

said: Yes, I would be glad to do it. I did not know why. I went over and took her to the House of Representatives. We are in the Senate. That was in the House. He was in a hearing. He came out, and I said: I want to introduce you to someone who is the First Lady of Cote d'Ivoire. She then put her arms around him and started crying. He did not know why she was crying. She said to him: Will you forgive us? J.C. Watts said: Forgive you for what? She said: Because we are the ones who sold your brothers into slavery.

In the United States of America, people walk around guilty—and they should be—about the slavery we had. But in Africa, and particularly Sub-Saharan Africa and west Africa, where most of the slave trade came from, such as Cote d'Ivoire, they realize they are the ones who sold their brothers into slavery. Here is Simone begging J.C. Watts to forgive her for selling them into slavery.

She was an elected member of Parliament from her district. She was leading the way for developing a center to care for orphans in her district. At the national level, Simone Gbagbo, the First Lady, worked to have a nationwide program for women to get their products to market. No name for that program is yet found, but that is what the program is. On a continental level, she was the head of the Organization of African First Ladies against HIV/AIDS, a forum created to establish a role for African First Ladies in dealing with the HIV needs of women and children. That is who Simone is. Isn't she pretty? That was 1 week ago.

Let's see what she looks like today. You cannot see it now. They have held her and pulled her hair out by the roots. They went out into the streets and said: This is the hair of Simone Gbagbos. I don't know what else they did to her. Use your own imagination—brutally murdered.

Who are these people? They are the Ouattara forces. Do you think we made that up? Here is another picture. There they are. All of these are identified leaders of the Ouattara forces holding her. See what that they are doing to her, beating her and pulling her hair out. That is what is happening today.

So I only will say—I will conclude with this—our State Department has to wake up. You cannot assume the United Nations is doing something that is right. We have to understand there is this half of a continent called Sub-Saharan Africa, and those people—their lives are worth just as much as they are worth in Kosovo or Bosnia or the United States or any of the other places we go and try to save lives.

Again, I would say to any of our friends and any of the Presidents of any of the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, what has happened right there could very well happen to the Presidents or First Ladies of your countries.

I only ask three things. No. 1, stop this. Stop the firing that is going on right now. People are being murdered

as we speak. Stop it. We can do it. We have the power to do it. Our State Department can ask the United Nations to make it happen in spite of what the French might want.

No. 2, send them into exile. Give them the dignity of living someplace else in Sub-Saharan Africa so these people, so the people of Africa will know—can you imagine what the people of Cote d'Ivoire will be thinking and doing in the near future if they allow this to go unanswered? That is my appeal to the U.S. State Department, to the United Nations, and to the French.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business for debate only be extended until 6 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and that at 6 p.m. I be recognized.

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

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, there is no one else in the Chamber now. They said they had other speakers lined up, and when they come in, I will be glad to yield the floor to them. In the meantime, let me make a couple of comments about the discussion today that everyone is addressing, Democrats and Republicans.

I have been here for a number of years. I have seen different administrations come through. I think this is the first time the American people have finally awoken to the fact that we have finally gotten to a point where we can't continue to do what we have been doing.

When President Obama came into office, he came out with his first budget and then his second budget and then his third budget. If we add up these budgets, what he has done successfully, since he had total control of the House and the Senate, is passed these budgets. He has added more to our national debt in 2 years than every President throughout—in the history of this country, every President from George Washington to George W. Bush.

I can remember coming to this floor and I was outraged back in 1995 when then-President Clinton came up with a budget, and that budget was a \$1.5 trillion budget. This budget President Obama has come out with is not just \$1 trillion, not \$1.5 trillion, it is \$3.5 trillion, and the deficit alone for this 1 year is greater than the budget was for the entire year of fiscal year 1996. It can't happen. We can't continue to do that.

Consequently—and I criticized some of my Republican friends when a lot of

them voted for the \$700 billion bailout back in October of 2008. Of course, none of the Republicans voted for the \$800 billion stimulus package. Right now, we are quibbling over, well, can we really cut \$60 billion from the budget. Yet they passed an \$800 billion stimulus package—spending. It had never been done before in the history of this country. It has to stop now.

I watched what PAUL RYAN is doing over there. That is heavy lifting, that is tough, and he is talking about something that is very real.

I see my good friend from Utah has come in.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I thank my colleague.

Sometimes it amazes me how quickly debates change here in Washington. At this time in 2009, President Obama was riding high. Heralded as the second coming of Franklin Roosevelt, the conventional wisdom was that his election represented a sea change in the attitudes of American taxpayers. Where his Democratic predecessor came to Congress and announced that the era of big government was over, President Obama came to Washington convinced that the era of big government was just beginning.

With historic majorities in both Houses of Congress, he and his Capitol Hill allies set about the business of transforming the Nation's economy with massive jolts of new government spending and regulation. They cultivated an unholy alliance of big labor, big business, and big government, and the hoped-for result was a corporatist state where government bureaucrats would calculate the fair share that business would contribute to finance the administration's redistributionist policies. They exploded the growth of the Federal Government through ordinary appropriations and the stimulus. Democrats hiked up nondefense discretionary appropriations by 24 percent over the last 2 years and by 84 percent if you count the stimulus bill.

But, as an American songwriter once put it, the times they are a-changing.

Later this week, we will be considering the continuing resolution that gets us to the end of fiscal year 2011. To hear the left talk, one would think this proposal was shutting down agencies left and right. They say we have cut discretionary spending to the bone. This, of course, is a little bit melodramatic. Before the Republicans won in November, the Federal Government was on pace to spend \$3.8 trillion. That is \$3,800 billion. The continuing resolution we will vote on reduces spending by \$38 billion. And \$38 billion in spending reductions from spending of \$3,800 billion or \$3.8 trillion—whichever you like—is not exactly cutting to the bone.

I agree with my colleagues who say we need to reduce spending by even more. Facing our third consecutive

year with more than a \$1 trillion projected deficit, these cuts barely scratch the surface of what needs to be done. But make no mistake about it—even these cuts would have been impossible if not for the Republicans taking back the House and making gains in the Senate last November. When Republicans won, they changed the debate in Washington.

Even the press has been forced to acknowledge the depth of our fiscal crisis, though old habits die hard. Just this morning, we witnessed a relapse in the mainstream media as it did its best to enable excessive spending. The headline on the front page of today's Washington Post screamed "Cuts Will Affect Vast Spectrum of Priorities." This made me think of the old joke about the likely reporting at the New York Times on the outbreak of a nuclear conflict: "Nuclear War Breaks Out: Women and Minorities Hardest Hit." But I should not be too hard on the press. They seem to be getting it. There is certainly no denying it. We are spending way more than we are taking in, and, absent real reductions in spending and meaningful reforms to entitlements, this country is cruising toward a legitimate debt crisis that will adversely impact every American family.

This desire to reduce spending and restore the Constitution's limits on the size of government is the new normal for taxpayers. The Obama administration's salad days when they dreamed of permanently expanding the size of the Federal Government are way back in the rearview mirror. Because of the undeniable seriousness of our debt and deficits and the commitment of Republicans to taking it on, the debate has shifted from how do we enlarge the size of government to how can we scale it back. The administration was slow to recognize this. When given his first opportunity to weigh in on this crisis, the President voted "present." His fiscal year 2012 budget was laughable for its failure to take on our deficits and growing debt.

Even Ezra Klein, the liberal Washington Post reporter, could not carry the President's water on this one. Even he couldn't carry the President's water on this one. He wrote that when reading the budget, it is almost like the fiscal commission never happened.

The President's fiscal commission recommended over \$4 trillion in spending reductions, including adjustments to entitlements. I can't say I agree with everything in the commission's proposal, but it was a serious effort to get our Nation's finances back in order. But the President chose to pretend this report did not exist.

Well, since then, they must have done some polling over at the White House. They must have realized that on the most critical issue facing the country, American taxpayers and American families want something more from their President—they want leadership. The President of the United

States can't just subcontract out these issues to other people. The President of the United States has to lead, and in these areas it takes the President. He has to be bold. He has to take a stand. For all of the elegiac comparisons of President Obama to Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, and Ronald Reagan, those were not passive Presidents. On the big issues, they took big risks and they led the country. It seems as though the President's advisers have finally figured this out. They need to get involved in a serious way on the issue of Federal spending.

Sitting back and adding nothing, while your allies demagogue reasonable solutions to pressing problems, is simply not acceptable to the American people. Democrats tried this tired line of attack last week, alleging that Republicans were out to hurt the poor, the disabled, and the elderly. These smears really are beneath the dignity of our elected officials, and they show a total disregard for the common sense of American citizens and the good faith and charity of those who support Republicans. A good first step for the President would be to disavow these statements. He has a chance to do so tomorrow.

The President is giving a much-hyped speech tomorrow on the issue of spending and getting our deficits and debt under control. I can only say I hope he comes through. The people of my home State of Utah and the people of every State are demanding that Washington tackle out-of-control spending. Vague outlines or statements of principle are not going to do it. The President needs to take a stand, or should I say stance.

I would add that the American people don't want solutions to a spending crisis that involve higher taxes. The solution to a spending crisis is not higher taxes that will give the government more money to spend. Our problem is not that citizens are taxed too little; our problem is that government spends too much.

So the President needs to come forward with serious, concrete proposals and commit to working with Congressman RYAN, Speaker BOEHNER, and Senate Republicans to solve this problem.

I am willing to give the President a mulligan on his first budget proposal. The President, like Members of Congress, represents the people. As representatives of the people, we must acknowledge those times when we get it wrong. When the people make it clear that they want their elected officials to go in a different direction, in a democratic republic it is only right that the President and the Congress give voice to those concerns. The President seems to understand that he got it wrong with this first budget.

Taxpayers and families want Washington to take on spending, but the people will not be fooled. If the President comes out tomorrow and speaks in vague generalities, if he comes out and simply defers to Congress, he will have satisfied no one. Being the Presi-

dent of the United States is not like being a law professor. Your job is not merely to facilitate dialog. Your job is to lead.

I look forward to the President's remarks tomorrow. I guess we could call it the President's budget, part deux. My hope is that the sequel will be better than the original.

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

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

STEM EDUCATION

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about a matter that is very important to our country, to Minnesota, and to me, which is science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education or STEM education for short.

As I have traveled around Minnesota, I have heard from many of our high-tech businesses. They fear our students will not be ready to take on the jobs waiting for them when they graduate and, as a result, these jobs will go unfilled and our economy will founder. This is not just true in Minnesota, of course, but across the country—in Pennsylvania, the State of the Presiding Officer, and everywhere in our Nation.

That is why I am addressing our need for a well-trained STEM workforce through the STEM Master Teacher Corps Act, which has been cosponsored by my colleagues, Senators LIEBERMAN and SHAHEEN.

We have been hearing concern about the state of STEM education in our country for over a decade now. In 2000, a 25-member commission, headed by former Senator John Glenn, published a report called "Before It's Too Late," which addressed the pressing need for high-quality math and science teaching.

Five years later, another report—"Rising Above the Gathering Storm"—presented the findings and recommendations of a National Academies commission, chaired by former Lockheed Martin CEO Norm Augustine, concerning the deteriorating condition of STEM education and basic research.

Last year, a followup report, dramatically entitled "Rapidly Approaching Category 5 Hurricane," warned us that the "gathering storm" is now threatening to wipe out U.S. leadership in global science and technology if we don't act fast—and said so with good reason.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, nearly every one of the top 30 fastest growing professions requires