

twisting—only after the final bill hits the floor because all the arm-twisting and deal-making is going on behind closed doors, and it has already started.

Somehow the administration seems to think all this arm-twisting and deal-making will prove to the American people government works. I should think Americans will draw the opposite conclusion. Americans do not like the bill any more today than they did 3 months ago. They do not like the frantic, backroom deal-making any more now than they did then.

In the midst of all this, it is understandable that a lot of Democrats are on the fence about whether to vote for this bill, about whether to vote for this process as well. But the reasons they are giving for being on the fence do not square with reality, and they are not going to fly with the public.

Some say they like the current bill because they say it reduces costs. It does not. The administration's own experts say the bill increases health spending by \$222 billion more than if we took no action at all. In other words, this bill would bend the cost curve up, not down.

Others say they like the current bill because it reduces the deficit. But even if you grant that highly speculative premise, the one bill the Senate will be voting on tomorrow would wipe away every dime of those projected savings with one stroke of the President's pen. If you believe the health bill will save \$100 billion, then you have to also acknowledge the bill the Senate will pass this week increases it by \$100 billion.

So far from moving in a more fiscally responsible direction, the health spending bill the White House now wants Congress to pass before Easter would move us in a less fiscally responsible direction. This undercuts the entire point of reform.

The administration recognizes the weakness of its argument. That is why it is trying to create a sense of inevitability about this bill. Once again, it is imposing an artificial deadline to put pressure on Members. It is talking about how we are in the middle of the final chapter of this debate.

The administration wants Members to believe they are characters in a screenplay and that the ending of the play is already written. This is an illusion. House Members are not buying these arguments anymore. In fact, many of them are already walking off the set. My guess is, a lot more are about to.

They know we may be nearing the final act for this bill and the legislative process but that it is just the beginning for those who support it. Americans do not want this bill. They are telling us to start over. The only people who do not seem to be getting the message are Democratic leaders in Washington. But they can be sure of this—absolutely sure of this: If they cut their deal, if they somehow convince enough Members to come on

board, then they will get the message. The public will let them know how they feel about this bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 4213, the tax extenders legislation. Last week, the majority leader filed cloture on the tax extenders legislation. As a result, there is an agreement for a 3 o'clock filing deadline of first-degree amendments. As previously announced, there will be no rollcall votes today. Senators should expect a series of votes to begin tomorrow morning.

INCREASING ENGINEERING SCHOOLS GRADUATES

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about the importance of engineering education. As my colleagues know, this is an issue near and dear to my heart.

I believe we are at a crucial moment for STEM—for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—that often reminds me of sailing. Whether you have done much sailing or not, we all know that you can construct the perfect sailboat, outfit it with the best sails, man it with the greatest crew, and if the wind is not blowing, you will not move. The wind is blowing for STEM and I believe we must work effectively to capitalize on it now.

Today, America's engineers have a central role to play in developing the innovative technologies that will help our economy recover and promote real job growth. In particular, as the global economy turns increasingly competitive, many nations are investing heavily in training their future scientists and engineers.

We don't know where the next generation of innovation will come from. That is the nature of innovation. But we want to do what we can to make sure it comes from the United States. This means we must have an innovation policy, one that helps to generate greater interest in STEM and actually leads to the production of greater numbers of engineers.

A few weeks after I took office, I began meeting with groups of engineering deans and other leaders in the engi-

neering community to discuss these issues. I have learned many important things from these conversations. For example, while all the surveys today say that young people want to "make a difference" with their lives, they do not see engineering as the way to do that.

To someone of my generation, this is an astounding revelation. Engineers have always been the world's problem solvers. We need to make sure students are aware of that—so they will aspire to take on the challenges we face today.

I also learned about a challenge occurring on many of our Nation's college campuses. In talking to engineering deans it is clear that the present economic downturn has exacerbated a problem that has been with us for quite a while—that is the additional cost of educating an engineering student, which requires an investment in labs and other costly facilities. Simply put, most universities make more money on liberal arts students than STEM students.

We must start educating college and university administrators about the long-term benefits to the university and to the United States of spending the additional money required to graduate more engineering students.

Many administrators do get it. One is Pat Harker, president of the University of Delaware and an engineering graduate from Penn. Working with his engineering dean Mike Chajes they have increased last year's entering engineering class by 25 percent, but they do not have the lab space to accommodate these students. They now have to hold lab classes for engineering students on Saturday.

To figure out how to address these issues and grow the engineers and scientists we need, I again met with a small group of deans in the fall and worked with the American Society of Engineering Education to give them a homework assignment.

Yes, I turned the tables on them. This time the professors had homework. We sent out an informal survey to solicit ideas on how to increase the number of graduates from our engineering schools. We received some very thoughtful feedback from nearly 25 deans across the country. These comments provide a very clear picture of what needs to be done. Several common themes emerged from the surveys.

To begin, many of these deans said that we need a better way to communicate to parents, teachers, students, and school counselors about what it means to be an engineer. There was a great idea from Maryland about creating a web site on the rock stars of engineering such as Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, Alan Mullaly, and others.

They also agreed that green jobs are an excellent way to show young people how engineers make a difference. I think this comment from New York sums it up best: "Service to the community and the belief in great causes

resonates with the millennial generation. This makes green energy and clean tech the perfect vehicle to entice youth into considering careers in science and engineering."

Overwhelmingly, they told me that students need better preparation in K-12 science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education. For the past 5 years, the College of Engineering at Marquette University has been engaged in a range of STEM activities to increase the number of K-12 students who are interested in studying engineering and prepared for college courses in the field.

Marquette hosts nearly 50 Discovery Learning Academies every year. At these events, students spend several days engaging in hands-on learning activities in robotics, water quality, biomedical engineering, energy, bridges, and more.

The university also supports Project Lead the Way courses that provide an engaging, hands-on curriculum in STEM education. They support First Robotics teams that inspire young people to be science and technology leaders through team robotics competitions.

They created a scholarship fund to aid students in pursuing engineering who could not otherwise afford to attend school there. And to bring school administrators and teachers into the effort, Marquette holds a conference to motivate educators to begin STEM-related activities in their schools.

Marquette's dean told us, "We have been at this for five years now and over that time, our incoming freshman classes have increased by 46 percent." This is great news.

The surveys also told us that, even if our campuses had the physical space to teach more engineering students, these deans would need additional faculty members and research dollars. I have to tell my colleagues, I am so encouraged by what they are doing in Utah.

In 2002, Utah's Governor challenged the higher education community through what they call the "Engineering Initiative," to double—and then triple—the number of engineers and computer scientists they graduate. Each year since, the legislature has allocated funds to support engineering education. These funds have been matched first by the university, then by corporate donations, and, finally, by the Federal Government.

Utah's Governor also prioritized building requests from the college of engineering, while the State legislature started the Utah Science, Technology, and Research—or U-STAR—Initiative. U-STAR provides salaries and startup packages to hire faculty who are doing research that can find commercial applications.

Tenure-track faculty members grew by 46 percent since Utah's Engineering Initiative began. From 2002 to 2009, engineering research expenditures went from \$25 million to \$56.9 million.

The number of engineering degrees granted by the University of Utah rose

76 percent in the past decade, and roughly 80 percent of these undergraduates accept engineering jobs right there in Utah.

What is more, the College of Engineering spun off 35 companies in the past 3 years. For the past 2 years, the University of Utah as a whole ranked second only to MIT in the number of startups. These results are just remarkable.

I truly am impressed with the work some of our Nation's engineering colleges are doing and I am inspired by their ideas. On our end, I think there are 4 things the Federal Government can do to bolster these efforts:

First, we can help inspire more young people to pursue engineering in the growing green economy. That is why I am so pleased that President Obama launched the "Educate to Innovate" campaign. This campaign is a nationwide effort of private companies, universities, foundations, nonprofits, and science and engineering societies working with the Federal Government to improve student performance and engagement in STEM subjects.

As part of the "Educate to Innovate" effort, President Obama announced an annual science fair at the White House, so that "scientists and engineers stand side by side with athletes and entertainers as role models." I think that is a very powerful message to America's youth.

Second, we can build a new generation of engineers through policies that promote STEM education. The fiscal year 2011 Department of Education budget submitted by the administration includes \$833 million for STEM education. This includes funding to improve teaching and learning of STEM subjects, to support STEM projects in the "Investing in Innovation" education program, to create a new STEM initiative to attract undergraduates to STEM fields, and to close the gender gaps in STEM disciplines.

In addition, I was pleased to join Senator GILLIBRAND and a number of my other colleagues in introducing legislation last week that will further these initiatives.

This bill is the Engineering Education for Innovation Act, or the E-squared for Innovation Act. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Education to award competitive planning and implementation grants to States to integrate engineering education into K-12 instruction and curriculum. It also funds the research and evaluation of these efforts.

Based largely on recommendations from the National Academy of Engineering and the National Research Council's "Engineering in K-12 Education" report, 77 organizations have voiced their support for the E-squared Innovation Act.

The third important step the Federal Government can take is to promote policies that encourage women and underrepresented minorities to enter engineering. While women earn 58 per-

cent of all bachelor's degrees, they constitute only 18.5 percent of bachelor's degrees awarded in engineering. We cannot let that go on. That is ridiculous. African Americans hold only 4.6 percent of bachelor's degrees awarded in engineering, and Hispanics hold only 7.2 percent. How can we move into the 21st century? How can we be the great country we are going to be if we are so underrepresented by women and minorities? We can and must do better.

Last year, a bipartisan group of 13 Senators joined me in writing the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to urge greater funding to increase participation of women and underrepresented minorities in rural areas in STEM fields. That is the second thing I talked about for STEM education where there is clear bipartisan support. STEM education is not a partisan issue; it gets bipartisan support. It is important for all of us, and we all agree.

I am grateful that in response, the Agriculture appropriations bill we enacted last October included \$400,000 to fund research and extension grants at land grant universities for women and minorities in STEM fields. This was a small but important step that we can continue to build on from year to year.

Last, we must continue to support research and development, a challenge that requires significant Federal as well as private investment. In our current economy, it is often hard, especially in this body, to imagine investing more in anything. But as Congress has recognized over the years and what was reinforced in the survey responses I received is funding is the lifeblood of research institutions. To yield more innovation, we need more R&D funding so universities can hire more graduate assistants and faculty, accept more engineering students, and ultimately create more jobs.

Utah is a great example of the importance of investing in research and development. The Bureau of Economic and Business Research estimates that for every \$1 million of research generated by Utah's research universities, \$1.5 million is created in increased business activity.

Listen to that. We are all talking about how to generate business activity. For every \$1 million of research generated by Utah's research universities, we get back \$1.5 million in increased business activity.

Moreover, a forthcoming report from the Science Coalition features 100 companies that can be directly traced to influential research conducted at a university and sponsored by a Federal agency. Examples include Google, Cisco Systems, SAS.

I become more encouraged every day that we have growing support for engineering. Engineers and scientists will foster the research and innovation that continues to lead America on a path to economic recovery and prosperity. Likewise, these discoveries and innovations will create millions of new jobs,

and they will help us to invest in our future security and prosperity. This is the target. This is the way to get to long-term economic health.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHANNIS be recognized next and I be recognized following his remarks for up to 20 minutes; that following my remarks, Senator KYL be recognized, and following Senator KYL, Senator FRANKEN be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska.

ABORTION FUNDING

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak for about 10 minutes about the health care debate that continues to be in front of us. For much of our country, the health care debate has been a long and confusing trail. As details have emerged over the last weeks and months, constituents ask me: What is going to happen to my health care? Will I be able to continue to see the doctor I have always seen? They heard both sides argue the merits and the detriments of various pieces of legislation. Citizens are understandably skeptical and perplexed by the debate that has transpired.

One of the things I suggest that is very clear, one situation that is clear as a matter of policy and conscience is that Americans are against the Federal funding of abortion, whether they support or oppose the bill. Unfortunately, the Senate-passed health care bill allows taxpayer funds to fund abortion.

The current Senate language says people who receive a new government subsidy could enroll in an insurance plan that covers abortion. Nothing would stop them from doing that.

Some say: Yes, but States could opt out. What I point out is that in those States that opt out, the taxpayers would still see their tax dollars funding elective abortions in other States.

Additionally, the Office of Personnel Management can provide access to two multistate plans in each State, and only one of them would exclude abortions. OPM's current health care program, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, now prohibits any plans—any plans—that cover elective abortion. For the first time, a federally funded and managed health care plan will cover elective abortions.

Those who have looked at this language have said very clearly that it is woefully inadequate. I say that. It does not apply a decades-old policy—an agreement really—that was reached many years ago that was embodied in the Hyde amendment. The Hyde language bars Federal funding for abor-

tion except in the cases of rape and incest or where the life of the mother is at stake. The public has clearly rejected advancing the abortion agenda under the guise of health care reform.

Yet as we have seen the language of the Senate bill proceed, it seems very clear my colleagues are refusing to listen. They seem bent on forcing this very unpopular bill upon us via a rather arcane process called reconciliation.

The important point to be made today is this: Reconciliation will not allow us to fix the egregious abortion language.

This is not the first time I have come to the floor to speak about this issue. Last November, I came here to urge pro-life Senators to vote no on cloture if they wanted any chance to address the Federal funding of abortion in the Senate bill. I said then that if the language was not fixed before the debate began, there would be no way to fix it. We would not have any leverage to fix it.

I wish I were here on the floor today to say that I was wrong about that. Unfortunately, though, I was not wrong. Unfortunately, when an amendment was offered to match the Stupak language in the House bill with the Senate bill, only 45 Senators supported it.

The sad reality is that this Senate, as a matter of the majority, is not a pro-life body. There are not 60 Senators who are willing to vote for that.

Back in November, some of my colleagues disagreed with my assessment. There was a big debate. They said: Whoa, wait a second. We can fix this provision via an amendment, they said. But they were wrong. When the dust settled, we were left with a Senate bill that allows Federal funding of abortion.

The House is now being asked to vote on the Senate bill. You see, that is going to be the pathway: vote on the Senate bill so any fix on other provisions can come through a reconciliation sidecar.

According to the National Right to Life committee, the Senate bill is—and I am quoting their language—"the most pro-abortion single piece of legislation that has ever come to the House floor for a vote since *Roe v. Wade*."

They go on to warn:

Any House Member who votes for the Senate health bill is casting a career-defining pro-abortion vote.

There is talk that Democratic leaders might try to appease pro-life House Members by promising to change the Senate bill through a separate bill or the reconciliation sidecar I mentioned.

I urge pro-life supporters and pro-life House Members to think through this very carefully. Don't be fooled. Don't be lulled into thinking there are 60 votes in the Senate that will somehow rescue this situation. There are not. You do not have to take my word for it. It is in black and white in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is the same situation we faced in November.

The Senate specifically rejected the amendment that would have blocked

Federal funding for abortion. Nothing—nothing—has changed to suggest the Senate would have anywhere near 60 votes to support it now.

It was recently reported that some in the pro-life community support adding pro-life language in the reconciliation sidecar or maybe in a separate bill with the hope and the promise that somehow the Senate will swoop in and waive the rules and keep that language there. Let me be abundantly clear. As much as I might want that to happen, it will not happen here, as demonstrated by November's vote.

If the Senate rejects it again, the language in the Senate bill would become law. Current law would be reversed, and taxpayer dollars would, in fact, fund abortions.

There was recently a column in the Washington Post. It issued a warning to pro-life Democrats to be wary of this strategy. I am quoting again:

The only way they can ensure that the abortion language and other provisions they oppose are eliminated is to reject reconciliation entirely—and demand that the House and Senate start over with clean legislation.

I come to the Senate floor again to encourage my pro-life colleagues in the House to recognize the reality in the Senate. I tell them what they know already, and that is that many innocent lives are depending on their courage.

This issue should not be an issue of political gamesmanship, especially when the game is so rigged against pro-lifers. This is an issue of conscience. On this one, you are pro-life or you are not.

Agreeing to a strategy that is guaranteed to fail, one that has failed already in this health care debate in November, in my judgment, is not leadership at all. It is surrendering your values.

I leave the floor today, and I pray that my House colleagues will have the wisdom to understand this in their decisionmaking.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

STEEL INDUSTRY FUEL TAX CREDIT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to talk about two subjects—first, an amendment filed by Senator ROCKEFELLER, amendment No. 3371 to amendment No. 3336, cosponsored by Senator HATCH, Senator BAUCUS, Senator CASEY, Senator BAYH, and myself.

This amendment would extend the steel industry fuel tax credit and make minor technical corrections to ensure that the steel industry will continue to recycle the hazardous waste called coal waste sludge. The recycling process which converts coal waste sludge into steel industry fuel eliminates a hazardous waste, ends the need to landfill or incinerate the waste, displaces fuel from the coking process, and increases the efficiency of coke-making. This recycling process makes the production