

was how she accomplished so much that serves as such a wonderful example and why she was so beloved.

The friends of Don and Adele and those with whom she worked describe her best. Henry Bloch, the founder of H&R Block and a lifelong friend, said:

If there ever was a first lady of Kansas City, it was Adele. She was honored and respected by everybody. It's a major loss for this community.

Irv Hockaday, a former CEO of Hallmark and a friend of Adele and Don's for close to 50 years, said:

She was like a magnetic sun . . . whose constant warmth and magnetism just had a pull. And people gravitated to her. To me, her most compelling quality, of many, was her empathy.

They say that no one is indispensable. That's true in a way. But she comes about as close to being someone we can never, ever forget or replicate.

Irv Hockaday certainly captured Adele, as did Steven Doyal, spokesman for Hallmark Cards:

We lost a great human being. Her greatest passion was in the area of children. She believed passionately in the potential of every child.

At Children's Mercy Hospital, Adele moved easily from rocking sick babies in the nursery to running board meetings and leading multimillion-dollar fundraising campaigns. One of the best known was with Tom Watson, with whom she established the Children's Mercy Golf Classic.

Jack Ovel, the hospital board chairman, said:

She was quick to give others credit. She was always telling other people, "You are the wind beneath my wings."

Perhaps her most notable collaborative effort was bringing the University of Kansas and Children's Mercy together. Early on she realized what that would mean for residents of Kansas City.

Jim Heeter, president of the Greater City Chamber of Commerce, described the news of Adele's passing, which came in the middle of the monthly chamber board meeting:

The entire room fell into stunned silence when it was announced. She was known and loved by virtually everyone around our board table. We observed a long moment of silence in her honor and her memory.

Mary Shaw "Shawsie" Branton, who was her copartner and close friend in one charitable and/or civic event after another said of Adele:

I have lost a close friend. She touched all our lives. There was an aura around Adele, "How can I help? What can I do? . . . How can I find a solution?"

"This is a great day of sorrow," said Sarah Rowland, chairwoman of the Nelson-Atkins board of trustees.

Jane Chu, CEO of the Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts said:

Everything she did was about inspiring Kansas City residents. She so believed in these projects because she so believed in this city, she cared about making it a great place to live.

One can clearly see by the many comments of Adele's friends and lead-

ers in Kansas City, with regard to their sense of personal loss, expressions of admiration of love and respect for the world of achievements Adele accomplished, there is only one Adele Hall.

In my case, Mr. President, I was on the floor of this body last Monday during a series of votes taking place when a cloakroom attendant gave me a message to call my office immediately. I did, and my chief of staff, Jackie Cottrell, came over to the cloakroom and told me of the news of Adele's untimely passing.

There are certain people in life where you feel you are privileged just to know them—people who make a difference, really nice people who give you a certain sense of awe, people who are really not aware of their special and unique persona. Adele had that certain something—a unique charisma, comprised of a wonderful smile, charm and grace, but also the determination and ability of a leader.

When she came into a room, those present knew things would get done. She always stood ready in friendship and support and love. Unfortunately, given her strength of purpose, she was also the kind of person you might well take for granted.

Jackie and I immediately called Annie Presley, a good friend and companion-in-arms with Adele. Annie and I couldn't say too much during that phone call, but I did blurt out, "Well, it's the end of an era." And it is. Adele, in addition to all of her civic and art works, had tremendous influence, serving as an adviser, a friend, and supporter to Presidents, Governors, Senators, Congressional Members, and city leaders. Annie was right by her side in these endeavors. Her passion for politics made both Kansas and Missouri a better place to live. Her advice, her guidance, and support were invaluable to so many. Don and Adele's Kansas home was the setting for countless benefactor receptions. The list represents a Who's Who in politics, from both Presidents Bush, Senators Bob Dole, Kit Bond, Nancy Kassebaum, and, yes, somebody by the name of PAT ROBERTS.

My friendship with Don and Adele began more than 20 years ago. I admit I was a bit nervous the first time I was invited to their home. I arrived early and Adele warmly greeted me, welcomed me in. Don took me into the study, and after some discussion we all ended up listening to the Andrews Sisters—I don't know why—until we were informed it was time to greet the other guests. I think Don and I would have been there a lot longer if Don had his way. We have been great friends ever since.

Perhaps the highlight of our efforts together was when First Lady Laura Bush came to Kansas, and together we welcomed her to our great State.

Finally, Mr. President, when I talk about Adele's respect and her humility, I am reminded of the story when President Bush came to Wichita on my be-

half. The White House staff and security, God bless them, had names on the floor in the reception room, and those who were greeting the President had to stand on the right name. God knows what would have happened if you didn't stand on the right name.

Adele stood exactly as instructed on her name, without any hesitation. I did not do that. I didn't follow orders quite as well. I met with the President's vehicle and hurriedly told him our special guests were standing at attention at their appropriate spot, which amused the President greatly. The secret, of course, was that Don and Adele often stayed at the White House as guests of both George H.W. Bush and President George W. Bush.

When President Bush came in the room, he asked: Adele, are you standing in the right place?

She replied quickly: Why, Mr. President—George—I will stand wherever you want me to.

That really produced a lot of laughs and prompted a big hug.

Mr. President, today's obligations in the Senate prevent me from attending the celebration of life service, but I am there in spirit. To Don, Don Jr. and Jill, David and Laura, Margaret and Keith, and Adele's nine grandchildren, our thoughts and prayers are with you.

I feel compelled to say if all of the people in the Kansas City area could be in attendance, those who loved Adele or who have benefited from her many endeavors, the numbers would fill Arrowhead Stadium and then some.

Helen Steiner Rice may well have summed up what Adele would be telling us now:

When I must leave you for a little while, please go on bravely with a gallant smile. And, for my sake and in my name, live on and do all things the same. Spend not your life in empty days, but fill each waking hour in useful ways. Reach out your hand in comfort and in cheer, and I, in turn, will comfort you and hold you near.

Mr. President, the heavens are a little brighter now because they have a shining star in Adele Hall.

I yield the floor, and upon careful study 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. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today, as I have virtually every day since we have been back in session, to address what is perhaps the most critical question facing this Nation: how to rein in the out-of-control Federal spending that threatens to bankrupt the country and saddle future generations with a burden of

debt that will dramatically reduce the quality of their lives.

Yesterday morning on ABC's "This Week with George Stephanopoulos," Senate Majority Leader REID claimed:

"The American people need to understand that it's not as if we've done nothing for the debt."

I would argue that the American people do understand, but what they disagree with is the majority leader's statement that we have done something to reduce the debt we are accumulating at a record rate. We all know we are spending nearly \$40,000 of taxpayer money per second. We know it has now been 1,377 days since we passed a budget in the Senate or one has even been offered by the Democratic leadership. Our debt continues to accumulate and now stands at nearly \$16.5 trillion, and anybody who looks at the debt clock sees that the numbers are rotating faster than the eye can see. So, no, I don't agree. I don't think we have done much to address our debt. And rather than recognize the real problem of our debt, which is spending, the majority leader talked about the need for yet more taxes and higher revenues.

After all the debate about making the wealthy pay more in order to pay down our debt, the fiscal cliff deal barely changed the Nation's long-term fiscal outlook, particularly if spending continues on its present course.

A report from the Peterson Foundation released this week puts U.S. debt on a track to reach 200 percent of gross domestic product by 2040. Keep in mind that many respected economists—economists without a partisan position to promote, those who have looked at this impartially—have said to us that historically, without exception, once a Nation's debt reaches 90 percent of GDP, it becomes very damaging to the economy, and it is something I believe we are now experiencing the early phases of in America. So 200 percent of GDP, if we stay on the present course, will take this country and our economy down, and it will take away our ability to provide the needed and necessary functions of the Federal Government.

The plain fact is that our debt is going to continue to spiral upward until Washington tackles its spending addiction.

The President and some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are claiming that in the last few years they have already cut the budget to the bone. These so-called savings they talk about are savings anticipated by drawing down troops in Afghanistan and Iraq that are already set to wind down. So we can't just simply say: Well, we have solved the problem because we are now going to take this money which we anticipate we won't have to spend.

By the way, that assumes there will be no more overseas contingent operations that will have to take place in the next 10 years. If we look at what is happening around the world, if we look

at the instability and threats that are happening around the world, it is pretty hard to assume we simply don't or won't need to spend any money over the next 10 years to address something that is a direct threat to the United States.

All of this basically says it is pretty hard to take seriously the suggestion by the majority leader and the President that we have done our job in cutting spending to reduce the debt.

If I were able to take the time to list the wasteful catalog of duplicative spending and wasteful spending of the taxpayer dollars on this floor, I would use up the rest of the day—and more. But let me mention a few examples from my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator COBURN, who I think has done this body and the American public a great service by delineating and outlining some of this unnecessary spending of taxpayer dollars and giving us a route and a roadmap and a pathway towards addressing unneeded wasteful spending of tax dollars, particularly at a time when we are having to borrow nearly 40 percent or more in order to keep our government functioning. This spending Senator COBURN has listed comes out of official government reports—the Government Accountability Office, the Congressional Research Service, and other government entities. These have been documented by our own official national government agencies:

There is \$1.6 billion spent annually to maintain unneeded Federal property. If it is unneeded, why do we have to maintain it year after year at a cost of \$1.6 billion? Let's put a "for sale" sign up there and receive some revenue from these assets that are documented as being unneeded.

Another \$1.6 billion is spent by the Federal Government to provide free cell phone service. Now, the Congress passed legislation for certain categories of low-income people to receive free cell phones. Whether you are for that or against that or voted for it or voted against it, what has been laid out here is the fact that many of these phones are going to people who don't qualify for this handout, and hundreds of thousands of those go to people who already have at least one phone. Offer somebody a free second phone, and they are going to grab it. But do they need it, and does the taxpayer need to pay for it?

Also, \$50 million of taxpayer money went to the IRS for a public relations effort to try to improve its image with taxpayers. Good luck with that PR program. I think we know their opinion of the IRS. And is this really a necessary expenditure?

The IRS sent a prisoner who filed a bogus tax return a refund for \$327,456, and they even sent it to the correctional facility. You would think that somewhere along the line, somebody would say: Maybe we ought to look into this. Hopefully we will be able to get this one back, along with \$30,000

that was sent to a jail where a murderer collected \$30,000 in claimed unemployment benefits. Well, yes, he was unemployed, but that is not exactly what our unemployment system is designed to do. So while we are going after the \$327,000, maybe we can collect this \$30,000 on the way.

Every day we hear of reports of food stamps being used to pay for beer, cigarettes, cell phone bills, and even cars. That hardly needs to be mentioned because it is something we have come to understand—there is a lot of misuse of tax dollars.

On and on it goes, and I could list more and more.

Just the other day, Senator COBURN listed some duplicative programs, and he thought: Well, maybe we don't need multiple numbers of these. Maybe we can consolidate.

We have 18 domestic food assistance programs, 45 separate job-training programs. And I love this one, my personal favorite—more than 50 financial literacy programs provided by the Federal Government.

The first question we need to ask is what does the Federal Government have to say about financial literacy, given our current financial situation? Hopefully it is using its own dysfunction as an example of what not to do.

These outrageous spending items and duplicative Federal programs are not isolated examples. Just a few weeks ago the Treasury Department issued its year-end report for fiscal 2012. One of the bombshells in this report that has received virtually no coverage or commentary is the estimate by the Government Accountability Office that \$108 billion was lost to improper payments by the Federal Government.

Since over one-third of all Federal spending wasn't even examined yet by the GAO, the total amount lost obviously will be much higher. The fact that this escaped the notice of much of the media and many of my colleagues is very telling. Unfortunately, we are so used to the notion of inefficient or wasteful Federal spending, a government report verifying over \$100 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse doesn't even register.

When my colleagues come down to offer amendments and are voted down, amendments to offset spending for new programs such as disaster relief and a cacophony of rejections comes their way saying, "How dare you even think about trying to offset this, you are taking money away from babies and children and mothers and essential functions of the Federal Government?" Then you start to read down the list of wasteful programs and duplicative programs and they say they cannot come up with a dime to offset needed expenses.

Let me say we are not here to undermine or destroy the necessary function of running an efficient government. But the key word is efficient. We want to spend taxpayers' dollars in a way so taxpayers understand we are doing the

best to spend their hard-earned dollars on essential programs.

I have suggested to the Appropriations Committee that each program for which we appropriate money be put through a system of what I call triage. We ask each agency before it presents its budget to us, annually, for the appropriations to pay for their expenses and distributions, that they first address this question: Is this an essential function of the Federal Government? Is this a function we might like to do but can no longer afford to do? And separate that from those we no longer need or never should have been put there in the first place.

At a time when we are suffering from the plunge into deficit spending and debt, should we not apply some standards and principles as to where and how we allocate funds that are sent to us by the taxpayer? I have asked each agency to do that. We have not received any reports back. All we hear, from a number of voices around the town, is: Oh, no, we cannot touch any of this; every dime we spend is absolutely necessary.

I think what Senator COBURN has begun to do and what I hope to do, and to work on with him and others, is to identify some of those areas and literally ask the question to my colleagues and to the American people: Do you think this is an essential function of the Federal Government? Is this something that maybe we would wish to do but do not have the money to do? Or is this something that, frankly, has not lived up to its promise, is wasting money, or is this something that never should have been passed in the first place?

If we do not apply those principles to our future spending, we are going to continue down this road. We all know the big three—Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare—have to be reformed to save these programs, but have to be reformed because they are unsustainable in their current form. I will be talking much more about that later. But what I do want to acknowledge here today is that without getting to those programs, which we have to do if we are going to solve our long-term problem, we also need to seriously look at how we spend money on all the discretionary spending that comes before this body. We have to look at those things that simply do not measure up in terms of a responsible way of handling our taxpayer revenues.

I am going to continue coming to the floor, I am going to continue pointing out areas where I think we can save money, and continue to make the case that this Congress has not begun to do the job it needs to do in terms of dealing with our spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

#### DEBT CEILING EXTENSION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, last week the Senate passed legislation

that had already been approved in the House that extended the debt ceiling until late this summer. It was the right thing to do. It was the right thing to extend the debt ceiling of our Nation because it allows us to pay the bills we have already incurred. There is not one dime of new spending that is authorized under the legislation we approved. My only regret is that we did not extend it for a longer period of time, giving greater certainty to the financial markets.

If we were ever to violate the debt ceiling, the consequences would be that the taxpayers of this country would have to pay more for the obligations of our Nation in interest costs. It would permanently damage the reputation of this Nation as far as our ability to pay our bills. It would be counterproductive to everything we are trying to do to help the taxpayers of America. It was the right thing for us to do, to extend the debt ceiling, but we still have a lot more work we need to do.

Our current accumulation of debt is not sustainable. We cannot continue to spend what we are spending today and collect what we are collecting today in revenue and sustain the fiscal integrity of the United States. We spend too much and we do not bring in enough revenue. That is the issue we need to address. It was not addressed in the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling should have been extended. But we now need to deal with the fundamental problem that our spending and revenues are not in line.

We could talk about the cause of how we got here. We could talk about how the Congress reduced tax revenues while we were at war, a policy I spoke out against and voted against. But our responsibility is to figure out how we go from where we are today, with budget deficits that are not sustainable, to how we can bring our country into better fiscal balance. We need a balanced approach. We need an approach that looks at spending, looks at revenues, that acknowledges that job growth is, first and foremost, our objective. We have to create more jobs in our economy—more people working, less people needing governmental services, more people paying tax revenues; all that helps generate the growth in our economy.

We have to protect the middle class. The middle class has been particularly vulnerable during this slowdown in our economy from which we are now recovering. It has to be real, what we come up with. That means it really does deal with the deficit problems of this country and should be long term. I think all of us are tired of these short-term extensions. They may avoid an immediate problem but they do not give the type of predictability that is necessary for our economy to take off and grow.

If you are an investor, it is tough to invest if you do not know the ground rules, if you do not know what the Tax Code is going to look like, what the Federal budget is going to look like.

How do you invest in expanding a plant to deal with expanded Federal needs when you don't know what the budget is going to be? How do you deal with the Tax Code if maybe you want to develop an energy company when you do not know what the tax provisions are going to be for that operation? We need to give predictability. Therefore, long-term solutions are better.

And it needs to be truly bipartisan. I was here on New Year's Eve at midnight. I saw the Democrats and Republicans come together in a true compromise that I think put the Nation's interests first rather than our partisan interests. I would have wished to see us do things a lot differently than in that agreement, but it was bipartisan, we compromised, we listened, and did it in the best traditions of the Congress.

I wish to take us back 2 years ago when we started to struggle with how we would deal with our fiscal problems. President Obama appointed the Simpson-Bowles Commission, and we know a lot about that. They made their recommendations. Some of the recommendations' specifics were pretty controversial, but I think as to the overall framework of the Simpson-Bowles recommendations—the amount of additional revenue we need to bring in, the types and parameters of the spending cuts—I think there was general national agreement that that was the framework which would allow us to move forward in the best interests of our economy. I point out in the last Congress the Democrats on the Senate Budget Committee adopted that approach as our framework to move forward. I think that is what we need to look at.

Let me make a couple of points, because I have listened to a lot of my colleagues come to the floor and talk about how we have not made progress, that our deficits are too large. We have made progress. We have. We have gotten about halfway there. Simpson-Bowles was somewhere between \$4 and \$5 trillion of deficit reduction over a 10-year period. We are about halfway there. We have about \$2.5 trillion we have gotten done. We got that done because we passed the Budget Control Act, and the Budget Control Act put in lower caps on discretionary spending on the domestic side. That is now the law of the land. Over \$1 trillion of deficit reduction was accomplished because of the Budget Control Act.

We did another \$1 trillion of deficit reduction on New Year's Eve, the fiscal cliff agreements that brought in more revenue by making permanent the 39.6-percent tax rate for high-income taxpayers and bringing in some additional spending cuts. That is real.

My colleagues say we still have these large deficits and they are larger than they were before, but if we did not do the Budget Control Act and we did not do the fiscal cliff agreements, the deficit would be much higher. Again, using some common baseline, such as Simpson-Bowles did, we have done