

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 3981

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the American people deserve to know why we are not legislating. We are all here, and we are not passing any bills, bills that are important to the American people; for example, a bill to keep the government operating. We are getting to the point where we are running out of time. We are not doing that today. A bill to authorize the Defense Department, here we are in the middle of two wars, we are not doing that bill. A bill to help victims of 9/11, the brave first responders who are suffering because they worked, some of them almost 24/7, in the debris that was so toxic to them, and I remember then EPA Administrator Whitman saying it was all fine, it was all safe, the air was OK. We need to help them. We are not doing that. A bill to help our firefighters, a bill to help firefighters have the dignity to be able to negotiate for their wages, a bill called the DREAM Act to help many productive young people join the military and go to college and help our country, we are not doing those either. We are doing nothing. We are not doing a bill to promote manufacturing that was offered by one of my colleagues. We are not doing a bill to give tax breaks to companies that hire unemployed workers. We are not doing a bill to end tax breaks for companies that ship jobs overseas. We are not doing the START treaty, a treaty that is endorsed by international experts from America on both sides of the aisle, including George Shultz, and people who worked for Ronald Reagan and George Bush. We are not doing that.

All these bills, including the unemployment insurance extension, which is so critical, all that is being held hostage by my Republican friends who all wrote a letter and put their names on it. I am not making this up. It is in writing. They said they would do nothing until they won tax break bonuses for those who earn over \$1 million, the millionaires and the billionaires. They are holding up all this important work. To me, it is shocking. I have heard of having an objection to a bill and having a strong moral objection to a bill and holding things up. They are holding up every single thing, as my friend, Senator STABENOW, has talked about for days now.

Here is the point: Democrats have agreed to give every working American a tax break on their first \$250,000 of income, every working American, up to the sky, a tax break on the first \$250,000 of income. We even offered to go up to the first \$1 million because some of our friends said: Oh, 250 isn't high enough. There are some small businesses in there. We investigated

that, and 97 percent of small businesses would be protected with the \$250,000 level. But if we go up to 1 million, all the small businesses are taken care of. We have expressed interest in going up to \$1 million. Guess what. This is not enough for the Republicans in the Senate. They are fighting for those earning over \$1 million, over \$1 billion. It doesn't matter. They are holding everything hostage.

Let's be clear. They are fighting, they are united, they are strong, they are adamant on behalf of the billionaires of this country, by the way, many of whom said: Please, we don't need any more tax breaks. We are doing great.

So if ever people wanted to know which party fights for whom, this is it, folks. This is the clearest example I have ever seen in my life.

Do you know that under the Republican plan a family earning \$10 million a year—listen, \$10 million a year—will get back, under their plan, \$460,000 every single year? They are fighting for that.

They say they care about the deficit. I do not see that because their position on tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires will add hundreds of billions of dollars to our deficit. But when you ask them whether they would be willing to help us to extend unemployment benefits to the workers who are caught in this deep, dark recession, they say: Oh, we can't afford it.

So listen, they will not pay for the tax cuts to their millionaire, billionaire friends, but they insist on cutting the Federal budget to pay for extending unemployment insurance, which, as far as I know, has never been done before. It is an emergency funding, and it is, by the way, \$50 billion compared to \$400 billion.

So I hope the American people—I know they have a lot of things to do, getting ready for the holidays and caring about families; unfortunately, many of them are worried this holiday; more than 400,000 workers in California will lose their unemployment benefits by the end of December—I hope they see who is fighting for them versus who is fighting for the millionaires and the billionaires. It is right out there.

I could not believe that one of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, from Massachusetts, was outraged that we tried to extend unemployment benefits. Why is he outraged? He should be outraged that more than 2 million workers nationwide will lose their benefits by the end of December. We just got a report that 7 million unemployed workers could be denied access to benefits by the end of next year, while my Republican friends are fighting to get \$460,000 a year for someone who earns \$10 million. They would allow 7 million unemployed workers in our country to go without benefits.

Their proposal is: Well, let's cut a program. Well, ask any economist

about that. That is harmful to an economic recovery. We know that for every \$1 of unemployment insurance that gets spent, it has an impact of \$1.61 to the economy because folks on unemployment are not like the \$10 million-a-year family that is going to stick it in their trust fund; they are going to spend it in the corner grocery store, and that has a ripple effect throughout the economy.

I wish to read to you a statement by Laura from Long Beach, one of my constituents.

Today my parents' unemployment benefits expired. Today, I don't know how they're going to make it. I don't know what I'm going to do.

This morning I woke up to hear that the Republicans in the Senate have signed a letter pledging not to allow anything to pass until Bush tax cuts are reinstated. These are the same tax cuts that only help people who are employed, excessively wealthy, and people who will never hire my dad, who is a hard worker—but nearing 60.

He experienced losing his job when a lot of Americans did. Since then, he's been working low paying jobs at local businesses—businesses that little by little have had to cut back. Unfortunately, this usually means that they fire their newer employees—employees like my dad.

Since losing his job, his 10 year old car has quit working, leaving him bereft of transportation and making it even more difficult to find a job. My mom isn't as healthy as she used to be and can't work because she needs to provide childcare for my sister, who works hectic hours in the healthcare industry.

I'm currently in graduate school—the first of my family to graduate from college. My husband and I are debating whether or not I need to drop out so that I can help provide for my parents, who currently live out of state.

Suffice it to say, when I read the news this morning, I broke down in tears.

Let me divert. She heard about the letter from the Republicans saying they would do nothing until these tax cuts went in, and she broke down in tears. She said:

My family has lived a hard life, and this just made it harder. But really, I'm crying because I can't believe that this is what my country has come to—or more importantly, this is what my father's country has come to.

... He was raised believing that this country was the best country in the world—that it would always look out for the best interest of its people. He served in the military, bought American cars, and worked at the same job for over 20 years. So as much as I am writing this letter because I'm upset about my own familial circumstances, I'm equally interested in writing you to remind you of the middle class—and those of us who are slipping out of it.

I have a number of other letters, but I know other colleagues are here. But no one could be more eloquent than Laura and I want to thank her and everybody else who wrote to me and I

will come back again during the time we are in session to put these letters in the RECORD.

But in summing up, it is very clear where we are. My Republican friends, to a person, have all signed on to a strategy, and that strategy is to keep us from passing very important legislation, including an unemployment insurance extension, including the Defense bill, including the START treaty—everything I put in the RECORD—until they get their tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. That, to me, is a shame. They have a right to do it. I support their right to do it. But I also think the American people ought to know what is going on.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3981, a bill to provide for a temporary extension of unemployment insurance provisions; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are a couple ways we can help people who are currently looking for work. One is by extending unemployment benefits for those who have been out of work now 99 weeks. This is what the extension is about: for those who have already—

Mrs. BOXER. Is there an objection?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I have just heard from my colleague, would the Senator agree to include an amendment that has been proposed by Senator BROWN that would offset the cost of the bill with unspent Federal funds, the text of which is at the desk? Would the Senator include that amendment that has been proposed?

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely, I would not agree to that modification. It goes to the very point I was making. They want to give tax breaks to millionaires and not pay for it, but they are forcing cuts in other jobs programs here. It would only make a worse recession and I object and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. President. So I do object to the motion by the distinguished Senator from California.

As I was saying, there are two ways to help those who are looking for work and one of which is to improve the economy. We can do that by giving some certainty—certainty—to people who provide jobs, who build businesses, who create opportunities, the job-creating sector of this country. We can do that by giving them certainty regarding what their tax rates will be come January 1. Right now there is an incredible amount of uncertainty.

The second way is to deal with the unemployment benefits for those who have been out of work now 99 weeks because that is what this is about. These are people who have been collecting unemployment benefits for 99 weeks. I will tell you, there are people across the Nation having a tough time due to this poor economy. I wish to see the economy improve.

The national unemployment rate in October was 9.6 percent. Today's front page of USA Today says: "Jobless data could break '80s record"—a record from the 1980s. "November was likely 19th month above 9 percent."

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question—please, a very quick one?

Mr. BARRASSO. Yes, Mr. President.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator so much, and he is my friend.

I just want the Senator to understand this extension is not for anything beyond 99 weeks. Believe me. It is up to 99 weeks. We do not have any extension beyond 99 weeks. I just wanted my friend to know that.

Mr. BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from California. Senator BROWN, who occupies the desk next to mine, was on the floor talking about this just 2 nights ago and does want to work to extend unemployment benefits and to do it in a way that is paid for. That is why I came to offer the amendment to the Senator from California to say: Well, let's do it but do it by paying for it using unspent Federal funds, the text of which is at the desk.

We need to pay to extend this. But what we need to do is stimulate the economy because of what we see on the front page of USA Today about "Jobless data could break '80s record" and "November was likely 19th month above 9 percent." We need to give certainty to business.

My colleague from California made comments about a letter signed by 42 Republican Senators. In fact, I did sign that. All the Republican Members of the Senate signed it. In the first paragraph it says:

President Obama in his first speech after the November election said "we owe" it to the American people to "focus on those issues that affect their jobs." He went on to say that Americans "want jobs to come back faster."

That is why 42 of us signed the letter. Let's focus on that. Let us get that done. Let us provide that certainty. If after that is done the majority party wants to go and address the issues of don't ask, don't tell, wants to talk about the DREAM Act, talking about incentives for illegal immigrants with college education, if they want to talk about issues of firefighters joining unions, fine. But let's get to the fundamentals of what the American people want to have dealt with. That is why I was happy to offer an amendment to my colleague from California to say pay for it, and then we can move on. Because businesses need that sort of certainty.

I heard her many comments about taxes, and I believe you should not raise taxes on anyone in the middle of economic times such as these. My colleagues on this side of the aisle all agree and there is actually bipartisan agreement that you should not raise taxes on anyone in the middle of economic times such as these.

The newest Members of the Senate—and since the election there are now three new Members who have been sworn in; two on that side of the aisle, one on my side of the aisle—are unanimous in saying one should not raise taxes on anyone during these economic times.

Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia said: "I wouldn't raise any taxes."

Senator COONS from Delaware said: "I would extend them [the tax cuts] for everyone."

So when I look at this and also see statements by JOE LIEBERMAN from Connecticut, Senator BEN NELSON from Nebraska, Senator JIM WEBB from Virginia, Senator EVAN BAYH from Indiana, Senator CONRAD from North Dakota, it is a growing chorus of Democrats saying: One should not raise taxes on anyone during these economic times.

We need to give certainty to the job-creating segment of this Nation. We need to do it in a timely manner. With it only being 4 weeks until the end of the year and people wanting to know what is going to happen with their taxes, I think the best thing this body could do is to provide that certainty.

So with that, I notice a number of colleagues who are waiting to speak and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I agree with my friend from Wyoming. We need certainty in the marketplace, and we are happy to do that. We are happy to create certainty right now that middle-class taxpayers and small businesses will be able to receive tax cuts permanently into the future, that we will be able to extend those tax cuts.

We also believe it is important to give certainty to people who are out of work through no fault of their own, who yesterday began to lose unemployment benefits. Now, I personally believe, as long as the economy is as sluggish, as slow, as challenged as it is, we ought to extend benefits beyond 99 weeks. But the bill in front of us is not that. It is the bill Senator BOXER talked about, which is just the basic program. The program basically says, if you lose your job today you have the same opportunity to receive some temporary help as the person who lost their job on Monday or Tuesday because, right now, the Republicans have been blocking us from even extending the basic program for anyone who is newly unemployed, newly out of work.

So I think people who are out of work at this holiday season would like some certainty.

I was interested in a story in the paper today—I believe it was today—quoting the Michigan Retailers Association concerned about Christmas and the inability to have unemployment benefits extended would directly relate to the ability of families to have any kind of opportunity to have Christmas, and it would affect retailers and small businesses. They would like to see some certainty. I would also like to see a more robust effort and certainty as it relates to jobs.

When we look at the way to stimulate the economy, the way to create jobs, the budget folks tell us the No. 1 way right now to keep the economy going is to help those who have no choice but to spend the dollars in their pockets. That is somebody who is out of work. That is the No. 1 way to stimulate the economy, to try to keep things moving, and certainly we have heard that from our retailers. On a long list, the least effective was to give another bonus tax cut to millionaires and billionaires. That was the least effective.

So I agree we want economic certainty. What I would love to see is to take those dollars that have been ineffective for 10 years—and we know that simply because it hasn't created jobs. I have lost over 800,000 jobs in Michigan, 10 years of tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. I have one question: Where are the jobs? If my colleagues can answer that, I am happy to support that policy.

What I would suggest as an alternative is that now, just a little under 2 years ago, we invested in the recovery to, for the first time in many, many, many years, invest in American manufacturing: battery manufacturing, new clean energy manufacturing, making things in America, making things at home. And we are beginning to see every month now manufacturing slowly coming up. The investment in the American automobile industry has paid off for us in turning things around, in keeping manufacturing jobs here. We are moving from 2 percent of the manufacturing of advanced battery technologies in America to 40 percent of the world's manufacturing in 5 years because of a strategic investment.

I am happy to talk about those kinds of investments, but what we have heard from Republican colleagues is that they are willing to risk everything. They will risk everything to get another tax cut, a bonus tax cut on top of the one everybody is going to get if we extend tax cuts for the first \$250,000 in income per couple. They want a bonus tax cut, and they are willing to risk everything and stop everything if they can't get it. So it is very clear what their priorities are.

I can speak from Michigan that these are not our priorities. When I look at our manufacturers, our suppliers; when I look at small businesses; when I look at families who are struggling to keep their homes to stay in the middle class—maybe trying to get into the

middle class—working families, their priority is not to give somebody making \$1 million a year another \$100,000 bonus on top of the regular tax cut.

So what are we talking about? We are talking about everything being risked for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. What are some of the things we are risking? Another \$700 billion on the national debt. If we want to deal with the debt—and I don't know about my colleagues, but I heard an awful lot about the debt, concern about the deficit in this last election and through this last year. There were concerns when we were investing in manufacturing, investing in other things to create jobs, helping small businesses; the tax cuts for small businesses, lending for small businesses. We heard an awful lot from the other side of the aisle about the fact that we shouldn't be doing these things because of the deficit. The most important thing was the deficit.

I am not willing to be lectured about the deficit. I voted to balance the budget when I was in the House under President Clinton. We handed President Bush a balanced budget, the largest surplus in the history of the country. So I am not willing to accept that. I have great concern about the deficit, but that concern means I don't want to see \$700 billion put on the national debt for a bonus tax cut for millionaires and billionaires.

So they are willing to risk the national deficit. They are willing to risk jobs. Again, the least stimulative way to create jobs is to put another bonus round of tax cuts in the hands of millionaires and billionaires who, if they invest it—we don't know whether it will be overseas, taking jobs overseas or where it will be—but we know it hasn't trickled down to the people I represent, certainly, in Michigan.

The sense I get from the other side of the aisle is that they think we just haven't waited long enough; we haven't waited long enough for it to trickle down. Well, we are tired of waiting. We are tired of waiting, and we are tired of an economic policy of tax cuts geared to those up here when it doesn't work and we are losing jobs. Under that policy of trickle-down economics, Michigan lost over 800,000 jobs in the last 10 years. I am tired of that. I want to see a policy that is going to work. That one hasn't worked. I don't see why in the world we are willing to extend it.

They are willing to hold up the tax cuts for middle-class families and small businesses. Again, I am not willing to be lectured about small business when we have seen 16 different small business tax cuts filibustered in the last 2 years on the other side of the aisle; eight tax cuts in the small business jobs bill that only two colleagues from the other side of the aisle courageously stepped over to support. So we understand the importance of small business.

Social Security and Medicare: We have a debt commission that has a

number of proposals that are very difficult on Social Security and Medicare, and that is based on the deficit we have now not another \$700 billion. I wonder if my colleagues are willing to support cuts in Social Security and Medicare, additional cuts to pay for their tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. I don't know. Is that what they are suggesting? It certainly is something that could happen if we add another \$700 billion.

Then there is the one we have been talking about that is not an economic issue but a moral issue for us as a country: Are we going to help folks who have gotten caught up in this country and who find themselves in a situation that is unprecedented through no fault of their own? They didn't cause the recklessness on Wall Street. They were not the ones who made the decision not to enforce trade laws in a fair way or tax policy that allows jobs to go overseas.

The people in my State were not the ones who made any of the decisions that caused the situation they are in. Yet Wall Street did pretty well. A lot of folks did pretty well. A lot of folks now are back doing very well.

The folks left holding the bag are working families, folks who have been in the middle class and are now mortified because they have to go ask for help at a food bank for the first time in their lives. That is not an unusual situation in my State; people who have always worked, who want to work but find themselves in a situation, because of the economy, they did not create; where they now have to ask that our country be willing to support them at this time for their families until we can turn this economy around. Who are we if we are not willing to do that as a country?

Frankly, I am embarrassed we are having a debate on the floor of the Senate about whether to extend help for somebody who has lost their job, the bread winner who no longer can bring home the bread versus a \$100,000 bonus tax cut for a millionaire next year, and whatever it is for billionaires. I find that embarrassing, and I find it more than that, actually. If ever we are going to talk about our values and priorities and get them right in terms of what affects the majority of Americans, it ought to be when we are looking at these choices.

People in my State want to work. They want us to focus on jobs. They want us to partner with business. They want us to do those things; when it is necessary, stand back, get out of the way; stand up and partner, do all of the things that will allow us in a global economy to compete, to be able to make things in America and, of course, I prefer they be made in Michigan. But they want jobs. They want the economy to turn around.

Nobody is out there asking for a handout. They do want us to understand what they are going through and to be willing to have the same sense of

urgency about the average family in this country as we did for the Wall Street banks. That is ultimately what we are talking about on this floor, is what the priorities are going to be.

Our colleagues have sent a letter, with everybody signing it, saying they are not willing to do anything else. They are not willing to extend unemployment benefits. Two million people started losing their benefits yesterday—temporary help, by the way—\$250 to \$300 a week, which just barely kind of maybe keeps the heat on, because it is getting cold in Michigan, and a roof over their heads while they are desperately sending resumes out all over the country.

I get on planes now with people who are flying all over the country because they want to work. They are flying all over the place and coming home on the weekends, trying to find work. Our colleagues say: Well, you know what. Forget them. They need to wait because the most important thing is extending the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in our country.

I happen to—as we all do—know a lot of people in that category who say to me: I am willing to do my share. I am not asking you for this. I am willing to do my share. I have done well. I understand we have a national deficit. I understand we have a country that has a lot of challenges right now, and I am willing to step up and do my part. So this is not trying to beat up on people or demagogue against people who have worked hard, in many cases, and done well for themselves. But it is about having a set of priorities about what is important. In the few days we have left between now and the end of the year, what is the most important thing we could be doing?

I know other colleagues wish to speak. Let me just say, in my judgment, we can create certainty. It certainly doesn't have to be extending tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. It certainly can be extending tax cuts for the middle class and small businesses, creating certainty with the R&D tax credit for those who want to innovate and invest. There are other kinds of certainty we can create for businesses in our Tax Code. We need to do that before the end of the year.

We need to remember that there are a whole lot of families right now who are trying to create some certainty in their lives about whether they can put up a Christmas tree because they are still going to have their house. That is not rhetoric; that is happening to people. We as Democrats are not willing to risk all this. The Republicans may be willing to risk everything to give a bonus tax cut to millionaires and billionaires, but we are fighting for everybody else.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 minutes.

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

UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I wanted to take some time today to talk about some issues that have been around for a number of years and remain unresolved in a way that I believe is very detrimental to our country and our citizens.

There is a lot of discussion these days about deficits and debt at the Federal level. We have a \$13 trillion Federal debt and a \$1.3 trillion deficit this year. We have a fiscal policy that is in great difficulty. The discussion these days is about extending tax cuts—by the way, none of which is anticipated in the budget numbers that are already unsustainable, showing large debts for the long term. Extending all of the tax cuts that were scheduled to expire this year will add \$4 trillion to the \$13 trillion debt that already exists. The reason I mention the fiscal policy issue is, when we talk about debt and deficits, most people talk about the need to cut spending. We also need some additional revenue from those who are not paying their share. But we do need to cut spending.

I believe I have held 21 hearings as chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee over recent years—21 separate hearings on the subject of waste, fraud, and abuse in contracting in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Much of it still goes on in terms of the work with the Pentagon on this contracting issue.

I have just received a letter from the inspector general at the Pentagon, who is looking into one of the issues of the last hearings—the issue of soldiers and contractors who were exposed to sodium dichromate, a chemical that was the subject of the movie “Erin Brockovich,” soldiers who were exposed and not told they were exposed to that deadly carcinogen and some of whom have already died. They were both National Guard and Regular Army soldiers.

In the context of doing a lot of these hearings, I have discovered and I believe that throughout the last decade, we have seen the greatest waste and fraud and abuse in the history of this country. It has contributed immeasurably to this overspending and deficits and debt. I wanted to talk about that work we did, myself and my colleagues, over 21 separate hearings.

At one of the hearings we held, we had testimony from a man who, in Iraq, was responsible for rooting out

corruption in the Iraqi Government. His name was Judge al-Radhi. I have a photograph of Judge al-Radhi. He testified in this country. He testified that in his work as head of the anticorruption unit in Iraq, he found that \$18 billion was missing, most of it American money, most of it coming from the American taxpayer.

Just missing. Now, why was he here in the country testifying at a hearing I held? Because he got booted out of Iraq, and he got no support from the U.S. Government as he was booted out of Iraq, and he ended up in this country. But he is the person who was supposed to be rooting out and investigating and prosecuting waste and fraud and abuse.

His investigations and the investigations of his staff—some of whom were assassinated, some of whose families were killed—show there was \$18 billion—\$18 billion—missing, and most of it was American money. Well, that is the story about Judge al-Radhi.

We had a hearing early on in this process and talked about the issue of contractors and contracting. As you know, in the early part of the war in Iraq and in Afghanistan, money was just shoved out the back door of the Pentagon, hiring contractors, very large contracts, in most cases no-bid, sole-source contracts.

A very courageous woman came to testify before our committee. Her name was Bunnatine Greenhouse. She was the highest civilian official at the Army Corps of Engineers, the highest civilian official in the Pentagon in charge of contracting. Here is what she said. She objected to the way the Pentagon was doing these contracts, massive contracts, sole-source, a massive amount of money, and she watched as the normal processes were avoided and ignored. She testified in public:

I can unequivocally state that the abuse related to contracts awarded to Kellogg, Brown & Root represents the most blatant and improper contract abuse I have witnessed during the course of my professional career.

This is an extraordinary woman, the highest civilian person in the Army Corps of Engineers. She was in charge of contracting. Two master's degrees, came from a family in Louisiana. All three kids have advanced degrees. Her brother, by the way, was one of the 50 top professional basketball players in the last century, Elvin Hayes. Bunnatine Greenhouse. Remember that name. A very courageous woman, she saw abuses, spoke about it publicly, and for that she lost her career. She gave up her career. She was told: Resign or be fired.

Let me talk about what she meant when she said the most unbelievable abuses she had seen in contracting. I want to do it starting small because then I am going to talk about billions of dollars.

But at one of our hearings, we had a man who kind of looked like a bookkeeper at a John Deere dealership in a