opinion, the single greatest contributor to making it more difficult for people who are trying to make it is some of the policies—as well-intentioned as they may be—that are being implemented at the governmental level. We need to invest and commit deeply to this notion of fairness, which is defined in America as equality of opportunity.

The second thing we need to continue to believe in is prosperity. Prosperity in America has and must continue to mean private sector economic growth. The private sector grows and creates private jobs which employ people and turn those people into parents who can send their kids on to college and consumers who can spend money in our economy. The creation of middle-class jobs is not just the backbone of our economy, it is the backbone of our prosperity.

How are jobs created in the private sector? It is simple. Someone has an idea, they have a business or product they want to invest in, they have access to money, whether it is their own money or someone else's money, and they use that money to put that idea into practice. They start a business, it works, and as a result people get jobs, people are employed, and the cycle repeats itself. The job for us in Washington is to make it easier for people to do that at every level. No. 1 is to make it easier for people to have ideas, and that is the easiest one of all. Americans have not run out of good ideas, and Americans have not forgotten how to create jobs. There are plenty of great ideas. There are great business ideas for the 21st century. There are a bunch of them that exist in the minds of hundreds of thousands of Americans who are waiting for the chance to put that dream into practice.

The second thing we have to do is make it easier for them to get access to the money they need to start their businesses, and that means to encourage investment. I do not understand why we would punish or discourage investment. Why raise taxes on people who want to invest in businesses that allow these businesses to grow and hire more people? It is important we make that easier as well.

I would like to talk again about small businesses. The survey I outlined a minute ago showed that 78 percent of small businesses say taxes and regulations coming from Washington also make it harder for them to hire more employees. So in addition to making it easier for people to make money available to investors to allow these ideas to go into practice, we also have to lower the cost of doing business and the barriers to entry, and the equation is pretty straightforward.

If you are an employee working for somebody and decide you can do a better job than your boss and want to start your own business and want to compete against him, well, the regulations that impact that industry and the tax code that applies to that industry are too complicated and too burdensome so you cannot do it. If you are a small business trying to grow, no matter how much money you have invested, you may not be able to deal with that as well.

By the way, there are two industries I hope we will look at as real growth opportunities and prosperity in America. We are an energy-rich country and advances in technology have made certain deposits of energy once inaccessible to us accessible. Natural gas is a great example. We need to stop punishing investment in the energy sector by raising taxes. We need to stop passing regulations that put entire areas of this country completely off limits and make it difficult to access our energy deposits. I think energy is an area on which we should focus.

The other is manufacturing. As labor costs rise around the world, there is no reason more and more manufacturing cannot return to the United States. But this is not going to happen if we regulate people looking to do manufacturing in a way that they decide America is not the place they should do business and if the tax treatment of America puts us at a competitive disadvantage.

Let me close by saying that the opportunity before us is real. The 21st century holds promise, promise that holds no parallel in human history. I don't think it is an exaggeration to say we can see the kind of economic growth here and around the world that we have never seen before. That is how promising the 21st century is. It all comes down to a choice. We have to make a choice. Are we prepared to abandon the principles and ideals that made us unique and special or are we going to reembrace those principles and ideals and in so doing make this new century an American century as well?

When I hear some of the talk in this building, it concerns me. When I hear people telling the American people that the way to protect their jobs is to raise their bosses' taxes, I think that is counterproductive. When I hear policymakers in Washington pitting the American people against each other, telling people that the only way they can do better is if someone else is worse off, I get concerned. Not only is it not true, that type of thought has never worked anywhere in the world. In fact, people flee from countries that think in that way.

The American experience has been something very important. The American experience has been that this is a country where everybody can do better, where the people who have made it can stay there, and the people who are trying to make it can join them. We have never believed that the way for us to do better is for other people to do worse. We have never believed in order to climb the ladder, we have to pull somebody else down. For me, it is not theory, it is the experience of my life.

My parents raised me with middle-class jobs in the service sector. My dad, for example, was a bartender, and I thank God every night there was someone out there willing to risk their money to build a hotel in Miami Beach and later in Las Vegas where he could later work. I thank God there was enough prosperity in America so people could go on vacation and leave tips in my dad's tip jar. With the money he raised as a bartender, he gave me the opportunity to do what he never had a chance to do.

We had help along the way. I had student loans and grants from the government to help me get my education. I went to a public school system, and that is an important role for government to play.

Let's not forget we cannot have more government than our economy can afford. That is why those of us who desperately want to see a country that continues to have prosperity but also compassion believe safety net programs should exist to help those who cannot help themselves and help those who have fallen to stand and try again. That is why we believe we have to have a strong and robust economy.

What is startling is that we, the largest and most prosperous Nation in human history, have built a government so massive that not even the richest country in the history of the world can afford it, and we cannot continue on that road either.

I will close by saying that I hope this new year will be the beginning of our work toward a new American century. I know it worked in the past. I know this is a nation where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything. It is not just something I read about in a magazine. I have seen it in my own life. There is no reason it cannot continue here if only we are creative.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 18 minutes.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, today, state of the Union day, marks 1,000 days since this Senate has fulfilled its statutory responsibility of passing a budget. This is not a little bitty matter, and it implicates the leadership of the Democratically controlled Senate and their willingness to address the American people honestly and effectively concerning the very significant financial threats this Nation faces.

Indeed, President Obama, on April 29, 2009, when we last had a budget, said this:

A budget serves as an economic blueprint for the Nation's future.

That is true. It is not an insignificant document that just has a bunch of numbers; it is a blueprint for the Nation's future. We either have one or we don't. He went on to say a budget is necessary ''to lay a new foundation for growth and to strengthen our economy.''

I believe that is certainly true because the whole world, our own economy, U.S. businesses and investment, and the American people are concerned that we don't have a plan for our future that gets us off of the debt path—some would say an economic growth death path—that we are on. They want to see that we have a plan to do better.

We will have a speech tonight. I suspect it will be grand in sound and have some popular phrases. But the question is, when it is over will we have a plan that can be examined? Will we have a plan that will lead us on an improved—dramatically improved—debt path or will we remain in business-as-usual mode, in denial?

A budget resolution is legally required by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. It was passed because Congress hadn't been passing budgets effectively. So the Congress passed a law and said we must do it. We are going to require ourselves to do it.

By law the President must submit a budget to the Congress by the first Monday in February. The President has submitted one for 2012. He submitted it to the Congress last year. It was not a good budget. It was what I have called the most irresponsible budget ever submitted to Congress. I chose those words carefully because we have never been, as a nation, in a more systemic danger from debt as we are today. Our population is aging. Our growth is not solid. The number of people on Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security has increased. We need growth and prosperity. We are in danger if we don't change it. That is why the world is worried about the United States. That is also why Europe is having such a serious problem. So it is important that we have a budget and we lay this out.

So the law requires the President to submit the budget to the Congress by the first Monday in February. We did it last year. It was not a good budget because it increased spending, it increased taxes, and it increased spending more than taxes. Over the 10-year budgetary window or plan, it increased the debt more than if we had not had the budget, if we had just gone on automatic pilot for spending growth in our country. That is why it was a failed budget plan. When the Senate finally voted on it—I brought it up after the majority leader brought up the House budget to try to defeat it. I brought up the President's budget and asked my Democratic colleagues if they supported their President's budget. It failed 97 to 0. Not a single Senator voted for that plan because it was irresponsible. It put us on a worse course than we were already on, and nobody wanted to be on record as voting for it.

Now, once the President's budget has come in, the Senate Budget Committee, by law, is required to report a budget resolution to the Senate by April 1. Congress is required to complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget no later than April 15. It is a challenge. In the past it has been a real challenge. People have worked hard to meet that goal.

Last year, while the Senate did not act, the Republican House met its requirements under the Budget Act to consider and pass a budget resolution in both their Budget Committee—Congressman PAUL RYAN's committee—and in the full House of Representatives. The chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, however, did not even offer a budget for consideration in committee, which precluded its consideration before the full Senate.

The budget process exists in one respect to compel the President and Congress to set forth a plan for the disposition of the taxpayers' money for the upcoming fiscal year and a minimum of 4 fiscal years. The budget has to be a 5-year budget. Often it is 10 years. The President submitted a 10-year budget which I think is preferable to a 5-year budget, and most people agree. Setting forth such a plan requires setting priorities; does it not? A household does a budget. A city, county, or State does a budget. They have to choose with their limited resources the priorities they can fund and determine how to use those scarce dollars, which in our case includes discretionary spending which is subject to the annual appropriation process, as well as the mandatory spending programs which are provided for under the rules set forth in permanent law. Those programs include food stamps, Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and a lot of other programs.

So mandatory spending programs currently comprise almost 60 percent of our spending. They are on automatic pilot. If a person reaches a certain age or if a person loses their job or their income falls below a certain level, they are entitled to certain benefits. A person can walk into a government office and ask for food stamps or ask for governmental assistance, and if that person qualifies it must be given whether the government has any money or not. If those programs are out of control and are growing too fast and are not properly managed, Congress has to change laws, not just change the budget to deal with it. So this is almost 60 percent of our budget today, the mandatory part.

So the budget process, through the use of reconciliation, is the only mechanism available to Congress to compel oversight and review of mandatory spending programs. Without the discipline provided by the budget process, these programs proceed on automatic pilot. So, importantly, the numbers that were deemed by the Budget Control Act, which was passed last summer in the wee hours of the morning just to avoid a governmental shutdown, that Budget Control Act, not subject to any amendments and not brought up for debate, set spending levels. But it could only set the number for discretionary spending.

The Budget Control Act effectively told Chairman CONRAD to provide discretionary spending at the levels of the Budget Control Act caps and for mandatory—the 60 percent—to stay the same, and revenue policies—taxing policies—at levels estimated in the Congressional Budget Office March 2011 baseline. So mandatory spending and tax increases and tax policies would be controlled by the Congressional Budget Office baseline, business as usual—the definition of business as usual for 60 percent of our budget.

So the so-called deemed budget is not a real budget, and the process used to adopt it is not the kind of process that is legitimate. It is not the kind of process that is required. In the Budget Act, we must have a committee markup. We must have 50 hours of guaranteed debate on the floor of the Senate and an unlimited number of amendments can be offered—a public, open discussion about the dangers facing this country and how Senators are going to deal with them, and they have to vote and they have to vote multiple times. The Democratic leadership, supported by Democratic Members, did not want to go through that process. That is why the Democratic leader, Senator REID, said it is foolish to have a budget. He did not mean it was foolish for America to have a budget. He meant it was foolish for them to have to vote publicly and be accountable for the serious challenges facing this country. I think that was a big reason for the shellacking a lot of Members of Congress took in the last election.

The American people want Congress to be accountable. Congress works for them. We are not on our own up here to do whatever we want to. The American people are watching us. Forty cents of every $1 we spend is borrowed. Are the American people not legitimately unhappy with us? Why should they be satisfied with Congress? Why should we be looked up to as people who are leading the country effectively? We will not even bring up a budget.

I just want to say, the Republicans fought for a budget. I am the ranking Republican member of the Budget Committee. We pleaded with the majority. We protested. But the leadership in the Senate has the power to set the agenda, and a minority cannot call a budget hearing in the Budget Committee, nor can they require a real budget to be brought forth for full debate on the floor of the Senate.

So this is where we are, I just have to say, because our colleague, whom I truly respect and like, Senator CONRAD, was saying we do not need a budget today. Apparently, they are not

going to produce one again this year. That is not right. We do need a budget, and we need to go through the process because the American people need to know what the debt commission told us; which is, we do not have the money to keep spending as we are spending today.

So a real budget would have required a weighing of the spending demands placed on the Federal Government and the available revenues and reached a consensus on what activities the government would pursue and how the government would pay for it, including the amount that would be added to the debt—how much are we going to increase the debt and how much will be left to future generations.

So the failure of our Democratic leadership in the Senate is to not seriously and credibly address our mandatory spending programs, which all experts and observers tell us are on an unsustainable course. Everyone tells us that. What we are doing today is unsustainable. For example, the budget the President submitted calls for deficits every single year for the next decade. It goes from about $1.3 trillion now—it was going to drop down, for the lowest single year, to a deficit of $740 billion, and in years 7, 8, 9, and 10, it would be going back again to almost $1 trillion.

We spend this year $650 billion on Social Security. By the 10th year, according to the Congressional Budget Office analysis of the President's budget, the interest we would pay on the debt alone—just the interest—would be $940 billion. Today it is $240 billion. This is how we get into the European crisis. This is why experts and economists have told us our spending and debt situation is unsustainable. That is not a frivolous word. They mean it is unsustainable.

Contending that the creation of the supercommittee absolved the Senate of that responsibility to produce a budget is laughable and it is not credible and I reject that. Instead, we are told that the deeming of a budget and spending caps—and only discretionary spending—determined in secret and brought out in the eleventh hour before the Senate for an up-or-down vote, without amendment, to avoid a government shutdown—to contend that meets the requirements placed on this Chamber for responsibility and fiscal rectitude just cannot be sustained. Nothing could be further from the truth. Passing a real budget is indeed not easy, particularly now because we have such a serious financial crisis. Tough decisions are going to have to be made. Perhaps our Democratic leadership does not want to show Americans how much their big spending agenda truly costs. That is what a budget shows over 10 years: how much we plan to spend, how much we are going to cut, how much we are going to tax. Maybe they do not want the people to know how much they intend to raise taxes and how much of that falls not just on the rich but on the middle class. I can show you the budget the President submitted. It goes beyond the rich. It was a big tax increase.

The failure to propose and openly debate on the floor a detailed, long-term fiscal plan may be considered by some to be smart. But it is sending our country toward the fiscal cliff. Our Democratic colleagues wish to pretend for the Nation that they have an actual budget plan. If they want to do that, they must find in their files the secret document they produced last year and finally, once and for all, make it public.

Senator CONRAD said: I have a budget. He said: We are going to have a committee markup, and I am going to present to our conferences the majority's budget plan to the Budget Committee. He was prepared to do that. He was prepared to do that, I thought. I was ready to get prepared to have the hearing. So when we got ready, somehow it did not happen. It got put off. It got put off again. Then, in the days that followed and we made a fuss, Senator REID eventually said, basically: I made that decision not to have a budget. It is foolish to have a budget.

So we never saw this budget. He said publicly they had one. Are they ashamed of it? Were they afraid to bring it out? Did no one want to see it? We were prepared with our little calculators to see how much taxes were going to increase, how much spending was going to increase, how much debt was going to increase. When are we going to change our debt trajectory and make the country better, put us on a sounder path? That is what we wanted to know, and we were told we were going to get it. We did not.

So instead of an open, accountable process, where the public votes are taken, where our constituents can hold us responsible for the leadership we provide, we got, at the eleventh hour, deals, a month of secret meetings, and political maneuvers. The primary aim of the process, it looks to me, was political advantage, not the advantage for the people of the United States.

So I believe when the majority leader and his majority colleagues chose to block the lawfully mandated budget process and not bring up a budget—not have committee hearings and actual votes, not have 50 hours of floor debate, not being able to allow amendments that deal with the budget and spending—they put politics over the Nation's interest. They rejected a duty they have, by all just deserts in logic and also by law. They did so for their political convenience.

I think if they continue to fail to produce a budget, to allow it to be discussed, to show what their plans are for the future, they have forfeited the leadership they have asked for in the Senate. If they cannot produce a budget and they do not have the gumption to lay out their plan for the future and have numbers that can be studied and examined, added and subtracted—if they cannot do that, if they are not willing to face up to that responsibility, they do not deserve to lead the Senate because, at this point in history, I think it is the most significant matter we face.

Our economy is not doing well. Our debt is surging. This year, the debt came in, as of September 30, another $1.3 trillion. Three consecutive years of deficits over $1 trillion, averaging $1.3 trillion. Can you imagine that? The highest deficit President Bush ever had—and it was too high—was $450 billion. But for 3 years we have averaged $1.3 trillion.

The debt is surging out of control, and the Budget Control Act that purports to change that trajectory only reduced the projected deficit over 10 years by $2.1 trillion, when every expert—Democrats, Republicans, liberals and conservatives—before our Budget Committee told us we need to have $4 trillion over 10 years in reduced deficits.

Because under the projections we have from the Congressional Budget Office, we are on track to add $13 trillion more to the debt in 10 years—$13 trillion more—doubling the now over $13 trillion in debt we have.

That is why we cannot continue. We need a plan to change that. Instead, we got a minimum reduction, I guess, from approximately $13 trillion to $11 trillion out of the Budget Committee. So we will add $11 trillion to the debt over the next 10 years rather than $13 trillion. That is not enough change. Mr. President, $4 trillion, in my opinion, based on the studies and the hearings and the testimony of the witnesses I have heard, is not enough. We need to do a good bit more than that. The House proposed a better plan by far. It would have changed our debt course, but the Senate did not do its responsibility to meet that challenge or the position of the House.

I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts. We look forward tonight to the President's State of the Union. I hope he will do more than do his normal eloquent processes and lay out a real plan, a plan that can be studied, a plan that can be evaluated, to put this Nation on a sound fiscal course. Because until we do that, jobs will not be created, and we will not see growth. There is a lack of confidence in our economy, and the greatest foundation of that lack of confidence is the debt.

I will just add briefly, there are things we can do to create growth and jobs without an increase in spending and without increase in debt. How do we do it? We eliminate every single regulation that is unwise. We reform our Tax Code into a growth-oriented Tax Code as much as possible. We produce more American energy and stop making policies that prohibit the production of American energy, creating American jobs, creating wealth in the United States, stopping the export of that wealth to Venezuela or

Saudi Arabia or other places such as that.

We have to end this health care bill that was passed. Already, health care premiums for average Americans have gone up—for a family of four: $2,400. Already? It was supposed to bring those costs down. That is a hammer blow to the middle class.

So we are talking about jobs, growth, progress. Those are the kinds of things we need. We can do it without more government debt and more government spending. That is what I will be looking for tonight.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

DATA PRIVACY DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 28, 2012, privacy advocates, industry leaders, and government officials from across our Nation will celebrate Data Privacy Day 2012. I am pleased to join these stakeholders in calling attention to the need to better secure our privacy and security in cyberspace.

In the digital age, our Nation faces the challenge of securing our computer networks from cyber threats and cyber crime, while at the same time, encouraging innovation and protecting Americans' right to privacy. Even as the Internet and other rapidly advancing technologies spur economic growth and expand opportunity, there is growing uncertainty and unease about how Americans' sensitive personal information is collected, shared, and stored. Data Privacy Day provides an important reminder about the importance of data privacy.

After a record year of high-profile data breaches in the private sector and throughout government, it is more important than ever that Congress step forward and enact meaningful data privacy legislation. As the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I continue to work toward that goal.

Last year, I reintroduced comprehensive data privacy legislation that will better protect Americans' sensitive personal data and reduce the risk of data security breaches. The Personal Data Privacy and Security Act would establish a single nationwide standard for data breach notification and require that companies that have databases with sensitive personal information establish and implement data privacy and security programs. This bill would also help law enforcement better combat cyber crime by strengthening and clarifying the penalties for violations of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act and creating a new criminal offense for cyber attacks involving government computers that manage critical infrastructure information.

The Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported this bill in September 2011. The committee has previously reported similar legislation three times. I urge the 112th Congress to finally enact this much needed legislation.

In the coming weeks, the Senate is expected to consider comprehensive cyber security legislation. Protecting our Nation's data from breaches is at the very core of a comprehensive strategy for improving cyber security. That is why President Obama included a data breach proposal that closely mirrors the Personal Data Privacy and Security Act in his cyber security proposal to Congress. That is why consumer and privacy advocates, business leaders, and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle continue to call for the enactment of data privacy legislation. And that is why I will continue work to ensure that meaningful data privacy legislation is included in any cyber security legislation the Senate considers this year.

I will also continue the important work that the Judiciary Committee began last year to update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, ECPA, so that our digital privacy laws keep pace with changes in technology. Updating this law to reflect the realities of our time is essential to keeping us safe from cyber threats.

Again, I thank and commend the many stakeholders and leaders from across the Nation who are holding events to commemorate Data Privacy Day. I look forward to working with these stakeholders and with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers to ensure that the right to privacy is ensured in the digital age.

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR DAVID WOOD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Chris Bohjalian is one of the treasures of Vermont, as well as being a gifted writer. We Vermonters are fortunate to be able to read his weekly column. They almost always deal with some aspect of life in the State he and I share.

Marcelle and I were especially touched by his column on Christmas Day about Pastor David Wood, of the United Church of Lincoln, VT.

So many of us go to church on Christmas Day, shake hands with those officiating at the service and thank them for what they have done, and then go home to be with our families. What Chris has done is talk about the Herculean tasks of Pastor David Wood. It reminds us that those who give us spiritual guidance and consolation do far more than what we see on holidays and holy days. I would ask unanimous consent that Chris Bohjalian's column about the extraordinary David Wood be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press]

IDYLL BANTER: BURNING THE CHRISTMAS CANDLE AT BOTH ENDS

(By Chris Bohjalian)

Look, I know Santa just pulled an all-nighter, flew through serious turbulence over Iceland, and had to put up with—yet again—Prancer's ''attitude'' that no one has yet to write a song about him. (You live on nothing but lichen between Thanksgiving and Christmas, and watch what happens to your temper.) But my great friend and the pastor of the United Church of Lincoln, David Wood, just performed four church services in 16 hours.

Yup. Four in 16. This is what happens when Christmas falls on a Sunday.

''From a spiritual point of view, I love it when Christmas comes on a Sunday. From a practical point of view, it's terrifying,'' David told me.

Specifically, last night there were three services at the church here in Lincoln. There was a 7 p.m. pageant for families—and this year the pageant was mighty impressive, with St. Nicholas himself sharing the story of the Nativity. Then there was an 8:30 p.m. service that was more traditional, just as joyous, but at least marginally less raucous. Finally, at 11:30 p.m., there was the quiet, contemplative, communal service that ended shortly after midnight—on Christmas Day. And while the church's youth pastor, Todd Goodyear, did the heaviest lifting at that very first service, David was still plenty involved.

In any case, after three services in five hours last night, David finally collapsed into bed about quarter to 1 on Christmas morning . . . and was back in the sanctuary today, preaching, 10 hours later.

That workload might not daunt Santa, but it would most mortals.

It has always seemed to me that the majority of priests and ministers and rabbis and imams work incredibly hard. Certainly David does. To wit: I will never forget when my wife was in labor with our daughter a little over 18 years ago. When Grace arrived—so did David. The labor was 22 hours, but still he was there within 40 minutes of Grace's arrival. Two months ago, my wife had six hours of kidney surgery. I had told David about it the day before. Sure enough, there he was the next day at the hospital. And it's not like my wife gets preferential treatment. (Given the number of Humane Society shelter cats she has tried to foist on David's family, he should be giving her a very wide berth.) He is always comforting someone or some family in hospitals in two counties. And then there are the funerals. And the christenings. And the baptisms. And the marriages. And the meetings. And the counseling. And the Yankees. (We all have our flaws.) David has been the pastor here in Lincoln since 1979, so this is not the first time that Christmas has fallen on a Sunday on his watch. He knows what to expect: ''Everything speeds up. Nothing slows down.'' Consequently, he had his sermons done weeks ahead of time. He had a plan in place to get the props from the pageant removed