

light on this issue when we get into these budget debates. I, frankly, have a series of budget reforms. I think that, absent a constitutional amendment, we ought to be putting some statutory reforms in place that would force downward pressure on spending.

I have a bill that calls for a 2-year or biennial budget where we budget in one year, in the odd-numbered year, and in the even-numbered year we do more oversight. So when people here are running for reelection, instead of worrying about how to spend more money to curry favor with a particular constituency, we will be doing oversight and looking at how we can save money for the next generation. So I would like to get a debate on that. I think we ought to make the budget resolution we pass here binding and give it the teeth and the force of law which it does not have today. I think there are a series of prescriptions that would be worthwhile for us to not only entertain but hopefully implement to really take seriously the challenge that is before us.

I thank the chair for the time, and I look forward to engaging in a debate about spending and about debt and how to better create jobs in this economy for the American people, which is what I think they want us focused on. I hope it will be not just rhetoric but action that follows.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time remains in morning business on the minority side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 6 minutes 47 seconds remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to reserve that time. I do not believe there is another Republican Senator on the floor.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to begin the Democratic side of the morning business.

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

#### INVESTING IN AMERICA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I listened closely to the speech given by the Senator from South Dakota about the deficit. I was thinking as he gave the speech that it was a good one, but I think a little bit of history is warranted at this moment.

In the year 2000, 11 years ago, President William Jefferson Clinton was leaving office. We had gone through a period of budget surpluses. We were taking the budget surplus generated each year and buying more longevity in Social Security, as appropriate. It was a very positive situation. The national debt of America when President William Jefferson Clinton left office was \$5 trillion. In other words, the ac-

cumulated debt of America from George Washington to the end of William Jefferson Clinton was \$5 trillion. And as President Clinton left office, he said to President Bush: I want to give you, in the next year, a \$120 million surplus in terms of what you can anticipate to happen in the next year. It was a pretty positive situation with a lot of job creation, businesses doing well, homes being built.

Now fast forward from 2000 to 2008, 8 years later. Let's take a snapshot. What was the state of the economy? We were facing unemployment at record levels in numbers growing by the month. We no longer had a national debt of \$5 trillion. Eight years later after President George Bush, that national debt was \$12 trillion, more than doubled in an 8-year period. The obvious question is, what happened? Why were we doing so well 8 years before and had fallen so badly 8 years later?

We had two wars not paid for—we just added those to the national debt—in Iraq and Afghanistan. We had tax cuts even to the wealthiest, something that had literally never occurred in the history of the United States, and that added directly to the debt. We had programs unpaid for, signed by the President into law, very expensive programs, even in the area of Medicare. Accumulate those things with the 9/11 occurrence and the downturn in the economy, and we saw our national debt go from \$5 trillion to \$12 trillion. Instead of President Bush leaving new President Obama a surplus for the next year, they anticipated a \$1.2 trillion deficit as President Bush left office. That is what Barack Obama inherited 24 months ago.

To hear some of the comments being made, one would think President Obama had created the deficit crisis. He inherited the deficit crisis from President George Bush. He said: The first thing we need to do is get the economy up and running. Republicans were virtually no help. Only three Republican Senators joined us in a stimulus bill which is now being mocked and criticized. But, in fact, one-third of the stimulus was in tax cuts, tax cuts to working families to help them through a recession. Another third was a safety net, unemployment insurance, as well as help to State and local governments. The final third was infrastructure, building roads and bridges and things across America for the economy. That is what the stimulus was.

Did it bring us back in a hurry from our recession? No. But it stopped the decline in our economy, and we are bringing ourselves back now as more consumer confidence is being demonstrated than we have seen in a long time.

I was a member of President Obama's deficit commission. For the record, I want people to know that that deficit commission originally was legislation. It was a statute. We were going to enact a law to give this commission

the authority to come up with a report and force Congress to vote on it. Powerful stuff, with a lot of bipartisan support. When this powerful piece of legislation came to the floor of the Senate, seven Republican Senators who were cosponsors of the bill voted against the bill that they cosponsored, this effort to try to deal with our budget deficit in honest terms. After the bill failed, the President said: I will create one by Executive order. I served on it. It was Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson cochairing an effort with 18 members. At the end of the day, 11 of us, including myself, signed on to the final report. I always added the caveat—and I think most would—that I don't agree with all of it, but I think it was the closest we were going to come to facing a terrible crisis.

The crisis is this: Out of every dollar we spend in Washington, we borrow 40 cents. That is unsustainable. Whether we are using that dollar to build a missile or to pay for food stamps doesn't make much difference. We have to borrow 40 cents for every dollar we spend. Where do we borrow the money? One of our major creditors was in town last week, President Hu Jintao of China, a major creditor and a major competitor. Which takes me to the President's State of the Union Address last night.

The Republicans are fixed on one particular area. They believe the sum and substance of all that we do in Washington should be focused on the deficit. I think the deficit is critically important. I voted for the deficit commission report. We have to do things that are unpopular and we have to do them in a sensible and timely way. But it isn't the whole story. What the President tried to remind us last night is that we also have a great American economy. We have to ask ourselves: Will that economy be able to compete in the world of the 21st century? How will we do against competitive nations such as China and Japan and Germany? Those were questions asked by the President last night.

I have heard many Republican Senators and Congressmen since say those investments, that spending, we don't need. What we need is to focus on the deficit.

I think the President got it right. The President is calling for balance, responsible deficit reform, and investment in America that makes a difference in who we are and what we can be. The President talked about the Sputnik moment, long before the Presiding Officer was born, the Sputnik moment, October 4, 1957, when the Soviet Union launched the satellite Sputnik into outer space. It scared us to death. Here this nemesis of the United States in the Cold War, the Soviet Union, with the capacity to develop a bomb that could destroy major parts of America, was now in outer space and we were not. They had a missile that launched a satellite. It was a tiny little thing, about the size of a basketball. It circled the Earth. At that time in October of 1957, a chill set in on Capitol

Hill when people got to thinking, maybe we are not as good as we thought when it comes to math and science and education, if the Russians beat us into outer space.

Congress did something in 1958 in response to that that was historic and considered radical at the time. Congress came up with something called the National Defense Education Act. It was the first time in the history of the country when we had offered college loans to those other than veterans, and it was a program that was going to reach across America and try to put more young people in college. Did it work? Look at the numbers. In 1940, 15 percent of college age students went to college, about a half a million students in college. In 1958, we started the loan programs. By 1960, the number of college age students in college had grown to 3.5 million. Two years later I was one of them.

Now fast forward 10 more years to 1970. By 1970, 7.5 million students in America were in college. Forty percent of college age students were going to college. The investment of this government into the National Defense Education Act and student loans democratized higher education, dramatically increasing the number of students in colleges and universities, and not only prepared us for a man on the Moon and NASA but prepared our economy for more important things to come.

Let me give an example. When Sputnik was circling the globe, our scientists were sitting there upset and frustrated that the Russians were the first in space. Up in Baltimore, there were two scientists at a laboratory, and they decided they would try to track the Sputnik satellite. The Russians, in order to prove they were actually doing something, were emitting a signal from this satellite, this little basketball-sized satellite. These scientists said: Let's see if we can find that signal, the frequency. They did. Then they used—and I will get lost here in a hurry because I am a liberal arts lawyer—the Doppler effect to determine where the satellite was circling the globe and its speed. They told some people at the Department of Defense what they had found. The Department of Defense challenged them and said: If you can tell us where the satellite is and how fast it is moving, could you reverse that equation? We would like to know if we had a satellite in outer space whether we could figure out where your radio receiver was. So they did the calculations and did the work, and they determined it.

The purpose in asking the question was so that we could reach a point in national defense when, if the Russians launched a missile with a bomb on it toward the United States, we could tell where it came from and launch one in return. We did this calculation, and we started the development of this in 1958, where we could figure out where the receiving station was on Earth, if there was a transmitting satellite. If it

sounds as if it might have led to something, it did. It led to a situation today where I can carry in my pocket a BlackBerry which has a GPS. GPS came out of that calculation. Now someone can basically determine where DUBIN is by where his cell phone is. That has become common technology and science, but it was research by the Federal Government that led us 50 years later to this moment.

I say that because the President was trying to make that point last night. When it comes to the future of our economy and where we will be and whether we will be competitive, we need to invest—it is not a bad word, it is a good word—in our country: in people so they have the education and training, so they can compete; in businesses so they have basic research and the kind of incentives for innovation so they can move forward in growing their businesses and increasing the number of employees; and in building the infrastructure of America that makes a difference.

There was a company a few decades ago that became very popular named Lands End. Most people know it. It has since sold to Sears. They own it today. But when Lands End was thriving, it was located in a small town in Wisconsin. A lot of people wondered how they could run a big mail order operation out of a small town in Wisconsin. The answer was they had put together enough infrastructure that it worked. There were enough highways and enough ways to provide their product by mail and other delivery all around the United States.

Now we are in a new generation of challenges. That generation is calling for technology. The President talked about advancing the technology of computer reach to make sure we have high speed computer accessibility across the United States. That technology, innovation, and education is going to build a platform for us to be competitive. I think the President got it right. We deal honestly with the deficit, but we don't do it so quickly that we make the recession worse. And we invest in our people so that we are ready to compete in the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his as usual right-on-the-money words about the President's speech. I anticipate eagerly the speech of my colleague from Rhode Island who graciously yielded to me.

I rise to commend President Obama on the pitch perfect State of the Union he delivered last night. His speech was smart and balanced, forward thinking, and unabashedly upbeat about the future of our country.

Fundamentally, the President spoke about the need to preserve the American dream, to bequeath its promise to the next generation as our parents bequeathed it to us. The American dream

is very simple. It means there is a strong likelihood that you will be doing better 10 years from now than you are doing today and an even greater likelihood that your children will be doing better than you did.

Many people in America think that dream is in peril today. Some people even fear that America is in decline, that our greatest period of prosperity is behind us. To these purveyors of gloom and doom, to those who are sour and dour and think America and its government can't do anything right, the President sent a clear message: You could not be more wrong about America. We are and will remain the most economically vibrant, the most culturally vibrant country in the world, with the best system. We are the only country on Earth that tells a young man or woman, 12 or 13 or 14 years old, whether their family has been in this country 12 or 6 generations or whether they are a new immigrant, you can achieve the stars. No other country has that. That is a precious part of our birthright that remains alive and well today, as we see in the successes of so many.

It is true that we live in a much different world today than the generation that preceded us. The rules have changed, and it is tougher to get ahead. Unemployment is unacceptably high, and the competition for jobs is real. The middle class feels squeezed. But, as the President said, this should not discourage us. It should challenge us.

Last night, the President explained how we can rise to that challenge. He outlined how we can outinnovate, outeducate, and outbuild the rest of the world, tapping the creativity and imagination of our populous.

He urged us to invest in clean energy technology and other cutting-edge industries and challenged us to put a million alternative-fuel vehicles on the road by 2015. Thanks to the ingenuity of researchers such as those at the GM fuel cell facility in Honeoye Falls, NY, I believe we can achieve this ambitious goal. I am also hopeful we can take up and pass clean energy legislation in the months ahead.

The President also called on Congress to reform No Child Left Behind in order to restore America's global leadership in education. I am particularly pleased that the President enthusiastically endorsed a permanent extension of the \$2,500 college tuition tax credit I authored 2 years ago. I would like it to be even higher, to go to \$3,000 this year.

It is no secret that much of our Nation's infrastructure is in disrepair and that too many Americans do not have access to high-speed Internet or high-speed rail. For America to stay ahead of our foreign competitors, we need to improve the ways in which we transport people and information.

Since the days of Henry Clay, with the internal improvements, when our Nation builds infrastructure, economic growth follows, and this has clearly always been a government function. The

President clearly understands this fact and spoke to it last night.

The President did not just focus on growing jobs, the economy, and middle-class paychecks last night. He showed an acute awareness of the need to rein in Federal spending to get our Nation's fiscal house in order. I echo his call to consolidate or eliminate unnecessary government programs and to revisit and revise regulations that have long outgrown their usefulness. Of course, we need to find a balance, but I am confident that more can and will be done to make our government more agile and efficient.

The President had the right blend: Yes, cut out the waste, even eliminate wasteful and inefficient and duplicative programs, but do not throw out the baby with the bathwater or, as he said, do not throw the engine off the airplane when the plane is overweight. So the combination of growth, investment in our future, and innovation, with fiscal moderation and reining in waste, is just pitch perfect for the American people.

Lastly, I applaud the President for addressing one of the most critical matters facing the country: our broken immigration system. As you know, I have championed comprehensive immigration reform for some time, and the President seemed to endorse many aspects of the approach. He likes the approach, bipartisan, that Senator GRAHAM and I put together. He has told us that on several occasions. So I look forward to working with him as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as we map a path to comprehensive reform in the 112th Congress.

Some pundits and handicappers said Congress seemed subdued, even restrained last night. Well, if last night's speech did not seem like the usual partisan pep rally, that is because it was not. The President's speech was not meant to appeal to Democrats or Republicans or even Independents. It was meant to appeal to Americans. In that, the President succeeded overwhelmingly. The fact that we sat together side by side, Democrats and Republicans, was a fine fit with the President's appeal to the whole of America, not to one side or the other.

The address last night embodied so many of the values and ideals that unite us as Americans. It displayed the kind of optimism we relish, thrive on, and believe in. It was a great speech, a wonderful moment of comity. I expect this moment will not fade soon, and I hope so too.

I yield the floor for my colleague from Rhode Island.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I compliment my distinguished colleague from New York on his remarks. I would like to add a few observations of my own, but first I want to echo very much what he said. What the President did last night was to point a finger toward the future, and some peo-

ple were just capable of seeing the finger. But for most people, they saw where he was pointing, and he has pointed us toward an important future for our country. These are the issues we are going to have to address in the decades ahead, and we have to be prepared now. I want to touch on about three areas he pointed to. The first, of course, is infrastructure. I am not the only person in America who has noticed our crumbling infrastructure. Everybody who drives on our roads, everybody who goes across our bridges, everybody who has been to our water and sewage plants knows we have underinvested in those areas for decades.

As the President pointed out last night, America's own engineers give America a D for the status of our infrastructure. The Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that we have \$662 billion in total capital needs for clean water and drinking water investments over the next 10 years—\$662 billion that we need to put into our water and water treatment system in the next 10 years. By contrast, in the so-called stimulus bill, we put in \$6 billion; 1 percent of what we need. We have a lot of work we still have to do to make sure America has the clean water treatment and drinking water it needs.

The infrastructure question is not just about infrastructure the Romans could have built. It is not just about roads and bridges and waterworks. The President referred to a Sputnik moment many years ago and President Kennedy's drive to get us up into space and to accelerate our space program.

When President Kennedy pushed to put a man on the Moon within 10 years and bring him safely home, what that delivered was not just a man on the Moon. What it delivered was the technology that allowed a company called COMSAT, a public-private corporation, to put up into space the satellite technology that became the infrastructure of our modern communications system. That was done because of that call to action.

It is not just our communications system that is core infrastructure, as well as our roads and our bridges and our waterworks, it is also our information technology system, particularly in health care. When we build a robust health information infrastructure—so that as an American you are no longer carrying your cardboard file-covered records from appointment to appointment, no longer having to explain who you are and what you have and what medications you are on and why you are there for the umpteenth time because the doctor has not seen your file because it is not available to him electronically—when we fix all that so your pharmacy, your specialist, the laboratories you go to, the hospital, if you have had to visit one, are all connected to your primary care provider who is directing the care for your condition, that is a piece of infrastructure

that, like our health care infrastructure, will enable enormous growth in the private sector.

That is what infrastructure does. Roads are not valuable because people go out with picks and shovels and bulldozers and asphalt pavers and make them. They are valuable because once they are made, commerce runs across them and the private sector expands. That is just as true of communications and information technology and broadband and our energy grid. We need to invest in infrastructure, and we need to think about our modern infrastructure, not just the infrastructure the Romans could build.

The other point the President made that was critically important is that American manufacturing is not now competing on a level playing field with our foreign opponents. Many people have said this was a very "America first" speech; that the President seemed more nationalistic than he has been before. I suspect that is because in his years as President, it has been driven home to him how many disadvantages our foreign competition puts our manufacturers at. It is not fair. It creates immense disabilities for them and real handicaps, and we have to put American manufacturing back on a level playing field with their competitors around the globe.

I can go to the Cranston Print Works Company in Rhode Island, which is one of the last remaining vestiges of the vaunted Rhode Island textile industry. It was Rhode Island's textile industry that started the industrial revolution. Rhode Island's textile industry propelled Rhode Island to have more millionaires per capita than any other State in the country. Now it has winnowed away, winnowed away, and companies such as Cranston Print Works that has been able to hang on and survive and be successful keenly know how bad the disadvantages are.

You could have their CEO, George Shuster, give you a speech about how in almost every dimension of their operations they are at a disadvantage, and very often a disadvantage that America has created, against their foreign competition. I just want to mention one.

I have introduced the Offshoring Prevention Act because if George Shuster were to take his facility in Rhode Island and move it overseas, he could choose the year he declared his profits and defer them to the most advantageous tax year. When he stays in Rhode Island, he has to declare his profits in that year no matter what. There is no reason on Earth we should reward an American company that moves its processes overseas with a tax deferral advantage that they do not get when they are here at home. My Offshoring Prevention Act would prevent that.

The last thing I want to say—because I see my distinguished colleague from Arizona on the Senate floor and I want to make sure I leave him time—is just

a word about our long-term debt. I was immensely gratified the President took a firm position to defend Social Security. We who are familiar with the actual facts know that Social Security has never contributed a dime to our deficit, never contributed a dime to our debt, and that it is solvent for more than a quarter century ahead of us. It is not an immediate problem, and with very small adjustments it can be never a problem.

In States such as Rhode Island and New York, and I suspect Arizona as well, we have people who count on Social Security. Social Security gives us freedom. Social Security gives our seniors freedom from want and freedom from fear. It gives them freedom from privation and freedom from poverty. It gives the younger generation freedom to pursue their own dreams, knowing their parents will have a dignified old age because of Social Security, and they can take risks and seek opportunities they would never otherwise be able to take if they knew they were the only support for their parents in their old age, if the only thing that stood between their parents and penury was them. Thankfully, Social Security gives that liberty to young people across this country, as well as the freedom it gives to old people. So I am delighted he took this stand and that Social Security will not be improperly thrown under the bus of the important debt and deficit reduction work we need to do.

With that, I will yield. I see, again, Senator MCCAIN on the Senate floor. He is a distinguished Senator and a great friend, and I do not want to take time from him.

I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### HONORING THE VICTIMS AND HEROES OF THE SHOOTING ON JANUARY 8, 2011, IN TUCSON, ARIZONA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 14) honoring the victims and heroes of the shooting on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, this resolution states that we honor the victims and heroes of the shooting on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, AZ. As we all know, and the Nation and the world knows, on January 8, a gunman opened fire at a "Congress on Your Corner" event hosted by Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS in Tucson, AZ, killing 6 and wounding 13 others.

Among those who lost their lives were 9-year-old Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, Judge John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman.

Christina-Taylor Green was the 9-year-old daughter of John and Roxanna Green. She was born on September 11, 2001. She was a third grader, with an avid interest in government, who was recently elected to the student council at Mesa Verde Elementary School.

Dorothy Morris was 76 years old. She attended the January 8 event with George, her husband of over 50 years, with whom she had two daughters and who was also critically injured as he tried to shield her from the shooting.

John Roll, whom I will talk about later on, is a Pennsylvania native who was 63 years old. He began his professional career as a bailiff in 1972. He was appointed to the Federal bench in 1991 and became a chief judge for the District of Arizona in 2006. He was a devoted husband to his wife Maureen, father to his three sons, and grandfather to five grandchildren. He heroically attempted to shield Ron Barber from additional gunfire.

Phyllis Schneck, the proud mother of three and grandmother of seven and great-grandmother, from New Jersey and spending the winter in Arizona, was a 79-year-old church volunteer and New York Giants fan.

Dorwan Stoddard, a 76-year-old retired construction worker and volunteer at the Mountain Avenue Church of Christ, is credited with shielding his wife Mavy, a long-time friend whom he married while they were in their sixties and who was also injured in the shooting.

Gabriel Matthew Zimmerman was 30 years old, engaged to be married, and served as director of community outreach to Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS and was a social worker before serving with Representative GIFFORDS.

We all know GABRIELLE GIFFORDS was the target of the attack and was critically injured. Overnight, we received extremely good news in that her condition has been upgraded from critical to good. That is incredible news and is heartening to all of us.

Thirteen others were also wounded in the shooting, including Ron Barber and Pamela Simon, who were both staffers to Representative GIFFORDS, and several individuals, including Patricia Maisch, Army COL Bill Badger, retired, was also wounded in the shooting. Roger Sulzgeber, Joseph Zimudie, Daniel Hernandez, Jr., Anna Ballis and Dr. Steven Rayle helped apprehend the gunman and assist the injured, thereby risking their lives for the safety of others.

Some of the actions that took place during this tragedy have been carried extensively in the media. The reaction of the people of Tucson and in Arizona to this tragedy has been incredibly uplifting and encouraging to all of us.

There are so many stories of courage and bravery associated with this action. The quick reaction of our police and other first responders was remarkable, not to mention the incredible and extremely rapid care provided by the doctors and nurses and caregivers in Tucson. So in this great tragedy that has taken place, we can be comforted with the knowledge that our citizens reacted in the way that Americans do—with heroism, with courage, and with sacrifice.

I think it is entirely appropriate that this resolution be passed as one of the first acts of the new 112th Congress of the Senate and House. I wish to thank all Americans for their concern, their prayers and the sympathy and support they have extended not only to the victims and their families but also to the people of Arizona.

There will be discussion for weeks and months ahead as to how it was possible for this event to take place. I don't pretend to know all the answers. It was clearly a deranged individual, an individual who perhaps we could argue, while I can't say for certain, his mental illness should have been brought to the attention of the proper authorities. We do have a law that provides for such an action in the State of Arizona. At the same time, the question needs to be asked: The actions that we now have become very aware of, was the possibility of those actions brought to the attention of the proper people so they could take action?

The fact is it happened. The fact is we who are elected representatives will continue to have contact with our constituents. We will do so and not be deterred by the actions of this deranged individual. We cannot allow the actions of a deranged individual to prevent us from interacting, in a fundamental way, with our constituents. They deserve it. I am confident we will be able to continue the practice of townhall meetings, "Congress on Your Corner," the kinds of activities that are, in some ways, not entirely unique to the United States of America but certainly are not practiced in most parts of the world.

So we are encouraged by the news concerning GABRIELLE GIFFORDS and we will harbor the hope and pray that she will return to her duties in the Congress, representing the people of southern Arizona. We pray for the family of Judge John Roll and those others who gave their lives. Senator KYL and I attended the various memorial services and events surrounding this tragedy in Tucson and we come away obviously with deep sorrow over the event, yet at the same time with a great deal of pride and appreciation for our fellow citizens in Arizona and in Tucson who have reacted in a heroic and giving and loving and sharing fashion.

So I guess we will be voting on this issue sometime this afternoon, and I know other colleagues will be speaking on behalf of this resolution.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 188 are