

I was a young man of 17 at that time, but I was also a volunteer medical aid man. We had a little aid station—a temporary one—set up by the elementary school called Lunalilo. So I rushed there to respond to the call of duty, and I stayed there for about a week taking care of the wounded and the dead, because we also maintained a morgue on the school premises.

I became familiar with the cost of war—not the full cost, but I knew what was happening. The war was much more than just blood and guts. We have an extraordinary Constitution. We have an extraordinary set of laws. But throughout the history of mankind—not just the history of the United States but the history of mankind—war has always provided some justification for leaders to set aside these laws. For example, on just about Christmas Eve of 1941, about 3 weeks after December 7, the U.S. Government made a decision, and that decision was to provide a new designation for all Japanese residing in the United States. Citizens and noncitizens, such as my father, were given the new designation, which was 4-C.

As the Presiding Officer knows, 1-A means you are physically fit, mentally alert, and you can put on a uniform; 4-F means something is wrong with you; and 4-C is the designation for an “enemy alien.” Just imagine that—an enemy alien. This was used as one of the justifications to round up over 120,000 Japanese, most of them Americans of Japanese ancestry, and place them into these internment camps. There were 10 of them throughout the United States in very desolate areas—Arkansas, Arizona, Utah, out in the deserts. Their crime was they were “enemy aliens.” None of them had committed any crime. Investigation after investigation disclosed that. No sabotage, no espionage, no assault—nothing. They were rounded up and placed into these camps, which were described by our government as concentration camps. Yes, it was unconstitutional, but our leaders felt the war was a justification to set aside the Constitution and set aside the laws.

Well, many of us—especially the young ones—were very eager to demonstrate to our neighbors and to our government that we were loyal, that we wanted to do our part in this war, and, if necessary, put our lives on the line. We petitioned the government. Finally, after about a year of petitioning, President Roosevelt issued a statement saying: Americanism is not a matter of blood or color. Americanism is a matter of heart and soul. He said: OK, form a volunteer group. And that was done. We trained in Mississippi and we did our best.

The 100th Battalion, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team were assigned to do our battles in Europe. We fought in Italy and France. We started off the war with about 6,000 men. At the end, over 12,000 had gone through the ranks. So you can imagine the casualty rates.

We had about 10,000 Purple Hearts for all the wounds they received. We were told that these two units became the most decorated in the history of the United States.

Yes, the bombing of Pearl Harbor 70 years ago began a period of my life when I became an adult and, I hope, a good American. It is something I will never forget. It changed my life forever.

Something of interest at this moment: 20 years ago, when we decided to make it a national event—the 50th anniversary of the bombing of Pearl Harbor—on that morning, the President was there. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of War, the Secretaries of the Interior Department, State Department—all of the important people of the United States were in attendance.

In preparation of this, we took a poll, about 6 months before December 7, and the poll was among high school seniors, well-educated young boys and girls. The question was a very simple one: What is the significance of December 7, 1941?

Mr. President, I am sad to report to you that less than half could respond. Most of them thought it was a birthday of some President or some historic date of some nature, but they could not recall what it was.

On this 70th anniversary, I wonder, if that poll were taken again, What would be the outcome?

Well, I hope we will remember December 7. I hope we will remember 9/11. That was just a few years ago. But people are beginning to forget 9/11, as well as forgetting December 7.

If December 7 is going to teach us anything, it should be that we must remain vigilant at all times—not just to avoid war but vigilant among ourselves so we would not use this as a justification to set aside our most honored document, the Constitution. I hope it will never happen again.

Mr. President, I thank you very much for this opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I am very moved by the words of the Senator from Hawaii—not only his words but the example he has set for all Americans of heroism and sacrifice and service to his country, and a most valued Member of the U.S. Senate but, more importantly, a genuine American hero.

I thank the Senator from Hawaii for his continued service and his continued inspiration to all Americans, especially those who are serving in the military today.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would my friend yield for a brief statement.

Mr. McCAIN. I would be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I, like my friend from Arizona, compliment my friend from Hawaii. But I think it

speaks volumes to hear Senator JOHN McCAIN talk about a hero. It is a hero talking about a hero. Far too rarely do we recognize these people whom we have the opportunity to serve with here in the U.S. Senate.

When I came here with Senator McCAIN—we came at the same time—we had a lot of people who were war veterans. It is not the case anymore. But I so appreciate JOHN McCAIN—a certified, unqualified hero—standing and talking about DAN INOUE being a hero. This says, I repeat, volumes coming from someone who is a hero himself.

I have such admiration for both of these men. For someone who has never served in the military, to have the pleasure of being able to serve and work together with these two men will be something I will remember the rest of my life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I am deeply touched by the kind and undeserved words of my old friend of many years, the distinguished majority leader. We have had our spirited combat and our agreements, but we share a commitment—the two of us—for the betterment of this Nation.

I also remind my friend from Nevada what he already knows, but I remind him, it does not take a great deal of talent to get shot down. I was able to intercept a surface-to-air missile with my own airplane, which will not go down in the Aviation Hall of Fame, not to mention the several aircraft I destroyed at taxpayers' expense in previous times.

So I thank my dear friend from Nevada, as well, for his kind words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the humility of my friend. I have heard him say words to this effect before. The fact is, what he did after the plane went down is what we all will remember. As long as our country is the country it is, we will always remember what happened after that plane went down, what JOHN McCAIN did, setting an example for the world and certainly his country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

RUSSIA

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about Russia, and to review—particularly, in light of the recent election in Russia and the relationship we have—the state of what this administration has trumpeted as a so-called reset of U.S.-Russia relations, especially in light of the flawed Duma election that occurred this weekend, and in light of my strong belief that the growing demand for dignity and uncorrupt

governance that has defined the Arab world this year may impact Russia as well.

Let me once again make clear that I am not opposed to U.S. engagement with Russia. I am not opposed to working consistently in good faith with Russia to find more ways to improve our relationship. To the contrary, we must continue to actively seek ways to cooperate with Russia in mutually beneficial ways. It is in our national interest to do so. And whatever can be said about the administration's policy toward Russia, no one can accuse them of a lack of sincerity and diligence in trying to increase cooperation with Russia.

I would simply ask, What has been accomplished? What has been the result of the administration's good-faith desire for a so-called reset of relations with Russia? The answer, I am afraid, is precious little. Yes, there have been some areas of progress, but even those minor steps may now be getting rolled back.

There has been a lot of news recently pertaining to our relationship with Russia and Russia's future development, which my colleagues may have missed. It is very important to spend some time today and review these new developments.

Let's start with the issue of missile defense.

My colleagues will remember the debate we had here last year over the ratification of the New START treaty. In that debate, we spent a lot of time discussing the Russian threat to withdraw from the treaty if the United States took any further steps to build up its missile defense capabilities. Specifically, the Russian Government stated that the New START treaty "may be effective and viable only in conditions where there is no qualitative or quantitative build-up in the missile defense system capabilities of the United States of America." The Russian Government stated that in the ratification of the treaty. They went on to say that if those conditions were not met, Russia would exercise its right to withdraw from the treaty.

Many of us felt strongly at the time, and feel strongly now, that it was a mistake to ratify a treaty on which the two signatories had two completely antithetical positions about the implications of that treaty, particularly as it pertains to one of our most vital national security programs—our missile defenses. Some of us thought and argued at the time that the United States should not voluntarily sign up to a treaty that would likely be used by the Russian Government as a source of political pressure and blackmail to get us to make concessions on our missile defenses.

Well, here we are, 1 year later, and let's review some of what the Russian Government has been saying and doing in this regard.

On November 23, we read an article from Bloomberg entitled "Russia Pre-

pare to 'Destroy' U.S. Shield." This is what it said:

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev ordered the military to prepare the capability to "destroy" the command structure of the planned U.S. missile-defense system in Europe.

Russia may also station strike missiles on its southern and western flanks, including Iskander rockets in the Kaliningrad exclave between Poland and Lithuania, both members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, Medvedev said on state television today.

"I have ordered the armed forces to develop measures to ensure, if necessary, that we can destroy the command and control systems" of the U.S. shield, Medvedev said. "These measures are appropriate, effective and low-cost."

On the same day, we read the following in an article in the New York Times entitled "Russia Elevates Warning About U.S. Missile-Defense Plan in Europe." I quote from the article:

Russia will deploy its own missiles and could withdraw from the New Start nuclear arms reduction treaty if the United States moves forward with its plans for a missile-defense system in Europe, President Dmitri A. Medvedev warned on Wednesday.

"I have set the task to the armed forces to develop measures for disabling missile-defense data and control systems," Mr. Medvedev said. . . .

But it was Mr. Medvedev's comments about the New Start treaty, put into effect this year, that suggested a darkening tone in what has been a steady drumbeat of warnings out of Moscow in recent days over the plans for a missile-defense system based in Europe.

"In the case of unfavorable development of the situation, Russia reserves the right to discontinue further steps in the field of disarmament and arms control," Mr. Medvedev said in a televised address from his residence outside Moscow. "Given the intrinsic link between the strategic offensive and defensive arms, conditions for our withdrawal from the New START treaty could also arise," he said.

If all this were not troubling enough, we then read on November 28 an article from a Russian state news agency entitled "Russia's NATO Envoy to Visit China, Iran, Over Missile Defense." Here is what was reported:

Russian envoy to NATO Dmitry Rogozin will visit China and Iran in mid-January to discuss a U.S.-backed global missile defense network.

"We are planning to visit both Beijing and Tehran soon under the Russian president's directive, to discuss the planned deployment of a global missile defense network," Rogozin said during a roundtable meeting at the lower house of the Russian parliament.

On November 28, the Russian Government went even further, not just using the New START treaty to try to blackmail us into weakening our missile defenses but threatening to cut off NATO's supply routes into Afghanistan as well, which was another area of limited progress that the administration hailed as part of its so-called reset policy. This is how the Wall Street Journal described it last Monday in an article entitled "Russia Considers Blocking NATO Supply Routes."

Russia said it may not let NATO use its territory to supply troops in Afghanistan if

the alliance doesn't seriously consider its objections to a U.S.-led missile shield for Europe, Russia's ambassador to NATO said Monday.

If NATO does not give a serious response, "we have to address matters in relations in other areas," Russian news services reported Dmitri Rogozin, ambassador to NATO, as saying. He added that Russia's cooperation on Afghanistan may be an area for review, the news services reported.

So let me summarize: After being assured that the New START treaty would contribute to the improvement of U.S.-Russia relations, and that the Russian Government would not use the treaty against us as blackmail, we are now in a situation where the President of Russia is threatening to deploy ballistic missiles to destroy U.S. missile defense systems in Europe; where he is openly threatening to withdraw his government from the New START treaty if the United States does not make unacceptable concessions on its missile defense programs; and where the Russian Ambassador to NATO is threatening to cut off NATO's supply routes to Afghanistan and planning to visit China and Iran with the purpose of deepening Russia's cooperation with those governments against U.S. missile defenses.

I think it is safe to say that the effect to date of the New START treaty on the U.S.-Russia relationship is rather less positive than originally advertised. The problems in our relationship with Russia go well beyond missile defense, as important as that is. In recent months, as the Assad regime in Syria has slaughtered roughly 4,000 of its own citizens who are seeking a democratic future, what has been the Russian Government's response? With the help of China, Russia has been absolutely shameless in blocking any serious action in the United Nations Security Council, including by vetoing a toothless security resolution that would not have even imposed sanctions but merely hinted at the possibility of sanctions. At the same time, while the Assad regime's bloody rampage has continued against the Syrian people, the Russian Government has continued to serve as its primary supplier of weaponry. In fact, last week in a story entitled "Russia Delivers Missiles to Syria," AFP reported that despite the brutal violence of the Assad regime, and over Israel's strenuous objections, Russia delivered 72 supersonic cruise missiles to the Syrian Government worth at least \$300 million.

Then there is Russia's continued interference in the sovereign territory and internal affairs of the Republic of Georgia, a country that the Russian military invaded in 2008 and continues to occupy to this day. Two weeks ago there was a Presidential election in the breakaway state of South Ossetia, which is part of Georgia's sovereign territory. But when Moscow's preferred candidate was overwhelmingly defeated in those elections, the supreme court of this Russian proxy state declared the results illegal and nullified

the vote. Russian parliamentarians applauded.

Finally, there is the unfortunate issue of Russia's backsliding on human rights and democracy. A few months ago, President Medvedev announced, as we all know, that he would step aside in Russia's election next year so that Vladimir Putin could once again run for the Presidency. Some see this as a sign that Putin will come back. I object to that characterization, because I do not believe Putin ever left. He has been running things in Russia with no less informal power than he had as President.

Not surprisingly, over the past 3 years, the state of human rights and freedom in that country has gotten no better. In fact, things have gotten worse. Perhaps the clearest evidence of this fact is the tragic and heart-breaking case of Sergei Magnitsky, a Russian tax attorney working for an international company, Hermitage Capital, that had invested in Russia. Magnitsky did not spend his life as a human rights activist or an outspoken critic of the Russian Government. He was an ordinary man. But he became an extraordinary champion of justice and the rule of law in a Russia where those principles have lost nearly all meaning.

What Magnitsky uncovered was that a collection of Russian Government officials and criminals associated with them colluded to defraud the Russian state of \$230 million. The Russian Government, in turn, blamed the crime on Hermitage Capital and threw Magnitsky in prison in 2008. Magnitsky was detained for 11 months without trial.

Russian officials, especially from the interior ministry, pressured Magnitsky to deny what he had uncovered, to lie and recant. But he refused. He was sickened by what his government had done and he refused to surrender. As a result, he was transferred to increasingly more severe and more horrific prison conditions. He was forced to eat unclean food and drink unclear water. He was denied basic medical care even as his health continued to deteriorate. In fact, he was placed in even worse conditions until, on November 16, 2009, having served 358 days in prison, Sergei Magnitsky died. He was 37 years old.

The Magnitsky case shined a light on the tragic realities of human rights abuses in Russia today, and the overwhelming cruelty and injustice that Magnitsky endured has made it impossible for the government and the people of Russia to ignore. Even the Public Oversight Commission of the City of Moscow for the Control of the Observance of Human Rights in Places of Forced Detention, a Russian organization empowered by Russian law to independently monitor the country's prison conditions, concluded the following in a report this year:

A man who is kept in custody and is being detained is not capable of using all of the necessary means to protect either his life or

his health. This is a responsibility of a state which holds him captive. Therefore, the case of Sergei Magnitsky can be described as a breach of the right to life. The members of the civic supervisory commission have reached the conclusion that Magnitsky had been experiencing both psychological and physical pressure in custody, and the conditions in some of the wards . . . can be justifiably called torturous. The people responsible for this must be punished.

The case of Sergei Magnitsky is but an extreme example of a problem that is all too common in Russia today, the flagrant violations of human rights and the rule of law committed by the Russian Government and its allies outside of government. We have seen the problem in the show trial of Mikhail Khordokovsky, which I would remind my colleagues was unfolding at the exact same time that this body was debating the ratification of the New START treaty last December.

After the Russian Government stole Khordokovsky's oil company, it then turned around and charged him for the crime. Even more absurdly, as he was nearing the end of his 8-year prison sentence, the Russian state then charged him again for virtually the same crime. Before the judge had even handed down his verdict, Prime Minister Putin said, Khordokovsky "should sit in jail." And lo and behold, that is exactly what the judge ultimately ruled, sentencing Khordokovsky to 5 additional years in prison on top of the 8 years he had already served.

Earlier this year, not surprisingly, Khordokovsky lost his appeal of this ruling. In a report released this year, Freedom House concluded that the cases of Magnitsky and Khordokovsky:

Put an international spotlight on the Russian state's contempt for the rule of law . . . By silencing influential and accomplished figures such as Khordokovsky and Magnitsky, the Russian authorities have made it abundantly clear that anyone in Russia can be silenced.

The violations of human rights in Russia also extend to the deep and worsening problem of corruption, which perhaps as much as any other issue mobilizes the frustration and anger of the Russian public. In its annual index of perceptions of corruption, the independent organization Transparency International ranked Russia 154th out of 178 countries. That means that Russia is perceived as more corrupt than Pakistan, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. The World Bank considers 122 countries to be better places to do business than Russia. I would point out that one of those countries is the Republic of Georgia, which is ranked 12th by the World Bank.

When we consider the pattern of corruption and abuse the Russian Government has perpetrated over many years, it is not surprising to see the outpouring of anger and dissatisfaction that Russian voters expressed in this weekend's parliamentary elections. Unfortunately, the conduct of that election and especially its aftermath

has only validated the growing frustration that Russians feel for their rulers. Before the ballots were even cast, a noted Russian election monitoring organization called Golos was subjected to intimidation, harassment, political pressure, and fines. The subsequent election has been criticized by impartial international observers, including the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, which documented in its preliminary assessment numerous irregularities and other efforts by the government to sway a vote in its favor.

Instances of ballot stuffing have been documented. For example, in Chechnya, it was reported that 99 percent of the population participated in the election and 99.5 percent of them voted for Putin's party. That seems a little suspicious, especially considering that the Putin government has waged years of bloody warfare in Chechnya.

Despite the fact that the recent Duma election fell short of international standards and violated Russia's law, substantially fewer Russian voters chose to cast their vote for Putin's party, including in its stronghold and home base of St. Petersburg. This frustration has subsequently poured into the streets where Russian citizens have peacefully sought to demonstrate against the recent election fraud. The Russian Government has responded, in turn, by arresting hundreds of opposition leaders, democracy and human rights activists, journalists, and other members of civil society, including Boris Nemtsov, Alexey Navalny, and Ilya Yashin. Those men and women are exercising universal human rights and fundamental freedoms which should not be a crime in any country.

I call on the Government of Russia to release every Russian citizen who is unjustly detained for political purposes and to clarify the whereabouts and conditions of those individuals.

Mr. President, throughout this year, I have said that the demand for dignity, justice, and democracy that is shaking the Arab world to its foundations will not be confined to that one region alone. It will spread. It will inspire others. It will demonstrate to others that the frustrations, indignities, and lack of hope they may feel today need not be the realities they endure tomorrow. They can change those realities. They can change their destiny. They can change their countries. And it appears that message may be resonating with the people in Russia. We should hope that it does resonate and resonate in a peaceful manner, because we agree with a growing number of Russians who clearly believe they deserve better. They deserve a government that respects and responds to their aspirations for a better life. They deserve the power to freely elect their own leaders.

The political development of Russia is more than an issue of moral principle for the United States. It is closely

tied to our national interests. We have seen in the past that when autocratic governments feel they are losing legitimacy among their people at home, they try to demonize others, both in their country and beyond it, and redirect their public's anger against imaginary enemies. We have seen how the Putin government has done this in the past. We have seen its attempts to paint the United States and our NATO and other allies as enemies of Russia and to lash out against us in the hope of mobilizing public support at home. This is why the growing pattern of confrontation from the Russian Government that we have seen in recent months—over missile defense, resupply efforts into Afghanistan, and other issues—should be so concerning to us and why we must understand that the actions of the Russian Government cannot be separated from its character. In fact, as Russia's Government grows less tolerant of its own people's rights at home, we should not be surprised if it treats us the same way.

As I have said before, I believe we need greater realism about Russia, but that is not the same as pessimism or cynicism or demonization. I am ultimately an optimist, and I often find sources for hope in the most hopeless of places.

One year ago, after languishing in prison for 7 years and facing the near certainty of enduring many more, Mikhail Khodorkovsky spoke before his sentencing about the hopes of the Russian people as they watched his trial. He said:

They are watching with the hope that Russia will after all become a country of freedom and of the law. Where supporting opposition parties will cease being a cause for reprisals. Where the special services will protect the people and the law, and not the bureaucracy from the people and the law. Where human rights will no longer depend on the mood of the tsar, good or evil. Where, on the contrary, the power will truly be dependent on the citizens and the court, only on law and God. For me, as for anybody, it is hard to live in jail, and I do not want to die there. But if I have to, I will not hesitate. The things I believe in are worth dying for.

That there are still men and women of such spirit in Russia is cause for hope. And eventually—maybe not this year or next year or the year after that but eventually—the Russian people will have a government that is worthy of their aspirations, for equal justice can be delayed and human dignity can be denied but not forever.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I thank my most distinguished friend from Arizona for his generous, warm, and friendly remarks. They mean a lot to me. I will never forget them. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today in observation of the surprise attack that the Empire of Japan launched on the U.S. military bases in Hawaii 70 years ago. The attack was

concentrated on the Pearl Harbor Naval Base, where over 2,400 courageous sailors, soldiers, and marines lost their lives. Each year, close to 1½ million people from across the country and around the world visit the memorials at Pearl Harbor to remember the events of December 7, 1941, and how the world was changed forever on that day.

As the Sun rose over Pearl Harbor today, solemn prayers were offered and large crowds gathered to honor the sacrifice made by so many of our brave young men and women.

The National Park Service and the Navy Region Hawaii are hosting the 70th Anniversary Pearl Harbor Day Commemoration at the Pearl Harbor Visitor Center to recognize those who bravely survived the attacks and to remember the thousands more who gave their lives in service to their country that day.

Representative CHARLES WILLIAM "BILL" YOUNG from Florida will be representing Congress at the commemoration ceremony accompanied by William Muehleib, the president of the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, and approximately 100 survivors of the attacks, including 8 who were aboard the USS Arizona, which lies enshrined at the bottom of Pearl Harbor today. The USS Oklahoma, BB 37, Memorial Executive Committee will dedicate a rose granite memorial marker at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific at Punchbowl to honor the memory of the approximately 355 USS Oklahoma sailors who perished but were never individually identified. The remains of two servicemembers will be interred at the USS Utah and the USS Arizona so they may again join their shipmates in accordance with their wishes. And the Hawaii Air National Guard will fly F-22 Raptors over the memorial sites at Pearl Harbor and Hickam Air Force Base in honor of the fallen.

I want to recognize and thank the National Park Service and Navy Region Hawaii for their diligent work and dedication to ensuring that the legacy of the thousands of servicemembers who perished that day lives on through the memorials that stand solemnly at Pearl Harbor. They have done an outstanding job conveying the unwavering spirit of those who, in the face of perilous odds, stood their ground and fought back against the Japanese attack to save the lives of their brothers in arms. The efforts of these organizations have helped to make sure that our country will never forget the tragic loss that all Americans felt as news of the attack spread across the Nation.

We must continue to remember the acts of heroism, bravery, and sacrifice that followed the attack. Our country fought in the name of justice to preserve our Nation's sacred freedoms. And we must also recognize and thank the courageous men and women of our Armed Forces today who are still fighting in the name of those same freedoms. I urge the citizens of this Nation

to recall that it was the collaboration of a country and the sacrifices made by ordinary men and women who rallied in defense of freedom, liberty, and the great promise of our democracy that preserved our Nation's freedom and liberty. It is in that spirit of coming together to save our country that has always produced the strongest results and made our country great.

Mr. President, I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in prayer and remembrance for the men and women who died in Pearl Harbor and those who are still fighting overseas today. May God bless all of those who have served to protect our shores, and God bless America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. SANDERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1960 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SANDERS. With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the school year 2009–2010, the U.S. Department of Education provided \$132 billion in grants and loans to students. That was up from \$49 billion in 2001—a dramatic increase in Federal aid to education. A large part of the increase can be traced to one particular type of school: enrollment at for-profit colleges. That has grown faster than any other sector.

Currently, about 10 percent of the students pursuing education after high school attend for-profit schools—for-profit colleges and different training schools that offer certification in certain skills and certain professions, 10 percent. But that 10-percent portion of students in America account for 25 percent of all the Federal aid to education. In other words, dramatically more money is going to those students than those attending other schools after high school.

When it comes to the student loan defaults, where college students borrow money to go to school and then fail to pay it back, for-profit school students account for 44 percent of the student loan defaults in America. Again, 10 percent of the students, 25 percent of the Federal aid to education, and 44 percent of student loan defaults are attributable to for-profit schools.

The industry is dominated by 10 publicly traded for-profit companies. Of those 10 companies, they enroll almost half the students in for-profit schools.