

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 1 minute 45 seconds remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, they have a vendetta against clean energy. I guess they want to keep dependence on foreign oil. I do not and my people do not. We do not enjoy \$5-a-gallon gas, which is where it is heading maybe because of the unrest in the Middle East. We need alternatives—clean cars, cars that go 50, 60 miles a gallon or do not need any gas at all. Oh, they cut that.

They cut Head Start. Our little kids will not have Head Start. What are they doing? It makes no sense. Every dollar we put into early childhood education saves \$10. What are they doing? And Pell grants.

There are so many other ways to proceed. Do you know, if we just looked at the tax loopholes given to corporations who ship jobs overseas, it is over \$140 billion over 10 years? Let's take a look at that. Let's take a look at the billionaires. Why do we have to ask little kids to give up a slot in Head Start and get that Head Start they need? Why do we have to ask our teenagers to give up on going to college? That is what their budget does for no reason at all.

Let's avert a government shutdown by coming together. I am willing to move in their direction. They have to be willing to move to mine. Again, they cut \$100 billion off the President's budget. We cut \$40 billion. Let's meet in the middle.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 more seconds, and then I will yield to my friend.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, in conclusion, let's meet in the middle. Let's put this 2011 budget issue behind us quickly. Let's move on to long-term deficit reduction and job creation. If we fail, let's not get paid for our work here.

This afternoon I will be back to ask unanimous consent: No budget, no pay. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of my friend, the Senator from California. We have to be serious about the country's debt. Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says the debt is our biggest national security threat.

Anyone in my State who looks at what we are spending in Washington is astonished. We are spending, this year, \$3.7 trillion. We are collecting \$2.2 trillion. The House of Representatives has said: Let's take a step—a serious step—toward dealing with that debt. I applaud them for that. That number is a number that we on the Republican side try to support in the Senate. We might have our own priorities within that reduced number, but we need to get seri-

ous about the entire problem of America's debt.

It also goes directly to the problem of jobs we have in our country today. The last Democratic Congress and the President's policies have thrown a big wet blanket on private sector job creation in America. One of the biggest parts of the wet blanket is the big debt. According to economists, it costs us 1 million jobs a year. The big debt creates the potential for higher interest rates. That makes it harder to create jobs. It soaks up capital. It could be used to create jobs. It creates uncertainty. It creates a lack of confidence.

There is a lot of spirit in this Senate to find a consensus on how to deal with the debt. I want to be one who does that. I look forward to a serious discussion of those efforts.

A NEW MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, in Jerusalem last week during a private meeting with U.S. Senators, the Prime Minister of Israel suggested creating a new Marshall Plan to help the people of Middle Eastern countries who are struggling to gain more freedom. I was one of the Senators in that meeting.

In one important way, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's proposal is different from the plan that helped rebuild Western Europe after World War II. Its funding would not come from the U.S. Government but from private gifts and foundations worldwide. Instead of the money going for rebuilding bombed out industrial plants and roads as it did after World War II, it would more likely be spent in the Middle East now on schools, on health clinics, and on clean water.

Fundamentally, though, the plans are very similar. Both GEN George C. Marshall in 1947 and Prime Minister Netanyahu today proposed helping adversaries as well as allies. Both aim to relieve hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Both proposals are based squarely on self-interest, as antidotes to the spread of philosophies unfriendly to democracy: communism in the case of postwar Europe and militant Islam in the Middle East today.

In both cases, applicants for the money would write their own plans. In 1948, 16 nations met in Paris to develop the Marshall plan. President Truman then submitted it for approval to the Congress. Most of the money was distributed by grants that did not have to be repaid.

The first Marshall plan was short term, from 1948 to 1952, and so should be this new Marshall plan. The goal is not to create dependencies but to help people stand on their own.

There are some important differences between the idea of the Marshall plan after World War II and Prime Minister Netanyahu's proposal for the Middle East. The new Middle East Marshall plan would cost much less. The original

Marshall plan spent between \$115 billion and \$130 billion in today's dollars over those 4 years. If a Middle Eastern plan carefully distributed a few billion dollars over 5 years it could have an enormous impact.

The Marshall plan started out after World War II buying food and fuel and ended up rebuilding bombed-out industrial plants, roads, and other infrastructure. In addition to schools and clinics, a Middle Eastern Marshall plan is more likely to spend money on, for example, a corps of young people who are paid a subsistence wage to strengthen their own country.

Marshall plan money went to 16 European governments. Money for a Middle Eastern plan should probably be distributed through non-governmental organizations.

After World War II, there was a clear effort to impose on Europe and Japan the American model. We should have learned by now that the path to democracy in the Middle East is more likely to be uniquely Middle Eastern. The original Marshall plan was paid for mostly by United States taxpayers. Money for this new plan should come from around the world, mostly from private gifts.

The first Marshall plan was used mostly for purchase of goods from the United States. Today, those goods would be purchased from around the world.

What are the next steps? First, a coalition of foundations should step forward and announce its willingness to consider proposals from Egypt and other Middle Eastern countries that would assist a transition to a more democratic form of government.

Second, the first grants should be quickly approved, probably to non-governmental organizations already in place. The original Marshall plan moved slowly. In this age of instant communication, freedom fighters expect immediate results. Some evidence of improvement in their lives could help sustain a movement toward democracy against the lure of militant Islam.

An early State Department memorandum compared General Marshall's proposal to a flying saucer: "Nobody knows what it looks like, how big it is, or whether it really exists." Prime Minister Netanyahu's proposal also is usefully vague, with details to be filled in later by applicants for grants. But shouldn't it be enough simply to propose helping people struggling for freedom based upon the hard-eyed belief that their success will benefit other Democratic countries, including the United States and Israel?

TRIBUTE TO DAVID KEARNS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, in Rochester, NY, today and tomorrow, family and friends are celebrating the life of David Kearns, who died a few days ago at age 80.

David Kearns was the former chief executive officer of the Xerox Corporation who, during the 1980s, led that corporation to win back the copying market from the Japanese. Along the way, he found time to become America's most effective business leader who was a champion of education reform, especially for pushing new technology into schools. He served as Deputy Education Secretary under the first President Bush while I was the Secretary of Education in 1991, 1992 and 1993.

I remember first meeting David Kearns in 1990, when I was president of the University of Tennessee and had my office in Knoxville. He came into my office, and on the way he said hello to every single person in the outer office, and every single other person he met while I was there. And he remembered every single one of their names. I didn't forget that, and they didn't forget him. When David Kearns left the University of Tennessee from that visit I bought his book about education reform and read it.

Later that year, President Bush called me and asked me to become his Education Secretary. I asked the President if I could put together my own team, subject to his approval, and then if we could put together our own plan, subject to his approval. Those were two of the smartest questions I ever asked, because that meant I didn't have to go through the White House staff to get the team cleared or the policy cleared. I could go directly to the President. And as soon as I had that permission, I called David Kearns and asked him if he would be willing to be the Deputy Secretary of Education in the U.S. Department of Education.

I knew it would be hard to persuade him to do so. He was at the peak of his career. He had just retired as one of America's best known business leaders. His friends said: Why in the world would you go into the government and subject yourself to all that abuse and take a secondary position in a minor department? I asked President Bush to call David Kearns and recruit him, and he did, appealing to his patriotism. They both served in World War II.

David had such a passion for education, he came on board, and it was terrific that he did. It was a privilege to work with such an accomplished executive. Employees in the Department of Education loved having him around. Having him there helped recruit a distinguished team of leaders for the Department and we put together what we thought, over 2 years, was a pretty impressive program working with President Bush.

Some of the ideas sound very familiar today, especially to former Governors. One idea was break-the-mold schools. Today we call them charter schools, or start-from-scratch schools. The thought was to have one in each congressional district—535 of them—funded by \$1 million of seed money from the Federal Government.

To support those schools, we created a new American Schools Development

Corporation, and with David's leadership raised \$70 million in private capital for that. That attracted hundreds of design teams from around the country with ideas for how to create better schools. President Bush hosted a number of America's business leaders at Camp David to help make that happen.

We worked with Diane Ravitch to create an effort to implement standards for the national education goals that President Bush had helped to set in 1987 with the Nation's Governors. These were the goals for math, science, history, English, and geography, and we took important steps toward that. Today, the common standards States are adopting owe some of their beginnings to those efforts.

We established commissions to look at extending the school day. We pushed for technology in the schools. The President proposed in 1992 a GI bill for kids, which would give scholarships to poor kids so they could choose any school, public or private or religious, so they could have more of the same choices of good schools that kids with money had.

By the time we left in 1993, every State in America had their own version of America 2000—it was Tennessee 2000 or New Hampshire 2000 or Kansas 2000—moving toward the educational goals community by community. None of that would have happened without David Kearns' enthusiasm, skill, and leadership.

In 1992, during a riot over Rodney King in Los Angeles, President Bush sent David to represent him. David had a strong background in civil rights. While he was there, he telephoned me and said: This is the hardest phone call I have ever had to make. I have cancer. He had just discovered he had cancer of the sinus. When he came back, he had an operation and the operation gradually destroyed his eyesight.

That was 20 years ago, but it didn't stop David Kearns. During that time, he created the Kearns Center for Leadership at the University of Rochester, where he graduated and served as trustee for many years. Then to help him get around, because he couldn't see, or could barely see, he invited a young man each year to go with him and help him see and do what he needed to do. For those young men—nearly 20 over the last 20 years—that has been a remarkable opportunity to be in the presence of one of America's great mentors at an early stage in their lives.

Everyone who knew David Kearns admired him and loved him. A few days ago, I spoke with Shirley Kearns, David's wife of 56 years, and reminded her of what she already knows: how much David's friendship meant to me. Honey and I will be thinking of them today and tomorrow in Rochester. We will be thinking about Shirley, their 4 daughters, 2 sons, and 18 grandchildren.

For me, one story sums up David Kearns' life better than others. I think back to 1995, when I was in Utah. I was

trying to persuade Republicans that I was their natural nominee for President of the United States. I wasn't successful in that, but I was enthusiastic about it. I had made to a Republican group what I thought was an especially good speech. During the speech, I talked about my work in the U.S. Department of Education and I talked about David Kearns—about his leadership and about how he helped do all the things I have just mentioned. After the speech, an enthusiastic Republican lady came up to me and said: That was a wonderful speech. Thank you very much, I said. Now I know who should be President, she said. Well, thank you, I said. She smiled and said: David Kearns. That was the opinion that she and I and almost everyone who met him had of David Kearns, whose 80 years in this country have been very special.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, are we in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are.

Mr. BURR. I thank the Presiding Officer.

REMEMBERING FRANK BUCKLES

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I wish to take a moment in this Chamber to honor the passing of the last doughboy, Mr. Frank Buckles, the last of those World War I veterans. Mr. Buckles was America's last living World War I veteran and he died Sunday in West Virginia. His death came 1 month after his 110th birthday, which he celebrated on February 1 with his family.

Frank Buckles was dedicated to serving his country at all cost. He enlisted in the U.S. Army when he was only 16 years old. Throughout the Great War, Mr. Buckles proved himself to be a brave soldier. He served on the RMS *Carpathia*, drove ambulances and motorcycles in France and England, and escorted prisoners of war back to Germany.

Mr. Buckles lived to see our country at war several more times in his life. He even survived as a prisoner of war during World War II. He had been captured while working for a shipping company in the Philippines.

As a soldier and as a civilian, Mr. Buckles lived a life defined by hard work, love of country, and a sense of duty to his fellow citizens. His passing marks the loss of a generation that shared those same values, a generation that built America into the country it is today. My thoughts go out to his family.

It is also important we recognize that Mr. Buckles' death is an important moment for all of America. Our country should come together to honor Mr. Buckles and an entire generation that has done so much to build a world where democracy and freedom are celebrated values. This is the reason that I