

a group led by the French company, Airbus, over an American company, Boeing, to supply our next generation of aerial refueling tankers.

I think I speak for many of us when I say it is deeply troubling we would turn our aerospace leadership over to a foreign company. If the contract had gone to Boeing, it would have meant 44,000 American jobs. So now Airbus is arguing that this contract isn't outsourcing jobs because it teamed with Northrop Grumman, and they have their supporters on the radio and TV talking about how excited they are about the work that will come to the United States because of this deal.

I think we better step back and take a good hard look at what Airbus is planning before anybody pops the champagne. The reality is, we don't know what Airbus is planning.

The Air Force has already said it did not consider jobs a factor when it awarded the tanker contract, so all we have to go on is Airbus's word. We have seen Airbus's slick marketing campaign before, and we have very good reason to be worried. Airbus has a history of bending the truth to try to convince Congress that it plans to invest in the United States, but when you examine their claims, they don't hold up.

Five years ago, when Airbus was first working to unravel Boeing's tanker contract, Airbus and its parent company, EADS, hired a small army of lobbyists to come out here and assert to us that their business was good for America. Well, at the time I was very skeptical of their PR campaign, so I asked our Commerce Department to investigate. Guess what I found. Airbus had claimed they had created 100,000 jobs here, but the Commerce Department looked into it and it wasn't 100,000 jobs; it was 500. Airbus said it had contracted with 800 U.S. firms, but the Commerce Department came back and said it was only 250.

At that point, Airbus did something very funny. They changed their numbers, decreasing the number of contracts from 800 all of a sudden to 300, but they increased the alleged value of those contracts from \$5 billion to \$6 billion a year. So I said at the time: You cannot trust Airbus's funny numbers.

What is interesting is, if you peel back the veneer on Airbus's promises this time, you start asking similar questions. Airbus had said it will build an assembly plant in Alabama. The Air Force says the planes will be American. A plant doesn't exist in America, and the only thing we know about the jobs it will create is that most of that work is going to be done overseas. If you don't believe me, read the British newspapers.

An article in a newspaper in Britain reported Monday that:

Airbus will build the planes in Europe, and fly them to a plant in Mobile, Alabama, for fitting out.

Supposedly, this allows them to call them "made in America." That is like

shipping a BMW over from Germany, putting new tires on it, and calling it America's newest luxury car.

As I have said before, you can put an American sticker on a plane and call it American, but that doesn't make it American made.

I think we have to take some cues from the reaction of the French and German leaders about what this contract means for Boeing and the American industry, and it is not good. German Chancellor Angela Merkel called the deal "an immense success for Airbus and the European aerospace industry."

That is what they are saying in Europe.

A spokesman for French President Nicolas Sarkozy called this deal a "historic success." That is what they are calling it in Europe.

Four years ago, I stood on this floor to raise an alarm to my colleagues about Europe's attempt to dismantle the American aerospace industry, and I have spent years warning the administration and Congress that we have to defend our industry and demand that Airbus play by the rules. For decades, Europe has provided subsidies to prop up Airbus and EADS. Airbus is, to them, a jobs program in Europe, and it has led to tens of thousands of layoffs in the United States because of their illegal tactics, which I have been out on the floor a number of times over the past years to delineate for all of my colleagues. The U.S. Government now has a WTO case pending against Airbus—against the exact company the Air Force has now awarded a \$40 billion contract to.

So I think we have even more reason for concern because this contract now gives Airbus a firm foothold as a U.S. contractor, and it is one that is going to hurt our U.S. workers for years to come.

It took us 100 years to build an aerospace industry in the United States. But once our plants shut down, the industry is gone. We can't just rebuild it overnight. So let's set the record straight. With this contract—this Air Force contract—Airbus is not creating American jobs; it is killing them. With this contract, we can say bon voyage to 44,000 U.S. jobs and bon voyage to \$40 billion of our taxpayer money.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I address the Senate today to announce the organization of a new caucus: the Border Security and Enforcement First Caucus. I am very proud to be joined today by several Members in this endeavor;

specifically, Senators DEMINT, SESSIONS, INHOFE, BURR, DOLE, CHAMBLISS, ISAKSON, and WICKER. In the next few days, or in a week or so, we will have additional Members join, I am confident, based on a number of meetings and conversations I have had. So, again, I am happy to announce this important caucus to further the debate about a pressing national challenge. Our point of view and our focus is clear: border security and enforcement first.

Why join this caucus? Why form this caucus? Well, clearly, this problem is a major challenge for the country. Right now, 1 in 25 U.S. residents is here illegally. It is staggering when you think about it: 1 in 25, or 4 percent. The American people have voiced their enormous concern about this en masse, large-scale problem. They have also voiced their clear concern about some of the proposals put forward in Washington to allegedly solve the problem. One of those was shot down very clearly, very soundly last summer, and that is a solution that leads with a big, broad amnesty program.

I believe this debate moved forward last summer because we defeated soundly on the Senate floor that approach because the American people were finally heard loudly and clearly. I believe the message was unmistakable, beyond debate: We don't want a big, broad amnesty; we do want enforcement first. We want enforcement first. This caucus will basically follow that lead of the American people and continue to push the viewpoint and specific, concrete legislation that puts enforcement first, both at the border and at the workplace, as the way to begin to solve this enormous illegal immigration challenge.

So, first, our goal is simple: to push for border security and interior enforcement measures first, including workplace enforcement. That can be a main part of addressing this challenge and solving this problem. This caucus will be a platform to let Americans know that some in the Senate—a significant number—are continuing to make sure laws already on the books will be enforced and to push for stronger border security and interior enforcement legislation, and the funding, the mechanisms, and the systems we need in place to make that work. This caucus will act as a voice for those concerned citizens who have expressed that viewpoint—as I said, most clearly last July.

Another big point this caucus will help make over and over is a simple message: attrition through enforcement. In this immigration debate, I believe it has been a stale debate dominated by a straw man. That is the false choice that either we have to grant a huge amnesty to folks in this country illegally or we have to turn around the next day and have the law enforcement and resources to arrest, as some people put it, 13 million people. That is the false choice that is so often harped on

and presented on the Senate floor. That is a false choice.

There is a third way, and that is attrition through enforcement or whittling down in a significant way this 13 million plus figure to something much smaller, much more manageable, through real enforcement measures, not only at the border which, of course, is necessary to make sure the numbers don't go up and up, but in the interior, specifically at the workplace.

According to a recent Zogby poll, when given the choice between mass deportations, mass amnesty, and the third way, attrition through enforcement, a majority of Americans clearly choose attrition through enforcement. Of course, most polls leave out that option. Most polls promote the false choice. Most debate, quite frankly, on the Senate floor promotes the false choice, but it is false. There is this real alternative.

How do we get there? Two main ways: border security—the good news there is we have begun to make inroads, spending \$3 billion on significant new border security in the last appropriations cycle, and that was positive follow-on to the defeat of the amnesty bill last summer. But there is also a second key ingredient, a second key ingredient that has been largely ignored and not addressed in this effort, and that is interior enforcement, particularly at the workplace.

In my opinion, that is the missing link, the missing piece of the puzzle to make all of this begin to come together. Border security is crucial. We have done significant work there. We need to do much more. But interior enforcement and enforcement at the workplace is at least as crucial. We need to have a real system that works for that security—a real-time database, not a system based on paper documents which can so easily be forged—to ensure that companies only hire folks in this country legally. When we have that system in place, that will change the dynamics overnight. That will begin this process of attrition through enforcement. That will bring that 13 million plus number down significantly, if we truly have the political will to produce a system, a real-time database, a nonpaper system to ensure that employers only hire folks in this country who are here legally. If they do otherwise, then, of course, they should be hit with significant criminal penalties.

So, again, I am proud to announce the organization of this new caucus: the Border Security and Enforcement First Caucus. My colleagues will be hearing a lot more from us in the coming days and months as we repeat the message delivered by the American people last summer so loudly, so clearly: We don't want amnesty. We do want enforcement first, including workplace enforcement, including interior enforcement that can lead to attrition through enforcement. Hopefully, we can begin to get our hands around this

very crippling, potentially debilitating problem of illegal immigration.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. How much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 14 minutes 16 seconds.

THE BUDGET

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise this morning to respond to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, who came out a few moments ago to talk about the budget. We are in the process right now of putting together this year's budget. It will be voted on in committee today or tomorrow and, of course, then out here on the floor. We will have a lot of floor time over the next week to discuss the budget.

I felt it was really important to set the record straight because it is that rhetorical time again when we will hear our colleagues on the other side of the aisle come out and say Democrats are tax-and-spend liberals. Let me set the record straight.

Last year's budget had a \$180 billion tax cut in it—not for the wealthiest Americans but for hard-working middle-class Americans.

We worked very hard to put together a fiscally responsible budget. We are not going to sit here and listen to “tax and spend” thrown at us time and time again when, in reality, with the Democratic President 7 years ago we came into the time with a budget that had a surplus, which we soon saw diminished incredibly, and we are now in deficit spending because of an irresponsible tax cut the Republicans have been pushing for the wealthiest of Americans, which even Senator JOHN MCCAIN didn't vote for at the time. It did leave us without the capacity to make sure we had the investments we needed to be able to ensure that Americans can stay in their homes; that they can have roads they can drive on to get to work; that they can make sure their children have the kind of education they need so they can get a job and contribute back to this country; and, importantly, to take care of our veterans who are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan and finding long waiting lines at our medical facilities and not getting the adequate care they need.

The budget that the Budget chair will present this afternoon is, once again, a fiscally responsible document that understands the needs of Americans and will make sure we are responding to the crisis we are in today in this country and invest in America's people. It is fiscally responsible. It is not about tax cuts or tax increases, it is about making sure we have the revenues available to make sure every single American today has the opportunity that is available for them, that dream that they can live to be a strong

American citizen and to keep our communities and America strong.

So I reject the argument that we all hear thrown at us time and again that Democrats are “tax-and-spend” liberals. We are fiscally responsible Democrats, and we are proud of it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, as I understand, we are still in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PRYOR. I ask unanimous consent that we yield back the time, and it is my understanding that more Senators would like to speak this morning.

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

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CPSC REFORM ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2663, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2663) to reform the Consumer Product Safety Commission to provide greater protection for children's products, to improve the screening of noncompliant consumer products, to improve the effectiveness of consumer product recall programs, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Pryor amendment No. 4090, of a technical nature.

Cornyn amendment No. 4094, to prohibit State attorneys general from entering into contingency fee agreements for legal or expert witness services in certain civil actions relating to Federal consumer product safety rules, regulations, standards, certification, or labeling requirements, or orders.

DeMint amendment No. 4096, to strike section 21, relating to whistleblower protections.

Feinstein amendment No. 4104, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or distribution in commerce of certain children's products and childcare articles that contain specified phthalates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, I wish to notify our colleagues that I think we are making great progress on this legislation. Senator CORNYN is here to talk about one of his amendments. We know there are a few other amendments that are being discussed right now, maybe in the cloakrooms or in Senators' offices. That is very encouraging. The feedback we have received has been very positive. It looks as if there are some amendments that will require votes.

I encourage all Senators who would like to come and speak to make plans to do that at some point today. I encourage anyone who has any amendments that they would like to have