work, and where the problem is, where families are? Can't we solve that at the city level or the county level?

Maybe the answer is no. Then the question should be: Can't we solve it at the State level? Then the question should be: If we are going to solve it at the Federal level, is there a constitutional definition that allows us to do that?

There are some things that only the Federal Government can do. But there are not very many things that only the Federal Government can do.

We are going to hear in this discussion today and in the coming weeks about lots of good that can be done in our society. We are going to hear about some things I have worked to authorize and tried to get us to make a priority and still hope to keep a priority. Some of those programs are actually cut in the House appropriations bill that I will vote for today, because my view is we have to cut spending. If we could cut the $61 billion this year from exactly what I wanted to be cut, that would be better for me. But I am committed to cut spending in any bill we can get enough people to support, to put a bill on the President's desk that will say let's head toward a balanced budget. Let's get a balanced budget amendment. Let's head toward a balanced budget. But let's ask the right questions.

Before I came to the Congress, I was a university president for 4 years. It was a private university, Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, MO. We did not take any Federal money or any State money. We had to pay our bills. Because we had to pay our bills, as the president of the university I was constantly being asked to do good things but I had several different categories of ''no, this is why we cannot do that.'' There are two that maybe we ought to use the most often in Washington, DC, these days. The first is: No, that is a good idea but it is not what we do. I said that a lot as the university president. As a matter of fact, in the 4 years I was there I never had anybody come to me and ask me to do anything evil. I never had anybody come to me as president of the Southwest Baptist University and say here is something bad I think we should do as an institution. Every idea I got was a good idea, but it was not always something we could do. So one of my categories of no was ''no, that's a good idea but it's not what we do.''

We are going to hear lots about people with challenges that somebody should help. But the Federal Government is $1.6 trillion in debt this year—this year; not the $14 trillion accumulated debt, $1.6 this year—over $200 billion last month. Last month's deficit was within striking range of the annual deficit for the 10 years that ended in 2008. We are now spending more in deficit spending in a month than for a decade we spent in a year. If you average out that 10 years it is very close to February—and by the way, February is the shortest month. That is the only month where we have 28 days of spending, and we set a record on monthly deficit spending for the United States of America that was almost equal to the average annual deficit of the previous 10 years.

Sometimes people came to me and they had a good idea that actually was something the university could do. Often, then, I would have to say: Yes, that is a good idea, we ought to think how we can do that, but you are going to have to help me figure out what we can stop doing so we can start doing this. This may in fact be a better thing than some of the things we are doing now, but we can't do everything. Families deal with this issue all the time. You cannot do everything, even if it would be good to see those things done.

The Federal Government is doing the wrong thing when it heads down a road where you are spending so much more than you are collecting. One obvious answer is let's collect more. I suppose if you went to the Congressional Budget Office and said what would the collection amount be for the Federal Government if the tax rate were 100 percent—since they do not do any dynamic scoring over there, they score as if tax policy doesn't matter—I guess they could add up all the payrolls of America and whatever they added up to, that is how much money the Federal Government could bring in if the tax rate were 100 percent.

But that would not happen. Frankly, the tax rate of collecting the $2.2 trillion is about all we ought to be collecting out of this economy. For the 65 years after World War II, the government spent an average of about $1 out of $5, the Federal Government, that the economy could create. Now we are spending $1 out of $4. There is a big difference in a country where the Federal Government alone spends 1 dollar out of 4 that the country can create in goods and services as opposed to 1 dollar out of 5. You are not going to get a lot more on the taxing side. So we have to make the reductions in spending.

Then you are going to hear we are making these reductions out of 12 percent or 15 percent of the budget. Is that fair?

First of all, that is the only part of the budget we can get to without significant legislative activity. That should be the next thing on our agenda. Let's talk about the 60 percent of the budget we normally do not even talk about where if you meet the definition of the program you get the money, and see if we can't figure out how to produce better results for fewer dollars. That is what everybody else in America has been thinking about for 20 years now.

If you are still in business in America and you are competing in a global economy, you have been thinking how do we get a better result for less money, not how do we spend more money. We need to be sure the government is as good as the people it serves in that regard. It is 12 or 15 percent of the budget where we are talking reducing spending by $61 billion. That would not begin to be nearly enough, if you apportion it out. That is about one-seventh of the budget. If you multiply that by seven, you are still well over $1 trillion short of where you need to be. We need to start by taking at least this much money out of that part of the budget and figure out how we can also make the government work better in the other 85 percent of the budget.

Today is what it is. Today is a discussion to prove, apparently, that we cannot do anything. We can't do what the majority of the Senate wants to do, we can't do what the majority in the House wants to do. Let me tell you what the majority in the House wants to do is a minimum entry level to solving this whole problem. I am going to vote for it today and I urge my colleagues to vote for it as well.

I yield the floor.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JULIA GILLARD, PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 12 noon.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:40 a.m., recessed until 12 noon, and the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Nancy Erickson, and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Martina Bradford, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address to be delivered by the Honorable Julia Gillard, Prime Minister of Australia.

(For the address delivered by the Prime Minister of Australia, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

Whereupon, at 12 noon, the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FRANKEN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and other departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 3 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Hawaii.