

layered into this bill. It turns out Senator JOHANNIS did such an outstanding job of raising awareness about the 1099 requirement that our friends on the other side have basically co-opted the idea and are now claiming it as their own. Actually, that is fine with us. It is not a bad precedent, actually. We have a lot of other good ideas we would be happy to share—not replacing one 2,700-page bill with another but passing commonsense reforms that people actually want.

The case against this bill is more compelling every day. Everything we learn tells us it was a bad idea, that it should be repealed and replaced. The courts say so, the American people say so, job creators say so. It is time for those who passed this bill to show they noticed. Let's take this opportunity.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, following my remarks, Senator PAUL of Kentucky will be recognized for up to 20 minutes in morning business to deliver his first speech as a Member of the Senate. Following Senator PAUL's remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 223, the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization bill. I have spoken to the Republican leader, and we will have some votes between 5 and 6 o'clock tonight. We will have three votes. Senators will be notified as to the specific time at a later hour today.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. REID. Madam President, if the American people want to understand the difference between Democrats and Republicans, it is my suggestion that they pay attention to what is happening on the Senate floor this week. The two parties simply have different priorities. Democrats are fighting to modernize our Nation's air travel. Republicans are fighting to repeal the health care reform law, ignoring the 80 percent of Americans who want them to leave it alone. In other words, Democrats want to get passengers the rights they deserve. Republicans want to take away patients' rights that they already have, rights that are saving lives, saving money, and saving Medicare, just as we promised when we wrote this law.

What Republicans refuse to understand, or at least what they hope the people do not realize, is that in America we give our citizens rights; we don't take them away. That principle comes first and inspired the country's founding and has directed our evolution and defines our promise.

We as Senators have a choice. We can move forward or we can look backward; we can make progress or we can stage a futile fight with the future. It is clear this week that while the American people and Senate Democrats are looking ahead, Senate Republicans are looking for a way to distract the American people. This is what moving forward looks like: Our bill to modernize our Nation's air travel will protect consumers. It is a passengers' bill of rights. We know delays happen when we fly from the airports around the country. We try to fly sometimes. When we do, we want to make sure passengers are treated right. We want to make sure passengers have the right to timely and accurate information about their flight. We want to make sure passengers have the right to food, water, and access to restrooms when they are forced to wait.

We want to make sure passengers have the right to know that while they are sitting on an airplane that is on a tarmac—as I said here yesterday, 3½ hours in Dallas alone waiting for a gate—we want to make sure passengers know the airline they are flying has a contingency plan to get them where they need to go.

This bill will also make flying safer and make it more efficient. It will help prevent accidents on the runways. It will finally introduce GPS technology to our Nation's air traffic control system. Mongolia has GPS. We don't. In most every country in the world, they determine where airplanes are with GPS. They do it in the air. We are still doing it on the ground. This bill will improve access to rural communities, which is important to Nevadas in rural cities such as Ely, NV, which is not near a big metropolitan area, and would reduce delays in the first place. That is what moving forward looks like, and that is why Senator ROCKEFELLER has worked for years to get this bill passed.

But there have been little side issues that have come up. The side issues are going to be debated on the floor and we will either pass them or get rid of them and get this bill on the road to the President's desk. So what I have talked about is what moving forward looks like. That is what we Democrats want to do.

This is what moving backward would look like: Republicans' symbolic effort to repeal the rights in the health care reform bill would put us all at risk. I am going to only mention a few of the things, but it would let insurance companies, once again, stand in the way of a child and the medical care that child needs. It would take away that child's right to get health insurance and instead give insurance companies the right to use asthma or diabetes as the excuse to take away that care. It would kick kids off their parents' health insurance. It would take away seniors' rights to a free wellness check. It would force seniors to pay more for their prescriptions. It would raise taxes on small businesses and add \$1.5 trillion to our deficit.

That is what their amendment would do.

This is how health insurance worked before reforms became the law of the land. We do not want to go back. Madam President, I am sure you have had parents come to you with tears in their eyes, saying: Now my child can get insurance. We don't want to have mothers say: What am I going to do? That is what they said in the past.

There is one more difference between Democrats and Republicans. We are fighting for jobs this week. Along with all the advantages in the aviation modernization bill I mentioned a minute ago, it is also a jobs bill. It will create and protect at least 280,000 American jobs. That is why we are fighting so hard for this bill. This is a bipartisan bill. Let's get to passing it.

While the health care reform law is making sick Americans healthier and better, it is also helping unemployed Americans find work. A healthier health care system is going to create hundreds of thousands of jobs a year for the next decade.

I went to GW University Hospital—I wasn't sick—to visit somebody there. A woman—she must have been one of the administrators—said: Oh, I am so happy. She said: You know that health care bill you passed, we are going to hire 500 new physicians. I came back and told my staff that and they said you must have it mixed up. Five hundred? I said: Let's find out her name and you call her. They called her. I was right. That is what she told me, and she said that is because of the health care bill we passed.

We are talking about this health care bill also helping unemployed Americans find work. A healthier health care system is going to create hundreds of thousands of jobs a year for the next decade. That is what they tell us. That is because when businesses do not have to spend much on premiums, they can spend more on people—and healthier workers are, of course, more productive workers and that helps our economy at every level.

This is the difference between moving forward and moving backward. It is the difference between giving people rights and taking them away. In the late days of the health care reform debate, my colleagues on the other side asked us to stop everything and start over. It is nothing more than an excuse to keep insurance companies in charge of health care in this country. The minority is again asking us to turn back the clock on the progress we made, turn health care back to the insurance companies. They can dig in their heels, try to slam on the brakes as hard as they want, but the course of our country goes in only one direction. We move forward.

Madam President, as I announced earlier, Senator PAUL is going to give his maiden speech. I am sure his father is looking on through the magic of all of the new communications we have to listen to his son give a speech in the Senate. We are all anxious to hear him.

Senator PAUL.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business with the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, recognized for 20 minutes.

AMERICA'S FISCAL CRISIS

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I am honored by the privilege of serving in the Senate. I am both honored and humbled by the responsibility of defending our Constitution and our individual freedoms. I will sit at Henry Clay's desk. There is likely no legislator from Kentucky more famous than Henry Clay. He was the Speaker of the House; he was a leader in the Senate. He ran for President four times and nearly bested James Polk.

Henry Clay was called the "Great Compromiser." During my orientation, one of my colleagues came up to me and asked: Will you be a great compromiser? I have thought long and hard about that. Is compromise the noble position? Is compromise a sign of enlightenment? Will compromise allow us to avoid the looming debt crisis?

Henry Clay's life is at best a mixed message. His compromises were over slavery. One could argue that he rose above sectional strife to keep the Union together, to preserve the Union. But one could also argue that he was morally wrong and that his decisions on slavery, to extend slavery, were decisions that actually may have even ultimately invited the war that came, that his compromises meant that during the 50 years of his legislative career he not only accepted slavery but he accepted the slave trade.

In the name of compromise, Henry Clay was by most accounts not a cruel master, but he was a master nonetheless of 48 slaves, most of which they did not free during his lifetime, and some of which were only freed belatedly 28 years after his death.

He supported the fugitive slave law throughout his career. He compromised on the extension of slavery. When he was the Speaker of the House, there was a vote on extending slavery into Arkansas. The vote was 88 to 88. He came down, extraordinarily, from the Speaker's chair to vote in favor of extending slavery into Arkansas.

Before we eulogize Henry Clay, we should acknowledge and appreciate the contrast with contemporaries who refused to compromise. William Lloyd Garrison toiled at a small abolitionist press for 30 years, refusing to compromise with Clay, with Clay's desire

to send the slaves back to Africa. Garrison was beaten, chased by mobs, and imprisoned for his principled stand.

Frederick Douglass traveled the country at the time. He was a free Black man, but he traveled at great personal risk throughout the countryside. He proved, ultimately, that he was the living, breathing example that intellect and leadership could come from a recently freed slave.

Cassius Clay was a cousin of Henry Clay, and an abolitionist. In the Heidler's biography of Henry Clay they describe Cassius Clay as follows: A venomous pen was his first weapon, and a Bowie knife his second weapon. He was so effective with the first weapon that he was wise to have a second weapon handy.

Cassius parted ways with his cousin Henry Clay, although they worked together on some things, and Henry Clay got him out of a few difficult times with the law. But they parted ways when Cassius Clay published a letter where Henry Clay seemed to be more in favor of emancipation than he was publicly. They never spoke again after that. Henry Clay disavowed the letter and condemned Cassius Clay.

Cassius Clay was an unapologetic abolitionist. He was an agitator. He made people mad, particularly slave owners and slave traders. One night in Foxtown, he was ambushed by Squire Turner and his boys. They were slave traders. They came at him with cudgels and knives. They ambushed him from behind and stabbed him in the back repeatedly. As he fell to the ground, Tom Turner held his pistol to the head of Cassius Clay and fired. The gun misfired. He fired again and it misfired. He fired a third time, and as it misfired for a third time, Cassius Clay was able to reach into his belt and pull his Bowie knife and gutted one of the Turner boys, killing him.

Cassius Clay refused to compromise. Cassius Clay was a hero, but he was permanently estranged from Henry Clay. Henry Clay made no room for true believers. Henry made no room for the abolitionists. Who are our heroes? Are we fascinated and enthralled by the Great Compromiser or by Cassius Clay?

Henry Clay came within 38,000 votes of winning the Presidency. He almost beat James Polk. He lost one State. If he had won that one State, he would have been President. The State was New York, and he lost it because a small fledgling party, the Liberty Party, a precursor to the Republican Party, an abolitionist party, refused to vote for Henry Clay because of his muddled views on slavery. One could argue that Clay's compromises ultimately cost him the Presidency.

Those activists who did not compromise—Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass, Cassius Clay—are heroes because they said slavery is wrong and they would not compromise.

Today we have no issues, no moral issues, that have equivalency with the

issue of slavery. Yet we do face a fiscal nightmare, potentially a debt crisis in our country. Is the answer to compromise? Should we compromise by raising taxes and cutting spending, as the debt commission proposes? Is that the compromise that will save us from financial ruin? Several facts argue against that particular compromise.

Government now spends more money than it ever has before. Raising taxes seems to only encourage more spending. Government now spends one in four GDP dollars. Twenty-five percent of our economy is government spending.

Any compromise must shrink the government sector and expand the private sector. Any compromise should be where we cut Federal spending, not where we raise taxes. The problem we face is not a revenue problem, it is a spending problem. It is spending that is now swollen to nearly a fourth of our economy. The annual deficit is nearly \$2 trillion.

Entitlements and interest will consume the entire debt, the entire budget, if we do nothing. Within a decade, there will be no money left for defense, no money left for infrastructure, no money left for anything other than the entitlements and interest if we do not tackle this problem.

Many ask, will the Tea Party compromise? Can the Tea Party work with others to find a solution? The answer is, of course there must be dialog and ultimately compromise. But the compromise must occur on where we cut spending.

Even across the aisle, we have Democrats who are now saying, you know what, it is a problem. We should not raise taxes in a recession. So we are finding some agreement. The compromise we as conservatives must acknowledge is that we can cut some money from the military. The other side, the liberals, also must compromise that they can cut some money from domestic spending. Freezing domestic spending, though, at 2010 levels, as the President proposed in his State of the Union, does almost nothing. In fact, it freezes inflated spending levels, and will do nothing to avoid a crisis.

There is a certain inevitability to this debate, as the debt bomb looms and grows perilously large. As long as I sit at Henry Clay's desk, I will remember his lifelong desire to forge agreement. But I will also keep close to my heart the principled stand of his cousin Cassius Clay, who refused to forsake the life of any human simply to find agreement.

Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I congratulate Senator PAUL on his maiden speech in the Senate, and applaud him for taking the opportunity to underscore the seriousness of the fiscal situation we are in.

Solving the Nation's fiscal problems will indeed require principled leadership, and I am confident Senator PAUL