

of this year indicated it could not participate in the elections due to the junta's repressive election law. It therefore declined to register as a political party and consequently under the new law was abolished as a political party in early May.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In light of the NLD's boycott of the elections and its consequent dissolution under Burmese law, is it my friend's understanding that the NLD may be driven underground as a result of its decision or be forced to reconstitute itself in some other capacity?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes, it is. The NLD has indicated it will try to continue to help the Burmese people in ways other than as a legally registered political party.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is it the understanding of the senior Senator from California that the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, as amended by the Tom Lantos Block Burmese JADE Act, makes several references to the "National League for Democracy"?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes, it is. There are several such references in the legislation as amended.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is it also the Senator's understanding that references to the "National League for Democracy" should be interpreted to include any appropriate successor entity to the NLD, be it a nongovernmental organization or some other comparable group?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes. It is my view the proper statutory construction given the term "National League for Democracy" would be to include any appropriate successor entity, group or subgroups that the NLD may form in the future.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend for clarifying this matter. It appears that both cosponsors are in full agreement on the proper means of interpreting this term.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, we are going to vote momentarily. In the meantime, I thank the Senator from California for her steadfast support to the cause of justice and for supporting this resolution and taking up the cause of Aung San Suu Kyi. I don't know of anybody else in this body—and Senator McCANNELL has been forthright in his support, but I want people to know how strongly the Senator from California has been an advocate for Aung San Suu Kyi, and I deeply appreciate it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back, both minority and majority.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Ensign	McConnell
Alexander	Feingold	Menendez
Barrasso	Feinstein	Merkley
Baucus	Franken	Mikulski
Bayh	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Begich	Goodwin	Murray
Bennet	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Gregg	Pryor
Bond	Hagan	Reed
Boxer	Harkin	Reid
Brown (MA)	Hatch	Risch
Brown (OH)	Hutchison	Roberts
Brownback	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Bunning	Inouye	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Burris	Johanns	Sessions
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaufman	Shelby
Carper	Kerry	Snowe
Casey	Klobuchar	Specter
Chambliss	Kohl	Stabenow
Coburn	Kyl	Tester
Cochran	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Corker	LeMieux	Vitter
Cornyn	Levin	Voinovich
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
DeMint	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	Lugar	Whitehouse
Dorgan	McCain	Wicker
Durbin	McCaskill	Wyden

NAYS—1

Enzi

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 83) was passed.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENACTMENT OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Res. 591. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the measure.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Akaka	Barrasso	Bayh
Alexander	Baucus	Begich

Bennet	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Bennett	Goodwin	Murkowski
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Bond	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Brown (MA)	Hagan	Pryor
Brown (OH)	Harkin	Reed
Brownback	Hatch	Reid
Bunning	Hutchison	Risch
Burr	Inhofe	Roberts
Burris	Inouye	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Sessions
Casey	Kaufman	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kerry	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Specter
Cochran	Kohl	Snowe
Collins	Kyl	Stabenow
Conrad	Landrieu	Tester
Corker	Lautenberg	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Crapo	LeMieux	Udall (NM)
DeMint	Levin	Vitter
Dodd	Lieberman	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lugar	Warner
Durbin	McCain	Webb
	McCaskill	Whitehouse
	McConnell	Wicker
	Menendez	Wicks
	Merkley	Wyden

The resolution (S. Res. 591) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 591

Whereas July 26, 2010, marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act has been one of the most significant and effective civil rights laws passed by Congress;

Whereas, prior to the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, people with disabilities faced significantly lower employment rates, lower graduation rates, and higher rates of poverty than people without disabilities, and were too often denied the opportunity to fully participate in society due to intolerance and unfair stereotypes;

Whereas the dedicated efforts of disability rights advocates, including Justin Dart, Jr., and many others, served to awaken Congress and the American people to the discrimination and prejudice faced by individuals with disabilities;

Whereas Congress worked in a bipartisan manner to craft legislation making such discrimination illegal;

Whereas Congress passed the Americans with Disabilities Act and President George Herbert Walker Bush signed the Act into law on July 26, 1990;

Whereas the purpose of the Americans with Disabilities Act is to fulfill the Nation's goals of equality of opportunity, independent living, economic self-sufficiency, and full participation for Americans with disabilities;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act prohibits employers from discriminating against qualified individuals with disabilities, requires that State and local governmental entities accommodate qualified individuals with disabilities, requires places of public accommodation to take reasonable steps to make their goods and services accessible to individuals with disabilities, and requires that new trains and buses be accessible to individuals with disabilities;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act has played an historic role in allowing over 50,000,000 Americans with disabilities to participate more fully in national life by removing barriers to employment, transportation, public services, telecommunications, and public accommodations;

Whereas the Americans with Disabilities Act has served as a model for disability rights in other countries;

Whereas all Americans, not just those with disabilities, benefit from the accommodations that have become commonplace since the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, including curb cuts at street intersections, ramps for access to buildings, and other accommodations that provide access to public transportation, stadiums, telecommunications, voting machines, and websites;

Whereas Congress acted with overwhelming bipartisan support in 2008 to restore protections for people with disabilities by passing the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, which overturned judicial decisions that had inappropriately narrowed the scope of the Americans with Disabilities Act;

Whereas, 20 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act, children and adults with disabilities continue to experience barriers that interfere with their full participation in mainstream American life;

Whereas, 20 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act, people with disabilities are twice as likely to live in poverty as their fellow citizens and continue to experience high rates of unemployment and underemployment;

Whereas, 20 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act and 11 years after the Supreme Court's decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, many people with disabilities still live in segregated institutional settings because of a lack of support services that would allow them to live in the community;

Whereas, 20 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act, new telecommunication, electronic, and information technologies continue to be developed while not being accessible to all Americans;

Whereas, 20 years after the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act, many public and private covered entities are still not accessible to people with disabilities; and

Whereas the United States has a responsibility to welcome back and create opportunities for the tens of thousands of working-age veterans of the Armed Forces who have been wounded in action or have received service-connected injuries while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and honors the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990;

(2) salutes all people whose efforts contributed to the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act;

(3) encourages all Americans to celebrate the advance of freedom and the opening of opportunity made possible by the enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act; and

(4) pledges to continue to work on a bipartisan basis to identify and address the remaining barriers that undermine the Nation's goals of equality of opportunity, independent living, economic self-sufficiency, and full participation for Americans with disabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, in 160 days, the American people will experience the single largest tax increase in American history unless Congress acts. Unless Congress acts, the highest

individual tax bracket will rise from 35 percent to just under 40 percent. People in the lowest tax bracket will see a 50-percent increase from 10 percent to 15 percent. The marriage penalty will go up. The child tax credit will be cut in half. Taxes on capital gains and dividends will go up as well. Every single taxpayer in the country will see their taxes go up.

Last week in the Senate Finance Committee we heard testimony from several experts about what these huge tax increases would mean in terms of the economy and to small businesses. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former head of the Congressional Budget Office, reminded us that about \$1 trillion in business income will be reported on individual tax returns and about half of that will be subject to the two higher marginal individual tax rates. There has been a debate—and I guess it will go on—about the relationship between the bipartisan 2001 and 2003 tax relief bills and the deficit. Some on the other side of the aisle like to argue that our \$1 trillion deficits today are the result of tax relief we offered 10 years ago. They also like to argue that they bear no responsibility for the deficits they “inherited.” We are hearing a lot about that these days, very little taking responsibility for what has happened today but, rather, preferring to point the finger of blame at others in the past.

I have a chart which, if Members will bear with me, tells an important story. This chart measures the deficit as a percentage of our gross domestic product which is the entire economy. The solid lines, the red solid line and the solid green line, represent the historical record from the OMB. The dotted line represents CBO projections of the President's 2011 budget. The red line and a portion of the light green line also represent the record before the Obama administration took office, and the solid, dark green line represents the record since President Obama became President.

What does this chart tell us? It tells a very interesting and important story. It is true that deficits went up under the last administration and topped out at 3.5 percent of GDP. Of course, we have to remember the dot.com bubble, the recession that occurred about the time the last administration took office and, of course, the horrific events of 9/11. But then, just as the 2001 and 2003 tax relief provisions started to kick in, a strange thing happened to the deficit. It went down to \$318 billion in fiscal year 2005. It went down again to \$248 billion in fiscal year 2006. And it went down to \$161 billion in fiscal year 2007. That is when our deficit went all the way down to 1.2 percent of gross domestic product, from 3.5 percent to just 1.2 percent of GDP.

People may have different interpretations for why this happened. I believe—and I think most economists and objective observers conclude—the reason the deficit went down as a percent-

age of gross domestic product was because the tax relief we passed in 2001 and 2003, which will expire in 160 days unless we act, helped grow the economy and got about 8 million people on the payroll between 2003 and 2007.

Not an incidental; it generated a lot more revenue for the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, it hit historic levels. That is the real record on the deficit. For my colleagues who claim they inherited a bad fiscal situation, this is what they inherited: a deficit which had reached one of the historic lows of 1.2 percent.

The green line here actually shows what has happened since our colleagues on the other side took control of this Chamber and the House of Representatives. The deficit shot up from 1.2 percent to 3.2 percent of GDP in fiscal year 2008. That was the last year President Bush was in office. Then went to 8.3 percent in fiscal year 2009.

Am I blaming my colleagues for this? I am saying there is more than enough blame to go around. But it is also not fair to suggest that previous administrations or one political party contributed to this increasingly dire fiscal crisis.

The reason the deficit rose after 2007 is because of the financial crisis that occurred, the meltdown, particularly in September of 2008. We know the recession we have been going through and, of course, the emergency measures that Congress passed on a bipartisan basis to try to prevent a systemic economic collapse in America—and other countries around the world participated in as well—these emergency measures were supported by then-Senator Obama, then-Senator BIDEN, and by dozens of colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as well as colleagues on this side of the aisle. We thought we were acting in a major crisis, and we were. My point is, the deficits we have today were not inherited deficits but, rather, because of legislation they helped enact.

Beginning January 20, 2009 this Congress and the President delivered much higher spending. Colleagues will recall the much ballyhooed stimulus package, \$862 billion of borrowed money, which was supposed to keep unemployment below 8 percent. Obviously, that failed in its stated goal since unemployment has been almost up to double digits, now 9.5 percent. In places such as Nevada, it is 14.2 percent. In Michigan and other States, it is much higher. Obviously, the stimulus did not succeed in its stated goal. One thing it did succeed in doing is piling on additional debt on future generations unless we deal with it in a responsible way.

What happened as a result of the unprecedented spending we have seen since the Obama administration came into office? We see now that the fiscal year 2009 deficit as a percentage of the gross domestic product rose from an initial 8.3 percent to 9.9 percent, from 1.2 percent in fiscal year 2007 all the way to 9.9 percent.