very simply, a force of nature. Midge was a dynamo who was always striving to do more and to get those around her to do the same. That was why she was loved by so many and why she will be so greatly missed.

I was proud to serve with Midge in the State legislature, where she was a legendary figure. She was a true reformer, a role model, and a treasured colleague. When I arrived in the State Senate as a young legislator, Midge was always complimentary and supportive, which meant a great deal to me. At the same time, in true Midge fashion, she never failed to give me either additional work or a reading assignment. It was that determination to keep working for change, and to make sure that the rest of us were working for change alongside her, that truly made Midge one of a kind.

Midge was an outstanding representative for the people she served. In the State assembly, she used the skills she had honed from her work on the McCarthy campaign, advancing women's rights, and as a leader in the Democratic Party, to great effect. She was a terrific ally, a formidable opponent, and an unfailing advocate for the people she represented. And, in the end, she didn't just represent the west side of Madison, she represented all who care about economic and social justice, and the countless other causes she championed.

As I make this tribute to Midge, I am particularly proud of the way she represented what is best about our State's progressive tradition. She was absolutely committed to making democ-

racy work for everyday people, people who deserve a decent wage, safe working conditions and good health care, and who deserve to be treated equally, no matter their gender, their religion, or the color of their skin. Her values were the progressive values that have helped to strengthen our State, and the Nation, for more than a century.

Like so many Wisconsinites, my thoughts are with Midge's wonderful family, as people across the State and across the country mourn her loss. We are so fortunate that Midge devoted her tremendous energy, devotion and skill to bettering all of our lives. I am grateful to have known Midge Miller, and I am honored to pay tribute to her today.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 895. A bill to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability.

S. 896. A bill to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability.

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 Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 895. A bill to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability; read the first time.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 896. A bill to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability; read the first time.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 897. A bill to limit Federal spending to 20 percent of GDP; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 898. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide grants and flexibility through demonstration projects for States to provide universal, comprehensive, cost-effective systems of health care coverage, with simplified administration; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 384

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2010 through 2014 to provide assistance to foreign countries to promote food security, to stimulate rural economies, and to improve emergency response to food crises, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

S. 437

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 437, a bill to amend the Inter-

nal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the deduction of attorney-advanced expenses and court costs in contingency fee cases.

S. 455

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 455, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of 5 United States Army Five-Star Generals, George Marshall, Douglas MacArthur, Dwight Eisenhower, Henry "Hap" Arnold, and Omar Bradley, alumni of the United States Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to coincide with the celebration of the 132nd Anniversary of the founding of the United States Army Command and General Staff College.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide coverage for individuals participating in approved cancer clinical trials.

S. 491

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

S. 553

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota to include existing hiking trails along Lake Superior's north shore and in Superior National Forest and Chippewa National Forest, and for other purposes.

S. 614

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 614, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots ("WASP").

S. 645

At the request of Mr. THUNE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 645, a bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to modify the Department of Defense share of expenses under the National Guard Youth Challenge Program.

S. 677

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to require wealthy beneficiaries to pay a greater share of their premiums under the Medicare prescription drug program.

S. 738

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 738, a bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to assure meaningful disclosures of the terms of rental-purchase agreements, including disclosures of all costs to consumers under such agreements, to provide certain substantive rights to consumers under such agreements, and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions.

S. 827

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 827, a bill to establish a program to reunite bondholders with matured unredeemed United States savings bonds.

S. 846

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 846, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Dr. Muhammad Yunus, in recognition of his contributions to the fight against global poverty.

S. CON. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 18, a concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria.

AMENDMENT NO. 1007

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1007 proposed to S. 386, a bill to improve enforcement of mortgage fraud, securities fraud, financial institution fraud, and other frauds related to federal assistance and relief programs, for the recovery of funds lost to these frauds, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 897. A bill to limit Federal spending to 20 percent of GDP; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Limitation On Government Spending Act of 2009. This legislation will set limits on the amount of Government spending in comparison to the Nation's gross domestic product.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn." While we remain in an economic recession, the Obama administration continues to spend our way out of it, disregarding the future consequences.

As we continue on this route of reckless government spending, we continue to increase our debt that will be passed down to our children, grandchildren, and many generations to come. The only way to repay this debt is to increase taxes. That is why I believe it is so important that we restrict ourselves from spending too much, especially during this economic recession.

At a time when Utahns and Americans are tightening their wallets, this budget grows the size of Government, excluding nondefense-related spending in just 2 years by 22 percent.

Many Americans, as demonstrated last week through TEA parties, are asking if this Government spending will ever stop. After trillions for bailouts and other Government spending, this budget makes no hard choices to reform runaway spending.

I keep hearing my friends on the other side of the aisle eagerly point out that President Bush never vetoed a spending bill. While I may agree that the former President should have restricted more in Government spending, President Obama's budget spends more than President Bush's did every year, even after adjusting for inflation.

Furthermore, the spending in this budget is so massive that independent estimates suggest roughly 250,000 new Government bureaucrats may be needed to spend it all. While President Obama would like to claim this as job growth, I think this is a false sense of economic recovery. Long after our economy has hopefully recovered, we will need to continue financing these new 250,000 new Government bureaucrats through, you guessed it, more Government spending.

My Republican colleagues want to work with the President to improve the economy. This should be done by focusing on the issues that are hurting Americans the most. Fixing housing, reforming financial markets, developing clean energy and providing affordable health care are all common goals that both sides of the aisle share. But President Obama's European-style approach to achieve these goals is to socialize America—to spend, spend, spend and not worry about the enormous price tag it will leave.

If you look at the proposed budget, you can see the reckless spending. This budget increases discretionary spend-

ing by \$490 billion over 5 years, and it promises much more spending than that—\$1.3 trillion over 5 years—through 27 reserve funds. The total spending in this budget is \$3.9 trillion in 2009, or 28 percent of GDP, the highest level as a share of the GDP since World War II. This is absurd.

How can we tell the American public, who are budgeting themselves and making sacrifices, that we are going to spend our way out of this, then come back to them and tax them until they are back in the same position? It is ludicrous.

We are moving toward what I call the Europeanization of America. To understand what I mean, it is helpful to compare European countries' total government spending as a percentage of GDP with our Nation's Government spending. In France, for example, government spending is close to 50 percent of GDP. England's government spending is roughly 44 percent of GDP. In Germany, government spending is 45 percent of GDP. In the US Federal Government spending has been around 20 percent. However, to accurately compare the US to European nations, it is necessary to include state and local spending. Once that is factored in, US Government spending exceeds 37 percent of GDP, and that is before President Obama's stimulus package and budget for this year are taken into account. Thus, it is almost a forgone conclusion that by the end of this year, total government spending in the US will be in line with most European governments. Do we really want to move toward this Europeanization of America?

Despite what you may hear, trivial attempts to cutback will not make an impact on Government spending. This past week, President Obama admirably asked his administration to trim \$100 million in Government spending. While this amount would be significant a century ago, it doesn't do much today to reduce government spending. This cut would amount to just 1/400 of 1 percent of total Federal spending for fiscal year 2009. The Federal Government spends \$100 million about every 13 minutes. So, while President Obama's restraint on Government spending is admirable, it is just a drop in the bucket for what we really need to achieve.

It is time for us to take a stand on Government spending. We need to show self-discipline when dealing with Government spending. Since World War II, Federal spending has been between 18 and 22 percent of GDP. I am calling upon my colleagues to restrict Government spending to the historical average of 20 percent. This limitation may be waived by an approval of 3/5 of members of this body.

It is time that we restrict government spending. It will cause us to make some tough decisions about what is really important. One thing is certain, we cannot continue down the path we are headed. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to change

course and get back on the path to fiscal sanity.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting has been scheduled before Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, April 30, 2009 at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate office building.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nominations of Kristina M. Johnson, to be the Under Secretary of Energy, Steven Elliot Koonin, to be the Under Secretary for Science, Department of Energy, Ines R. Triay, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy, Environmental Management, Hilary Chandler Tompkins, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and Scott Blake Harris, to be the General Counsel of the Department of Energy. The Committee may also consider legislation on a Renewable Electricity Standard and on Siting of Interstate Electric Transmission Facilities.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224-7571 or Amanda Kelly at (202) 224-6836.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 895 and S. 896

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading, en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 895) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability.

A bill (S. 896) to prevent mortgage foreclosures and enhance mortgage credit availability.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

MODIFICATION TO ORDER FOR CLOTURE VOTE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order with respect to the cloture vote on Monday, April 27, be modified to provide that the vote occur at 5:20 p.m., with rule XII, paragraph 4, waived, and that the hour for debate prior to the vote begin at 4:20 p.m., with all other provisions remaining in effect. We will act as if the vote started at 5:30.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS HISTORY PROJECT ACT OF 2009

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 586.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 586) to direct the Librarian of Congress and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out a joint project at the Library of Congress and the National Museum of African American History and Culture to collect video and audio recordings of personal histories and testimonials of individuals who participated in the Civil Rights movement, and for other purposes.

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

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

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

The bill (H.R. 586) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2009

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, April 27; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for the transaction of morning business until 4:20 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. I also ask unanimous consent that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 386, the Fraud Enforcement Act, and all orders previously made remain in effect.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the previous order, the time from 4:20 p.m. to 5:20 p.m. on Monday will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. At 5:20 p.m., the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on the fraud legislation.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2009, AT 2 P.M.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:55 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 27, 2009, at 2 p.m.