

we are defending this Nation's vital national security interests if we continue on a 2-week by 2-week by 2-week sequence. There is not the kind of funding nor the kind of assurance to the men and women serving that we can adequately train and equip and make them fight at their highest efficiencies and capabilities. I disagree—and I will list some of the areas where I disagree—with the funding requirements. I don't agree with the number the Secretary of Defense has said, which is \$540 billion. I think we can do it with \$535 billion.

The fact is we can't subject our Nation's national security to a 2-week by 2-week process. It is not the way the Defense Department can function and this Nation can defend itself and its vital national security interests. We owe it to the men and women serving in harm's way as we speak.

The aspects of the Defense Appropriations bill that need to be taken away, eliminated, are \$300 million for medical research. I am sure the medical research is important, but it has nothing to do with national defense. Within that \$300 million is \$15 million for peer-reviewed Alzheimer's research, \$150 million for peer-reviewed breast cancer research, \$12.8 million for peer-reviewed lung cancer research, \$20 million for peer-reviewed ovarian cancer research, \$80 million for peer-reviewed prostate cancer research, and \$4.8 million for multiple sclerosis—all of which are worthy causes, but none have anything to do with defending this country. If they want them to be funded—and they deserve to be in many respects—they should come out of the Health and Human Services Appropriations, not out of Defense.

What has happened around here over the years is what I'll call the "Willie Sutton syndrome." He was the famous bank robber. They once asked him why he robbed banks. He said: That is where the money is. So some special interests have wanted funding for various projects that are either good or bad, or programs that are either good or bad, which have nothing to do with defense. We cannot afford those anymore. If we want to fund a program, it should come out of the appropriate area of responsibility of the Appropriations Committee.

Both bills include about \$70 million for private organizations and charities, such as \$24 million for the Red Cross, \$1.2 million for the Special Olympics, \$20 million for youth mentoring grants—all worthy causes and all not defense related.

Both bills direct \$550 million for non-defense public infrastructure projects, such as \$250 million for improvements to local schools that are not part of the Department of Defense school system. If they need to be funded, take it out of the proper appropriations moneys. It also includes \$300 million for roads.

Equally troubling is the way the bills make objectionable changes to the overseas contingency operations fund-

ing—the OCO. The overseas contingency operation funds are specifically for Iraq and Afghanistan. Both of the bills cut the Iraq security force funding by \$500 million. They also shift funding for nine F-18 Hornets from base to the overseas contingency operations, despite the fact that we have not lost an F-18, and that is \$500 million. It shifts \$500 million in funding for UAVs from the base, where they were properly requested, to OCO. They should not be designated to overseas contingency operations. They fund 20 additional missile defense interceptors for \$190 million, and they include more than \$37 million in funding support for the southwest border for the National Guard. I strongly support funding for the southwest border—to have it secured—and I will continue to advocate for that, but it doesn't apply to overseas contingency operations.

As we proceed, I intend to work to remove the nondefense-related spending from these bills, restore that funding to DOD priorities, including full funding for our troops in combat and the costs needed to maintain and restore their equipment.

I don't know if the government will be shut down. I don't know where there will be compromise. I don't know if we will engage in entitlement reform and all of the different scenarios that we could draw as to what is going to happen here at high noon in the great drama of our Nation's Capitol. We cannot forget that we are in 2 wars; that we have 100,000 troops in Afghanistan and approximately 50,000 in Iraq—those are rough numbers—not to mention other civilians and members of the diplomatic corps and other parts of the U.S. Government.

We cannot force them to live 2 weeks by 2 weeks by 2 weeks and not be sufficiently funded. I will be glad to engage with my colleagues in vigorous debate. Maybe they are able to find more ways to save money from our defense spending—and I am sure they are there, and I look forward to working with them. But as the Secretary of Defense has tried to make it as clear as possible to the Members of Congress—and I wish the President would weigh in more heavily—we cannot continue functioning and preserve our national security this way.

That is why if we do another 2-week continuing resolution, I will be coming to the floor to propose an amendment to provide funding for our Nation's defense for the remainder of the year.

I take a backseat to no one in my zeal to cut unnecessary spending. I am aware we have mortgaged our children's futures. I know we cannot stop spending the way we are. But the first priority of government—the first priority—is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens. That is why we must appropriately fund our Department of Defense and all its associated functions and especially provide the equipment and training and protection, as much as we can, to the men and

women who are serving and sacrificing so the rest of us can live freely.

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.

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

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

REDUCTION IN THE DEBT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we had votes this afternoon on the continuing resolution proposal from the House, and the Senate did not approve that. We did not have the 60 votes necessary to accept that. The Democratic proposal, which I would suggest does nothing about the debt, failed. I guess there were four or five party defections. If we take what direction those defections meant, all of those defections went to the more conservative side in that several thought the House reductions in spending were not enough, and several Democratic colleagues thought the Democratic majority leader's proposal did not go far enough.

I would just say that what we need to do—and it is very important that we achieve it—is to move toward a gradual, credible, sustained, mature reduction of the deficits this country has faced, and that takes some tough decisionmaking. It doesn't require us to act in an extreme or drastic way, but it means sustained serious changes in the trajectory in which we are headed.

I would just note that the House proposed reducing our nondefense discretionary spending \$61 billion over the rest of the fiscal year. If we take only the discretionary account, that amounts to about a 6-percent reduction. If we take the entire Federal spending, it is less than a 2-percent reduction in the entire Federal spending. So it is utterly implausible that this reduction in spending is so significant that it will impact adversely our economy today—that is one of the arguments they are throwing out—particularly in light of the fact these don't consider that we are dealing with outlays of money that would not even be spent in this fiscal year. It will be spent in the next year or two as we build a project—a road or something—that takes several years to complete. So the actual reduction in outlay in this year would not be that significant, and it will not reduce the fragile growth rate we are in.

What it does, though, is save \$61 billion out of this year's appropriations. Over a period of 10 years, that will result in approximately \$860 billion in savings because it reduces the baseline by this amount, and it carries out each with the 10 years of the \$61 billion reduction, plus the interest saved on all this debt since all of this money is borrowed. We are so deeply in debt, any reduction reduces our debt, it reduces

our interest payment, and it puts us on a sound path.

I do not believe the House sent us anything that is reckless or dangerous or extreme. The majority leader yesterday said it was reckless and used those kind of pejorative terms. It is not. It is a reasonable step that has a significant impact, pushing \$1 trillion, actually, over 10. Do a few more little things and we would save \$1 trillion on our debt over 10 years, and that is significant.

I would point out, Mr. President, we have had substantial increases in our budgets in the last 2 years—in 2010, in 2011—over the 2008 budget proposal. We have added 25 percent increases in spending in these discretionary programs. Some of them have received substantially more than that. So taking down these numbers will not put us into the poorhouse. It is not going to substantially alter the nature of the very Republic that we are here to serve or the government that is supposed to serve the people. It is not going to savage our government. It is not going to savage the programs.

For example, these reductions on which we voted, if they became law, \$61 billion over the rest of this fiscal year would bring us still above the 2008 levels by 4.3 percent. In 2008 we were spending \$378 billion on these programs. If this reduction were to be accomplished, the spending for the rest of this year would be \$394 billion. That is more than we were spending in 2008, and I believe it is a reasonable reduction.

I suppose, after this vote, that leaders and wise heads and people I affectionately call “masters of the universe” will all get together and they will start deciding what we are going to do: You didn’t win your vote and we didn’t win our vote, so let’s just sit down here and let’s divide up the pie and you give a little bit more, and we don’t want to cut too much spending, you know, and we will just not agree to anything like these spending levels.

I think that would be a mistake. I believe the American people in this last election were very clear that they expected us to do something about this reckless Washington spending. It was dominant in the election. There was a shellacking in this election of the big government big spenders. They went down all over the country—what was it, 87 new House Members elected, the biggest surge in years, every one of them, virtually, promising to contain the reckless spending in Washington.

I cannot understand what it is that people do not comprehend about the nature of the circumstances we are in. Forty cents of every dollar we spend today has been borrowed. Every economist who testified has said we are on an unsustainable path.

Mr. Erskine Bowles testified, President Clinton’s former Chief of Staff, a successful businessman himself, the head of the debt commission, along with Alan Simpson, a former Senator.

He said we could have a debt crisis in 2 years—maybe a little less, maybe a little more—at the rate we are going. Their joint statement said this country has never been in a situation in which we have such a predictable crisis. Senator Simpson declared that he thought we could have a debt crisis in less than a year. He said: I think it is less than a year, not 2 years. Alan Greenspan in January told the Wall Street Journal that there was a little better—not much—than a 50-50 chance that we would have a debt crisis in 2 to 3 years. These are ominous warnings. You can’t spend \$3.8 trillion and bring in \$2.2 trillion and think you can continue that. It is the largest deficit in the history of the American Republic.

The President’s budget that he just submitted to us projects no budget in 10 years less than \$600 billion. The last 3 years of his 10-year budget, those deficits are going up to \$900 billion. It is the wrong trend. This is not a course we can sustain. We have to get off of it. We could be reaching the precipice sooner than we think—1 year, 2 years, 3 years—if we do not get off this path. We need to take action now.

There is one opportunity; that is, this continuing resolution which allows us to make some reductions—enough to send a message that there are sufficient votes in this Congress to reverse the path we are on. Are there sufficient votes? I believe there are. Partisanship was in these last two votes. We know that. People were pressured on both sides. But the people who did not follow party lines were moving on to the right side, the more conservative, restrained side of spending. I think that suggests there is some momentum out there to do something other than just split the baby on this, how much we are going to reduce spending.

The proposal of the majority leader is really a \$4.6 billion reduction. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of the discretionary budget and a mere fraction of the total Federal spending this year. That is nothing.

The choice is, are we going to do nothing or are we going to do something? Are we going to listen to the warnings that we are facing a predictable crisis financially or not? We can do this. This is not going to be a dramatic reduction in spending. Frankly, I would like to see it go a good bit lower, as a number of people in the Senate I know believe. But most of us believed it was significant, it puts us on a downward path, and it saves \$61 billion this year and \$850 billion over 10. That is a pretty good amount to save in 7 months of this fiscal year, and we will come back next year and we will do more and better work.

We are going to have to bring entitlements into the discussion, but the President is going to have to step up on that. If he is going to oppose that, nothing is going to pass on entitlements, that is for sure. So we need some leadership, and we can move this in the right direction.

I am disappointed there were not more votes for the House proposal, but at least on the Republican side it got every Republican vote except a few who believed it did not go far enough in reducing spending.

I believe the message needs to be, to whoever is meeting in these secret chambers without the American people and without—I won’t be in there, I am sure. They will be meeting and making these plots. They need to know we are not just looking for any token cuts. We need to do something that is significant. We need to stay with the House number. That is what we need to do. It would be so good for this country. The whole world would say: This new Congress, they are taking a noticeable step. They actually reduced spending. Maybe in the United States they are ready to get their house in order. Maybe we do not mind continuing to buy their bonds. Maybe they will be able to honor their debts without debasing their currency. Maybe it is a good investment.

I believe that is what we need to be saying because otherwise we could be in a situation in which our debt surges, the interest on our debt surges, and the value of our currency is debased, and that will put us on the road to political as well as economic decline.

As ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, we have been wrestling with these issues. I thank Senator CONRAD, our chairman. He has had some good hearings and good witnesses and good testimony, but it is time for action, not just talk. We need to do something.

This is the bill that is before us. This CR is a vehicle by which we can speak to the American people, speak to the financial markets, say to the entire world that the United States realizes that our path is an unsustainable one, and we are going to do something about it. We are moving off that path. We are going to take the hard road. It will be a tougher road for a while, but it is the road to prosperity, it is the road to growth, and it is the road to more jobs.

Excessive debt slows down the economy, as Reinhart and Rogoff’s book and testimony show, as Secretary Geithner testified before the committee. It has already slowed our growth, he has acknowledged, and he is afraid we could have a debt crisis on an adverse incident that is exacerbated by the very high levels of debt we are under.

I 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.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

JOB LOSSES

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak long. I know we are getting ready to wrap up. I will not interfere with that. But I did not want the day to end without a reminder of the concern that H.R. 1 and the significant, serious cuts it imposes will produce significant, serious job losses. That is not something being manufactured on our side of the aisle. It comes from careful analysis from very neutral forums.

Many people will have seen this graphic already. Chairman Bernanke of the Federal Reserve is one of the observers who has looked at the bill and said it will cut significant jobs. I believe his testimony was that it was not trivial, that it would be hundreds of thousands of jobs. Economist Mark Zandi has advised Republicans and Democrats. He is a neutral, independent economist. He has calculated that the GOP plan would cost 700,000 jobs. When we consider the good news that we have just heard of job growth in the past reporting period, which was, I believe, around 170,000 jobs—less than 200 anyway—the idea of wiping out 700,000 jobs acquires a real scale and a real significance.

Finally, at the bottom is Goldman Sachs. Goldman Sachs is no great friend of the Democratic Party. It is a group of financial advisers and investors who look at data as dispassionately as possible, because if they are wrong, they don't make money. Goldman Sachs has estimated that the spending cuts will hurt economic growth. My memory is, they estimated it would be 2 percentage points off of our economic growth. When we consider that our economic growth is under 3 percent right now, if we take two of the percents out, we are basically getting pretty close to flat-lining the American economy. So prudence dictates that we go about the necessary adjustments to get rid of our debt and our deficit in a way that does not snuff out the gradually emerging recovery.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have just gone from 11.5 percent unemployment down to 11.3 percent. It is still pretty darn serious out there. While clearly things appear to have bottomed out and started to go in the right direction, nothing prevents what everybody calls the double dip. Things such as the gas crisis we are experiencing now have been discussed as potentially creating a double dip. To knock out hundreds of thousands of jobs, to knock 2 full percentage points out of growth out of a ratio that is not much over 3 percent is a very big hit to the economy. It may be wiser to allow the economic recovery to continue a little bit further, as the Bowles-Simpson group recommended, that you couldn't snuff out the recovery early. Let the blaze catch a little more. Let it get going, and then we can move into these areas.

I will come to the floor later to talk about not just prudence but also fair-

ness. There are two issues we need to address as we face up to our debt and deficit challenge. We have to do it prudently. We also should do it fairly. The way the House does it does not meet the standard either of prudence or fairness. On prudence, I think we have pretty strong agreement when Ben Bernanke and Mark Zandi and Goldman Sachs all talk about significant job losses as a result, and fairness is a topic for another day.

I yield the floor.

REMEMBERING JAMES ARTHUR
"ONION" EASTHAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of an upstanding hero of the Commonwealth, the late Mr. James Arthur "Onion" Eastham. A native of Somerset, KY, Mr. Eastham passed away peacefully on December 28, 2010. He was 87 years old.

Born in Pulaski County, KY, James not only served both his community and country selflessly, but touched the lives of all who had the pleasure of meeting him. His courageous and patriotic spirit led him to join the U.S. Marines Corps where he served as a staff sergeant and crew chief aboard a B-25 bomber, and in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater where he was awarded two Bronze Stars for duty at and during the Luzon and southern Philippine campaigns. He was also presented with the impressive award of the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with a Bronze Star for his bravery during combat with the enemy.

After the war, James continued to serve his community as a regional salesman for Morton Salt Company, as a longstanding member of the Kiwanis Club and the Somerset Masonic Lodge No. 111, and as a member of the First Baptist Church where he taught Sunday school and served as a chair of a building committee for the church's new sanctuary. It was no surprise that James's conscientious and excellent character earned him a spot on the Somerset City Council for 18 years, where he played active roles in helping to establish the Somerset Community College and finding a location for what is now the Lake Cumberland Regional Hospital. It is evident that both his family and the people of his close-knit community respected and valued James's tireless dedication and steadfast leadership, as he will always be fondly remembered as a man who stood firm in his beliefs.

I could surely continue to praise the works and accomplishments of this brave and humble man, but I will simply ask that my colleagues join me in remembering a true gentleman who poured his heart into serving, protecting, and strengthening his family, his country, and the Commonwealth. My thoughts go out to his beloved wife, Virginia; his three children, Jimmy, Wayne, and Lisa; his sister Edna; his grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and many other beloved friends and family members.

The Commonwealth Journal recently published an article about a contribution that was made in James's name to the Reid S. Jones Fund, a fund named in honor of his dear friend that helps veterans make educational advancements. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Commonwealth Journal, Jan. 30, 2011]

FOUNDATION LAUNCHES REID S. JONES MEMORIAL FUND WITH CONTRIBUTION HONORING JAMES "ONION" EASTHAM

The Jones Educational Foundation Inc., a 501(C)3 not-for-profit corporation based in Somerset, has launched the Reid S. Jones Memorial Fund with a \$1,000 contribution made by Dr. Sonya Jones honoring the late James Arthur "Onion" Eastham.

According to Dr. Jones, president and CEO of The Jones Foundation, the donation is intended to pay tribute to the friendship between James "Onion" Eastham, a man who was regarded highly in the Somerset community, and her father.

Further, the fund is meant to honor veterans from all the wars in which the United States has fought. The initial donation honors veterans who served in the European and Pacific theaters of World War II.

"I had been thinking about the Foundation setting up a fund for veterans in Dad's name ever since I made a donation in his memory to help restore the Soldiers and Sailors Memorial building at Union College," Mr. Jones said.

Reid Jones graduated from Union in 1959. He went on to do graduate work in education at Eastern Kentucky University.

"When Mr. Eastham passed away in late December, I knew it was time," Dr. Jones added. "Dad thought so much of his friend that I felt he would want me to do something special to honor Onion's memory."

Reid Sievers Jones (April 24, 1926 to April 15, 2005) entered the U.S. Army at a crucial point in the history of World War II. He was stationed in Germany, and he fought in the Battle of the Bulge. He was a survivor in what has been called "one of the bloodiest battles" of World War II.

Conducted in the dense, mountainous region of Belgium, the Battle of the Bulge was Adolf Hitler's last major offensive against the Allies. The battle ran from Dec. 16, 1944, until Jan. 25, 1945.

When he enlisted in the Army as a private, Reid Jones was 18 years of age. He married Elva Sears on Dec. 30, 1944, shortly before shipping out to the European front. He was promoted to the rank of staff sergeant and remained in Germany for a short time after the war to help begin the process of reconstruction.

James "Onion" Eastham (Sept. 22, 1923, to Dec. 28, 2010) served in the Asiatic-Pacific theater where he was awarded two bronze stars for duty at and during the Luzon and Southern Philippine campaigns. He also received the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with a bronze star for duty involving combat with the enemy.

Reid Jones and Onion Eastham were "two of a kind," said Jimmy Eastham, son of the former Somerset City Council member who served as staff sergeant and crew chief aboard a B-25 bomber in the United States Marine Corp.

Jones and Eastham both were salesmen after the war. Jones worked for many years for Fram Corp. and Eastham for the Morton