

Unfortunately, and this is why I am on the floor today, this important program that does so much to give taxpayers the full measure and worth of their tax dollar, that gives small businesses the opportunity to grow, to create jobs right here in America—not in China, not in France or in Spain but right here in America—these programs have been sputtering. This particular program has been sputtering on short-term extensions. Every 3 months we reauthorize it—or every 6 months. We need to move forward and provide a longer term extension. The bill we are going to be debating this week provides an 8-year authorization, which gives some certainty. It gives some stability to the 11 Federal agencies that use SBIR to help meet its research and development needs, to help the 300 labs in the United States of America that do primarily research and development for the Federal Government. It sends out a clear signal to innovators: The Federal Government has challenges, the Federal Government has problems, and now we are putting some money behind these challenges and problems and we want you to be part of the solution.

We believe in this program. I wish to thank particularly Senator TOM COBURN for negotiating this 8-year extension, a little bit longer than a normal 5 but less than what some of us wanted initially, permanency and then the 14-year authorization—because we think long-term stability is so important for these programs.

The agencies have to do some more work—our Federal agencies do—to step up their administration of this program, to get even better at putting out the needs of their agencies, identifying small businesses, so we want to give them the confidence this program is actually going to last for more than a few months, 2 years or 3 years or even 4. So this 8-year authorization is important.

I am proud, under my leadership, and also previously under the leadership of Senator SNOWE and Senator KERRY, we have worked very hard together to get this bill into its current form. In the very last hours of the last Congress, we were actually able to negotiate a landmark compromise with the Biotechnology Industry Organization—formally known as the BIO—and the Small Business Technology Coalition. They had been basically at odds over some aspects of this reauthorization. Because we worked very hard and in good faith, both sides came together, we have now achieved a compromise which has the support of the National Small Business Administration, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the NFIB, the National Venture Capital Association, local technology groups, many universities throughout the country, including my alma mater, Louisiana State University, Louisiana Tech, the University of Akron, in Ohio—just to name a few.

I wish to make sure people understand, not only from examples, what

this program will fund; in terms of Qualcomm, which was an earlier example, wireless technology, or whether it is a radiator used in military equipment, both in our tanks and sometimes used in other platforms, but also this technology can be used potentially in the racing car industry.

No other SBIR and STTR reauthorization bill has had this much support of this many organizations, and this compromise is represented in the bill we have laid down or we will be passing forward today.

The agencies have been particularly cooperative, particularly Department of Defense, USDA, and the Department of Energy. Along with Health and Human Services, they have the lion's share of these research budgets. DOD, it is not an insignificant amount, it is over \$1 billion. The Department of Defense will invest in small businesses to get the best technologies available, such as the radiator technology they need for our tanks.

HHS has \$615 million. It is a very small part of their total research budget but an important part, so when they put out the challenge to small businesses in America to come up with the next newest vaccine or the next medical technology or information technology that saves taxpayer money and helps provide better quality of life for all Americans, that word will go out from HHS.

DOE has \$150 million available to invest in small business; NASA \$125 million, just to name a few.

So not only will the taxpayers benefit, but small businesses and the people they hire as well. Many of these advanced technologies, developed by businesses that could have started in your garage or your den, such as Qualcomm, could not have existed without those programs. They are the brainchild of a scientist who took his idea to the next level, and had this program to get that first \$150,000, and then that first \$1 million.

I am urging all of my colleagues to support moving to this bill this afternoon. It passed out of the Small Business Committee last week nearly unanimously, and has continued to gain large bipartisan support publicly and privately. The CBO estimates a very modest cost of \$150 million over 5 years. We have made changes that have decreased the estimate from last year's cost of \$229 million.

We believe this \$150 million is a fantastic investment for the Federal Government to place research dollars in the hands of some of the best, most dynamic, most innovative entrepreneurs on the face of the Earth today. We want to give them an opportunity, particularly in tight credit and capital markets, to access these funds at the Federal level to produce the kind of goods and services and, most importantly, jobs for the future.

I see my time has expired. Again, I look forward to coming down with my members of the Small Business Com-

mittee to talk more about this bill as the week unfolds. I urge my colleagues today at 5:30 to vote yes for cloture on this important bill so we can pass it out of the Senate today, get it over to the House as quickly as we can, and to the President's desk for signature.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. 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. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we are going to have a vote a little bit later this afternoon to proceed to a bill which I do not happen to think is a very good bill, but I am going to vote to proceed to it, because the majority leader has made clear we will have the opportunity to offer amendments. I know some of my colleagues specifically wish to offer amendments to get to the heart of the subject that should be most on our minds today, which is reducing wasteful Washington spending, to get our fiscal house in order. In order to provide that opportunity, we should, in my view, proceed to that legislation so we can offer those amendments. We should be laser-like focused on the deficit, the debt, the spending of the Congress, and what we can do to get a handle on that spending, so that we do not mortgage our children's future.

It starts, of course, with a budget. A few weeks ago, the President submitted his budget to Congress, but it seems to me the message that budget sends is one of more spending, bigger government, and one that trumps America's well-founded concerns about this huge debt we are piling up and how it jeopardizes our Nation's future.

Under this budget, the debt held by the public will double by the end of this President's term in 2012 and then triple by 2019, to an astonishing \$7.3 billion. Think about that for a moment. In all of our history, from 1789, from George Washington through George W. Bush, we accumulated roughly \$5 billion of debt. This President's budget, in his first term, will double that. So in the term of President Obama, we will accumulate as much debt as every President of the United States combined before that. That is too much. It will triple in the next 5 years. That is what we are talking about with regard to this budget. The debt is actually going to be larger than our entire economy. Think of the attendant consequences.

It not only undermines confidence in our economy, but it crushes private sector investment and, therefore, job creation. This budget punts on everything serious we need to do to bring down the debt. It accelerates our path to national bankruptcy, it ignores all the major components of the President's debt commission's deficit financing or reduction plan. It punts on serious spending cuts and punts on entitlement reforms.

In fact, the Washington Post editorialized the day after the budget was submitted, calling the President the "Punter in Chief." It is a failure of leadership, and it indicates to me that the President is not taking the debt problem seriously.

As Erskine Bowles, who was the Democratic chairman of the President's fiscal commission, said, "The White House budget request goes nowhere near where they will need to have to go to resolve our fiscal nightmare."

We cannot spend, borrow, and tax our way to prosperity. Unfortunately, that is what the budget request proposes to do. Let me review a few key facts and some of the numbers in the budget. Under the category of "it spends too much," the size of the Federal Government would nearly double since the day President Obama took office. Let me say that again. Under the President's budget, the size of the Federal Government will nearly double since the day he took office.

You cannot claim with a straight face that represents anything close to fiscal discipline. Over the next 10 years, the President proposes \$8.7 trillion in new spending in this budget, with \$46 trillion in total spending. Spending in the 2012 fiscal year is projected to be a record \$3.8 trillion or 25.3 percent of the gross domestic product, which is the highest spending ratio to GDP since World War II.

I will note that while the President has touted the 5-year \$400 billion in spending freezes in his budgets, those freezes merely lock in spending levels reached after the massive spending binge that occurred on his watch. In my view, the status quo is not good enough. It is like closing the door to the barn after the horse is already gone. The President says his spending would cut \$1.1 trillion over the coming decade. Yes, that is true, but that is from what he planned to spend. So if he made an extraordinarily irresponsible request for spending and then cuts it by \$1 trillion, it is not something to be cheering about. The figure is smaller than the projected \$1.5 trillion deficit for the year 2011 alone. We need to do and we can do much better.

Under the category "it borrows too much," the budget adds \$13 trillion in new debt by the end of the decade. Gross debt by the end of the decade will reach \$26.3 trillion or 107 percent of gross domestic product. That figure eclipses the size of the entire economy.

Gross debt is projected to remain above 100 percent of GDP for every fol-

lowing year. The effects of high debt on an economy are well known. They include fewer jobs, less investing, and a lower standard of living, and that is not acceptable.

Under the category of "taxes too much," in total the President's budget includes \$1.6 trillion in new taxes on families, small businesses, and job creators. Much of that is new taxes on energy, including on the gasoline we buy, and new taxes on ObamaCare, the health care reform. In fact, the President's health care bill is mentioned more than 250 times in the IRS's fiscal year 2012 budget request. The IRS has said it will have to hire thousands of new workers to implement the new taxes in the health care law. Let's remember, we are not in our current predicament because we are an undertaxed nation. It is because of wasteful Washington spending.

I am deeply disappointed the administration has not put together a more responsible and serious budget proposal. I had hoped the White House had received the message that Americans sent in the last election about spending and debt and the size of our government. It is time for us to make tough choices. We need to focus on pro-growth policies, which includes much lower levels of spending and borrowing, and leaving more money in the private sector where it can be put to good use, including job creation.

Republicans want to work with the President to seriously cut government spending and bring down the debt. House Republicans took the first step by putting together a proposal that will cut spending to 2008 levels. That is the level prior to the Obama era spending binge, a binge which included, among other things, the failed stimulus plan and other massive spending bills.

That is the kind of meaningful action we need. I ask the President: Lead. Work with our leaders on both sides of the aisle to do a better job of promoting prosperity through much more sensible fiscal policies.

As I said, my colleagues will have amendments they will be bringing to the floor this week in an effort to point him in the right direction.

Another thing that is of concern to Americans and that we ought to be doing something about here at the Federal Government level is the problem of energy production and the implications of that through things such as higher gas prices.

Notably, the Energy Department recently estimated that the average American household can expect to spend \$700 more at the gas pump this year than it did in 2010. Since President Obama came into office our gasoline prices have doubled.

In a tight oil market, new domestic supply can have a very positive impact on gasoline prices, and developing that supply would create many well-paying American jobs. So, today, I want to talk about national policies in support

of affordable, new domestic energy. This is an opportunity for government to set the stage for job creation in the private sector, rather than continue its attempts to create jobs on its own through costly legislation.

Although we import 63 percent of our oil, America has abundant supplies of both oil and natural gas here at home. In a Washington Post op-ed published in 2008, columnist Robert Samuelson wrote at "it may surprise Americans to discover that the United States is the third largest oil producer, behind Saudi Arabia and Russia. We could be producing more, but Congress has put large areas of potential supply off limits. They include the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and parts of Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico."

So, why have not these energy development projects moved forward?

Let me provide some background. Before leaving office, President George W. Bush lifted an executive moratorium that had previously barred oil and natural gas development in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico, and Congress subsequently rescinded a statutory moratorium that year. These actions were intended to open an estimated 5.8 million acres in the central gulf to oil leasing and make as much as 16 billion barrels of oil available.

However, after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the gulf in 2010, the Obama administration imposed a new moratorium that all but halted deepwater exploration and development in the area.

A number of investigations were conducted to determine the cause of the Deepwater Horizon accident and protect against similar incidents in the future, and that was appropriate. But it was neither necessary nor wise to halt all off-shore energy exploration and development in response to the spill. The country needs a reliable supply of oil to fuel our cars, homes, and power plants, not to mention satisfy the numerous manufacturing processes that rely on oil. Locking away the vast supply of oil in the deep waters of the gulf merely increased our Nation's vulnerability to oil shocks emanating from abroad, and put consumers at risk of higher gas prices.

Despite Federal court orders, it was not until the end of February 2011 that the Interior Department finally issued the first permit to allow the resumption of energy exploration and development. Unfortunately, the permit was for just a single project. Essentially, the moratorium has become a "permit-torium," or an extreme slow down of drilling permits allocated by the administration. This slow down has included delays, suspensions, revocations, and cancellations of lease permits. These moratoriums have caused six deepwater rigs to depart the gulf for other countries, taking valuable jobs, revenue, and income with them.

Others may soon leave as well. Former President Bill Clinton understands the damaging impact these de-

facto moratoriums have on the economy. Last Friday, he called the continued delays “ridiculous.”

Just as we should reopen the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico to prudent exploration and development, so too should we lift the moratorium preventing job-creating development of resource-rich areas such as Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf, as well as oil shale in various Western States.

Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska has pointed out that her State has estimated oil reserves in excess of 65 years' worth of Persian Gulf oil imports. Yet they are virtually off limits.

As Alaska's Governor, Sean Parnell, wrote in a recent Wall Street Journal op-ed:

If Americans wonder what our economic Achilles' heel is, they need look no further than the federal regulatory system that delays permits for domestic exploration and production.

The Federal Government estimates that Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf holds 27 billion barrels of oil and 132 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. We could be drilling now in the Arctic Ocean off the coast of Alaska if the Environmental Protection Agency would speed things up and issue an air permit. Developing these resources would not only generate vast new supplies but translate to a lot of good jobs. In fact, a new study by Northern Economics and the University of Alaska Anchorage's Institute of Social and Economic Research shows that development of oil and gas in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas of Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf would create 54,700 new jobs that would be sustained for 50 years. An estimated \$63 billion would be paid to employees in Alaska, and another \$82 billion would be paid to employees in the rest of the United States.

As the report notes:

Domestic energy production is important for the security and prosperity of the United States. The money spent on domestic energy cycles through the U.S. economy, thereby increasing domestic activity and jobs.

Another resource-rich area in Alaska is ANWR. Despite being one of the largest resources of oil and gas in the United States, Alaska's ANWR is off limits for energy development. Tapping oil and gas supplies in ANWR would require opening just 2,000 acres of the 19 million-acre Arctic Plain to such development.

Remember, ANWR was specifically set aside by Congress for oil and gas exploration and development. It was specifically created for that purpose. This 2,000 acres would be the equivalent of the airport in Phoenix, called Phoenix Sky Harbor, inside an area the size of South Carolina—hardly noticeable.

Using directional drilling with a small environmental footprint, at least 1 million barrels of oil a day could be obtained from just this one area for the next 20 years. The U.S. Geological Survey has estimated that the area could have up to 16 billion barrels of recover-

able oil, an amount that is equivalent to 30 years of Saudi oil imports.

Analysis from Arctic Power shows that opening ANWR to oil and gas production would create approximately 730,000 jobs.

Those opposed to developing these resources often make the argument that it will take 10 years to open ANWR. But if President Clinton had not vetoed legislation authorizing Arctic development in 1995, oil would likely be flowing from the area today, easing prices and helping to insulate our economy from the whims of OPEC. Continued delay will only put our Nation further at risk.

A few final points about abundant onshore oil resources—permits for which have also been blocked by the administration. In 2009, the administration canceled 77 oil and gas leases in Utah and in 2010 canceled another 61 in Montana. It has been estimated that the United States has approximately 800 billion barrels of technically recoverable shale oil, which is roughly three times more than the proven reserves of Saudi Arabia. Again, it is all off limits.

Finally, a note about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In recent days, some of my colleagues have called for tapping into the SPR to bring down gas prices. But this Strategic Petroleum Reserve is a national security tool to guard against an economically threatening disruption in oil supplies. It was never intended to be used to lower gas prices. Our problem today is not a matter of supply. We have plenty of supply.

Since its creation in 1995, a Presidentially directed release from SPR has occurred only twice—in 1995, at the beginning of Operation Desert Storm, and in 2005, after the devastation Hurricane Katrina caused in the Gulf of Mexico. The current SPR inventory is 720 million barrels, which equates to about 34 days of oil at current daily U.S. consumption. Tapping the Reserve is nothing more than a short-term political solution to a problem largely of the administration's own making—its continued refusal to allow access to our Nation's plentiful resources.

The benefits of increasing domestic energy production are unquestionable, especially at a time when gas prices are soaring and good jobs are needed by many Americans. I urge the administration to move swiftly in favor of issuing more production permits and urge my colleagues to support policies in favor of increased domestic energy production. There is no reason for further delay.

One of the most eloquent spokesman for this same point is on the floor, the Senator from Louisiana.

I am happy to yield the floor to her.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to follow the remarks of the Senator from Arizona and associate myself with part of his remarks that have to do with the energy policy of our country.

I am disappointed in the administration's reluctance to get the Gulf of Mexico back to work. We did have a terrible tragedy in April, almost a year ago, April 20, the Deepwater Horizon catastrophe. For 40 years or longer, 40,000 wells have been drilled safely in the gulf, in shallow water and in deep, since 1940, deep water coming into play in about 1985. Up until the Deepwater Horizon accident, this industry had acted responsibly in large measure with cutting-edge technologies. Yes, we have to continue to investigate what happened, but shutting down so much of our domestic drilling with the unrest in other parts of the world is not the right policy.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator on energy as well as tapping into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. This is not a crisis of supply; it is a crisis of pricing. SPR should only be tapped when there is a supply issue. We can get back to drilling more at home and be efficient in other places.

JAPAN EARTHQUAKE

Ms. LANDRIEU. What I really wish to talk about is to give my heartfelt condolences to the people of Japan. We have watched all weekend, my family and I, in horror, watching the scene unfold with the terrible catastrophe that struck Japan on Friday afternoon, following the earthquake, 9.0 on the Richter scale, followed by a terrible tsunami, a wave of water in some places 30 feet high that devastated coastal communities. Some of the pictures are reminiscent of what happened to us on the gulf coast about 5½ years ago when a 30-foot wave came ashore right into Gulfport and Biloxi and the catastrophe of manmade proportion, in our case, when the Federal levy system broke and 1,800 people lost their lives. But this situation in Japan is the worst crisis, according to their Prime Minister, since the Second World War.

It is going to take all of our best efforts, governments around the world, individuals, corporations, and businesses, to be generous. I hope the people of Louisiana and our cities and communities will be generous because we were so benefited by the warm generosity of the people of Japan and many volunteers who came from all over the country and the world.

I hope, as this week of search and rescue comes to a close, there will be time for debris cleanup and rebuilding and mental health counseling—all of the things that go into helping an area of the country survive and grow back. I know the people of Japan were as prepared as any country could be for a situation such as this, but the events of that day have overwhelmed one of the best and most organized governments in the world.

I am heartbroken to hear that thousands of people are yet unaccounted for. Our hearts go out to them. I hope our Nation will be generous in this time, not only from a charitable and