

who were fragile in health died during that period. In the heat wave in Europe in 2003, 70,000 people died.

In Russia in 2010, a week-long heat wave sent temperatures soaring above 100 degrees Fahrenheit in areas where the average temperature that time of year is 67 degrees. Mr. President, 56,000 people died during that period as a result of that heat wave, and wildfires created a smoke plume nearly 2,000 miles wide, which was visible from space.

So this is not some kind of abstract issue: Oh, my goodness; isn't it too bad it is really hot today. What we are talking about are prolonged heat waves that kill substantial numbers of people.

In India in 2010, they recorded temperatures of over 100 degrees that killed hundreds of people; Chile in 2011, a heat wave, drought, and wildfire destroyed 57,000 acres of forest and land and forced 500 people to evacuate; Australia in 2012, the start of 2012 was the hottest start of any year for Australia in the century, according to ABC News, with temperatures exceeding 104 degrees and electricity cut off in some areas to prevent the igniting of fires.

Prolonged and more severe drought is likely to increase as global warming continues, according to the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado. This means increased risk of crop failure, wildfires, and water scarcity. A recent study published in Scientific American found that climate change has cut production of cereal crops—wheat, rice, corn, soybeans—causing these crops to be nearly 19 percent more expensive than if global warming was not occurring.

I could go on and on about this issue. But the main point I want to make is the following, and let me summarize it here. According to virtually the entire scientific community in the United States of America and around the world, according to virtually every agency of the United States Government, global warming is real, and it is significantly caused by human activity. People are mistaken if they believe the impact of global warming will just be in decades to come. We are seeing very negative impacts today. The scientific community tells us if we do not begin to reverse greenhouse gas emissions, those problems in America and around the world will only get worse.

If there is a silver lining in all of that, it is that right now we know how to cut greenhouse gas emissions. We know how to move to energy efficiency, mass transportation, and automobiles that get 50, 60, 100 miles per gallon. We know how to weatherize our homes so we can cut significantly the use of fuel. What we also know is that in the middle of this recession, if we move in that direction—energy efficiency and sustainable energy—we can create over a period of years millions of good-paying jobs.

Let me conclude by saying: we now have the opportunity to be in a win-

win-win situation. We can save consumers money, we can significantly reduce greenhouse gases and protect our planet, and we can create substantial numbers of jobs that we desperately need in the midst of this terrible recession.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### SYNTHETIC DRUG USE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in the fall of 2010 I came to this Chamber to speak about my growing concern of synthetic drug use in this country.

Specifically, I raised concerns about a popular new drug known as K2, or Spice, and I learned about this myself for the first time because a constituent of mine by the name of David Rozga committed suicide. David killed himself shortly after smoking a package of the drug he and some friends bought at a local shopping mall.

At the time, David's death in June 2010 was one of the first associated with what was a new and very dangerous drug craze. Nearly 2 years after David's death, the use of synthetic drugs like K2 has exploded and is becoming a major problem across the country.

In 2009 the American Association of Poison Centers reported only 13 calls concerning synthetic drug use. One year later, in 2010, over 1,300 calls were made to poison centers about synthetic drugs. So I have gone from 2009 to 2010, and now 2011. We have gone from 13 to 1,300 to last year, 12,000 calls to poison centers regarding synthetic drugs.

The Monitoring the Future Survey, a survey of high school youth, asked students for the first time last year if they ever tried synthetic drugs. Roughly one in nine high school seniors responded they used synthetic drugs last year.

These numbers are quite obviously an astonishing increase in just 2 years and they illustrate, of course, how rapidly the use of these drugs has come on the scene. These drugs are having a terrible effect on those who use them. Emergency room doctors across the country are reporting increasing uses of synthetic drugs in the number of users coming to the hospital.

My staff heard from one such doctor from upstate New York about what she has seen. Dr. Sandra Schneider, from Rochester, NY, reported that users in her ER experienced psychotic episodes, rapid heart rate, very high blood pressure, and seizures. In some cases, users—many of whom were in their teens and twenties—suffered heart attacks and strokes and died as a result.

Other cases involved users who tried to kill themselves, harm others, or got into a car accident while high on these synthetic drugs.

How do we get from practically no use to where we are now? The people who manufacture and sell these drugs have circumvented the laws to easily sell synthetic drugs online, at gas stations, in novelty stores at the local shopping malls, and in tobacco stores and other shops. Many of the drugs are manufactured overseas, in countries such as China, and then imported into the United States. They spray chemical compounds, that have not been tested on humans and were not intended for human consumption, on dried leaves. They package and market these drugs to appear as legitimate products such as incense, bath salts, plant food, and snow remover. They slap a label on these packages stating that the product is not for human consumption to get around FDA regulations.

Over 30 States have passed laws to ban various synthetic drug compounds. The Drug Enforcement Administration has also acted to stop these drugs. Although the DEA has used its emergency scheduling powers to control seven chemical compounds, there are too many on the market now for DEA to go through the long and laborious process to schedule each and every one. The makers of these drugs know this as well and have altered their chemical formulas—some as little as a molecule—to get around existing State and Federal laws.

This is exactly the case in my home State of Iowa. Iowa passed a law last year that banned many chemical compounds. However, the law only listed a specific set of chemical compounds and the drugmakers are now altering their formulas.

Recently, two Iowa youths have become victims of the new drugs. One is a Polk County teenager who got into a high-speed crash smoking a product called 100 Percent Pure Evil.

This teen had two other passengers in her car. After smoking this product the driver became agitated and stated she wanted to kill herself. She started driving her car into several trees. When paramedics arrived at the scene they reported that everyone was badly hurt and the driver was vomiting blood. Thankfully all passengers survived the crash.

Another teen in central Iowa experienced a near-death experience after smoking the same product. This teen purchased the product—remember the name, 100 Percent Pure Evil—purchased it at a local store and started convulsing and vomiting shortly after smoking the drug. Once a paramedic got this boy into the hospital he fell into a coma. He, however, awoke from the coma the next day but had failed to recognize his mother or grandmother at the hospital. Thankfully this boy has since recovered his memory. Now he suffers occasional anxiety attacks.

When the boy's mother told the police about the product and where he got it, she reported that the police told her there was nothing they could do about it because it was not known what was in the product and it may be legal. This product is still being reviewed to see if any compounds fall under Iowa's law.

Nearly a year ago I introduced this legislation we named after the person who died 2 years ago, David Rozga. I introduced this bill with Senator FEINSTEIN. It bans the chemicals that comprise K2/Spice. We designed the legislation to capture a wide variety of compounds so it would not be so easy to circumvent this law by altering the molecule. In fact, the Iowa Governor's Office of Drug Control Policy is crafting new legislation based on the legislation I introduced last year that captures more substances. My legislation was unanimously passed out of the Judiciary Committee 8 months ago. It is currently being prevented from consideration by the full Senate by one Senator. The House of Representatives passed its version of the Synthetic Drug Control Act overwhelmingly last December, with over 70 percent of the Representatives supporting scheduling these drugs.

Many of the opponents of this legislation stated on the House floor that by scheduling these compounds we are preventing scientific research. This is far from true. Any scheduled substance, even current Schedule I drugs such as cocaine and heroin, can be researched. Any scientist can apply to be registered by the DEA to research any drug. Just because we are removing the drugs from the store shelves does not mean we cannot study them.

I say to my colleagues, it is now time for the Senate to take action. We cannot let the will of one Senator obstruct the will of many. I believe if our legislation received a vote and a fair debate in this body, it would pass overwhelmingly. So I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to get these drugs off the store shelves and off the streets, and I urge the Senate leadership to allow a debate and a vote on the issue. The American people, people such as the Rozga family and others who have been victims of these drugs, want to see this poison removed from their communities.

I appreciate working together with the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York on this bill and similar bills as well.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Minnesota.

**Ms. KLOBUCHAR.** Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa. I thank him for his remarks. I think you can tell this is a very important issue but also one that is bipartisan. As he pointed out with the vote on the House side, this was a bipartisan issue over there. It was bipartisan on the Judiciary Committee. We simply need to

allow for a debate and a vote in a timely manner on these bills.

I also know Senator CHUCK SCHUMER from New York will be joining us, another senior member of the committee. We are all three on the Judiciary Committee, with Senator GRASSLEY being the ranking Republican on the committee. So we have much support for this bill.

Today I want to take a few minutes to add to the comments of Senator GRASSLEY about the growing threat to people of all ages, but particularly to our young people, of the dangerous synthetic drugs that are becoming, sadly, more and more common in our communities.

There have been reports from States around the country of people acting violently while under the influence of these drugs, leading to deaths or injuries to themselves or to others. While taking these drugs, people can experience elevated heart rates and blood pressure, hallucinations, seizures, and extreme agitation. They are very dangerous.

These synthetic drugs have exploded as an issue in recent years. Until 2006 I was the county attorney for Hennepin County, which is Minnesota's largest county. It actually is about a fourth of our State in terms of the population. During that time two words I never heard were "synthetic drugs." We were focused on crack, we were focused on methamphetamine, we were focused on laws to contain that, but synthetic drugs were not something we talked about. It is an example of how quickly this drug has come on the scene. Poison control centers and emergency rooms from across the United States are reporting dramatic increases in the number of calls and visits relating to synthetic drugs. In 2011, poison control centers across America received more than 13,000 calls about synthetic drugs. Think about that. Do you know what the number was in 2010, a year before? It was 3,200; it was 3,200 in 2010, 13,000 in 2011. In Minnesota there was a total of 392 calls to poison control relating to synthetic drugs in 2011, compared to 111 in 2010, so you are seeing a four-times increase in our State and across the country in terms of the rise of this drug.

A recent report by the National Institutes of Health shows that one in nine high school seniors admitted to using synthetic marijuana during this past year, so it is clearly a rapidly growing problem.

This all hit home in my State with the tragic death of 19-year-old Trevor Robinson in Blaine, MN, who overdosed on a synthetic hallucinogen known as 2C-E. Last year another young man shot himself in our State under the influence of synthetic drugs. I can only imagine the pain and anguish their friends and families must feel. It is anguishing. This is a life-and-death issue. It is not something where we can put our head in the sand and pretend it is not happening. This is a new type of drug, it is a dangerous drug.

We have begun to take action. We have to take action on both the State and Federal level and we are making progress on a few fronts. I introduced a bill which would add 2C-E, the drug that killed the young man in my State, and similar drugs to a list of banned substances so they will be treated in the same manner as other banned drugs that they mimic, such as heroin.

I am also cosponsor of the bill Senator GRASSLEY referenced and also Senator SCHUMER has another bill to ban other types of synthetic drugs. Basically one bans the bath salts, one is focused on synthetic marijuana, and my bill is on the synthetic hallucinogens. All three of these bills passed the Judiciary Committee in July and one has already passed the House with a very strong vote.

Unfortunately, as Senator GRASSLEY also mentioned, a hold has been placed on all three of the Senate bills by one Senator. That is extremely unfortunate. These drugs can kill, and if we do not take action they are going to become more and more prevalent and put more and more people at risk. We cannot wait around and let these important bills languish in procedural gridlock, especially because of one Senator.

We are going to keep fighting here in the Senate until those laws get passed. We have seen in Minnesota, with the tragic story of Trevor Robinson, what these drugs can do and I for one do not want to see it happen again, not in my State, not anywhere in the country. I understand the Senator who is holding these bills has genuine and philosophical opposition and he deserves to be heard on his objections. My suggestion is that we come to an agreement so we can have a period of debate on these bills, a simple period of debate. This should not be a week-long debate. We can take the floor and speak to this issue and he can speak as long as he likes. We are not asking him to change his position. We want him to be heard but we simply want to have a period of debate and then a vote. That is what the Senate should be about.

Luckily, the Drug Enforcement Administration is taking its own action and has temporarily banned some synthetic drugs, but most of the substances in these bills have not been banned, including all of the substances in my bill. On the State level, roughly 40 States have banned some synthetic drugs, including Minnesota, where a major law regarding synthetic drugs took effect in July. But that means that some States have not banned any of these drugs yet and some have banned only certain types, so people can go to other States to buy them legally or buy them on the Internet. That is one of the reasons we need this Federal law.

Also, local law enforcement needs a strong ally in the Federal authorities as they try to turn the tide against synthetic drugs. Sadly, many of these instances I have seen in our State with

synthetic drugs involve more rural communities—towns that may not have the ability to call in a bunch of lab technicians and experts to be able to testify about what type of synthetic drug it is. That is why, for the sake of that law community, it is important we get it on that Federal list and we also make it very clear it is banned. Passing a Federal law will help create a partnership and will send a strong message that we need to eradicate these substances.

I do think we have made progress by raising awareness of this issue, which will lead to better education efforts, more vigilance by parents, and more attention by law enforcement. Now that the DEA has become more familiar with these substances, it will be better equipped to combat the problem. But the fact remains that the most important thing we can do on the Federal level is to pass these three bills that have already been approved unanimously by the Judiciary Committee. These bills won't solve the problem overnight, but they are the first step we need to take, and we need to do it now. Before we lose more kids, before these drugs spread any further, let's pass these bills. As I mentioned, it is estimated that one in nine high school seniors has tried synthetic marijuana. I don't want to wake up a year from now and read that it has increased to one in seven or one in five. Let's have a debate. Let's hear what the objections are, and then let's pass these bills. I really think we can save lives. While there is still time to catch up, we should be doing everything we can to address these problems.

I thank my colleagues, Senator GRASSLEY, the ranking Republican Senator from Iowa on the Judiciary Committee, who has already spoken, and Senator CHUCK SCHUMER from New York, who is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee. We are doing this as a team. We think it is very important that you, Mr. President, and the rest of the Senate have the opportunity to vote on these bills and have the opportunity to debate them. We hope we can achieve this goal procedurally so we can move forward in the way we are supposed to.

I yield the floor. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today I rise to join my colleagues, Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator GRASSLEY, to discuss an epidemic overtaking our country: synthetic drugs. I wish to compliment both of my colleagues. Each of us has been working on this issue in different ways, and we com-

bined our three approaches into one piece of legislation that will go a long way toward helping to keep our kids away from drugs they should not have.

Synthetic drugs are an epidemic overtaking our country. They are also known as bath salts or, in the case of manmade marijuana, spice or incense. They are given innocent names, but they are deadly. Synthetic drugs are not sold on street corners by slingers who keep stashes hidden in alleys. Instead, these drugs can be found in local corner stores across the country. They are as easy to buy as a lollipop or a carton of milk, but they are much more dangerous.

No wonder emergency rooms and poison control centers have seen an enormous rise in patients who have taken these drugs and must seek help. The numbers are nothing short of eye-popping. Poison control centers reported 13 calls concerning these products in 2009, over 1,000 calls in 2010, and over 6,500 in 2011—from 13 calls to over 6,500 calls in 2 years. For every call they get, there are many people taking these drugs with no call at all. One survey, in fact, indicates that one in nine high school seniors used synthetic drugs in the past year. That is a frightening, astounding, and devastating number.

The Senate has before it a rare opportunity to do something simple and right that will actually go a very long way to fixing this crisis. We have three bills—Senator KLOBUCHAR's, my colleague from Minnesota, Senator GRASSLEY's, my colleague from Iowa, and mine—that would place the chemical components that make up these substances directly on schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act without waiting for the DEA to go through its yearlong listing process. Our communities desperately need us to make these drug compounds illegal once and for all. The DEA wants us to go ahead and make them illegal, and so does the FDA. There is no legitimate or commercial use for these compounds.

Our bills passed out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously and with no opposition. The House passed its version of our bills with little opposition. All we have to do now is put them on the floor and have a vote or simply pass them unanimously. But one of my colleagues has put a hold on these bills—just one. That is fine. I am in favor of protecting my colleague's rights, as they are my rights and Senator KLOBUCHAR's and Senator GRASSLEY's rights. But one Senator should not be able to prevent a vote on something that 99 percent of Americans want that directly affects their health and safety and the health and safety of their children. So I have a suggestion. Why can't we at least put these bills on the floor, and our colleague can air his opposition and see if he can win people over to his point of view? This really should not take more than an hour or two of our business.

Law enforcement and health professionals are begging for this bill. I know

for a fact that parents and families in my State are begging for this to become law. A lot of us have worked hard on this issue because it is of critical importance to our communities and States.

Before I go any further, I again want to compliment and commend my colleagues, Senators KLOBUCHAR and GRASSLEY, as well as Senator FEINSTEIN, who is not here with us this afternoon, for their excellent leadership on banning these so-called designer drugs.

On Monday I was in Rochester, NY, to discuss Senator GRASSLEY's synthetic marijuana bill with local law enforcement and emergency room doctors. I heard horrific stories of patients who smoked synthetic marijuana and ended up crazed in the emergency room. Everyone I met with urged me to help ban these substances as soon as possible.

My own bill, the Combating Dangerous Synthetic Stimulants Act, bans two more of these drugs, mephedrone and methylenedioxypyrovalerone—fortunately, it is regularly known as MDPV—and they are commonly sold as bath salts. By calling them bath salts, manufacturers are trying to deliberately mislead people into thinking they are an everyday product. It is despicable when young kids—14, 15, 16 years old—try bath salts and they think it is harmless. These dangerous drugs are sold in convenience stores and smoke shops for as little as \$14 to \$40. And what are their names? Tranquility, Zoom, White Lightning, and Hurricane Charlie. These so-called bath salts or plant foods are nothing more than deadly narcotics, and they are being sold cheaply to all comers with no questions asked at store counters around the country. How is it possible that such deadly drugs are legal? Because by marketing them as bath salts, which aren't for human consumption, they aren't regulated. These bath salts have much the same effects, according to users, as cocaine or ecstasy, but they are preferred because they are cheaper and more readily accessible. In fact, according to court papers obtained by the Staten Island Advance, one of our fine local papers in New York, a seller in Brooklyn boasted to a Federal agent that the bath salts would deliver a better high than cocaine.

This ease of access does not, however, translate into their safe use. A recent New York Times article reported that an individual high on bath salts had climbed a roadside flagpole and jumped into traffic, broken into a monastery and stabbed a priest, and scratched herself to pieces because something was under her skin.

One of these drugs, Cloud 9, is so easily accessible it is sold on amazon.com. A person can go on amazon.com and buy this horrible stuff. How much? Sixteen dollars, plus shipping. It is accessible to anybody. Can my colleagues guess what item most customers buy

with this specific bath salt? Is it relaxing candles or lotion? Is it soap? No. The item customers most buy with this bath salt is Click N Smoke all In One Vaporizer With Wind Proof Torch Lighter. That is the name of the product. One does not need much of an imagination to believe that the purchasers of Cloud 9 are smoking these drugs and not adding them to a relaxing bath.

These drugs are the worst kind. Not only do they cause people to perform horrible actions, but they also give the impression that they are legal, that they are innocuous. Make no mistake that these drugs can and will cause harm to their users. At least 30 States, including my home State of New York, have recognized these drugs as harmful. They have banned bath salts at the State level. But only the DEA—the Drug Enforcement Agency—and the resources that are behind it can keep these drugs from coming into our country, from crossing State lines, and from morphing time and again to evade State bans. That is why we need these bills.

The DEA temporarily banned two of these substances in November. However, the clock is now ticking until this temporary ban ends. FDA and HHS must complete a complicated checklist in the remaining 7 months to prevent these drugs from returning to the corner store.

We must provide the DEA with a permanent ban before the time runs out. This will provide them with the necessary tools to address these legal drugs on a national stage. The DEA has the ability to spearhead multi-State and international investigations to prevent the manufacture and sale of bath salts.

These drugs are deadly and dangerous. Yet they are easier to buy than cigarettes in many States. Parents should not worry that each time their child goes into a convenience store or gas station, he or she can buy a deadly drug.

This bill has broad bipartisan support. We cannot wait for another parent to lose a child because of the inaction of the Senate. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the legislation. Once again, I implore my colleague—the single Senator who is holding up this bill—I hope he will not agree to set aside his differences, which come from a deep Libertarian ideological perspective that is different than most Americans have, but agree not to block them but to debate them and let them come up for a vote.

I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my Republican colleagues for up to 30 minutes.

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

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. PORTMAN. As the Presiding Officer knows, this week the President sent his budget to Congress. This happens every year. The budget is a document that determines what the spending will be and what the revenues will be not just for the next fiscal year but for a 10-year period. So it is a document about what the direction of our country ought to be. It is a vision for the country, if you will.

It is being sent to the Congress at a time when we face extraordinary fiscal challenges. We have a record debt of over \$15 trillion. We have deficits that have been over \$1 trillion a year for the last several years, and it looks as though this year, once again, it will be well over \$1 trillion.

In comparison to previous years, we have a debt that is now as large as our entire economy, which is larger than at any time since World War II. In fact, as a country, we are spending more money at the Federal level than we ever have before—as a percent of GDP, more than we ever have since World War II. So these are times when we have a true fiscal crisis at our doorstep and we need to handle it.

We are borrowing over 35 cents of every \$1 we spend at the Federal level. In that context, I have to say I am very disappointed in the budget proposal that was sent to us because it is simply not up to the challenges we face. It taxes too much, it borrows too much, and it spends too much. Unfortunately, it adds another \$11 trillion to the national debt over this 10-year period—again, a debt that already tops 100 percent of our country's economy. It does nothing to change the fact that Social Security and Medicare are in trouble—very important programs, of course, but by not addressing them in this budget document it means what everybody knows, which is that unless we do something that will head toward solvency, this will continue to be the case.

Remarkably, I thought, the President proposes another \$350 billion in a so-called stimulus bill within this budget and pays for it either in red ink, with more borrowing, or by raising taxes. It actually raises taxes by nearly \$2 trillion over this 10-year period. This is despite the fact the Congressional Budget Office has told us that by raising taxes, we are going to hurt the economy. In fact, it would result in higher unemployment next year than this year.

We all know the long-term driver of these deficits is entitlement spending. These important programs, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, along with interest on the debt, are called

the mandatory spending part of the budget. That is now a bigger and bigger part of the budget and the fastest growing part of the budget. It is 64 percent of the budget this year.

Under what the President has proposed, for the next 10 years, that mandatory spending—which means it is not subject to annual appropriations by Congress; again, important programs but not on a sustainable path—this mandatory spending will grow from 64 percent of the budget—where it is today, which has grown and grown over the years—to 78 percent of the budget in 10 years, under the budget proposal the President has put forward.

Republicans, Democrats, Independents alike, we know this is not sustainable. It is not sustainable and, unfortunately, it is going to hurt these programs in a way that is going to make it very difficult for our seniors and others who rely on them.

Overall, the President's promise of deficit reduction also does not look like it works. The budget claims \$5.3 trillion in deficit reduction over the next decade. However, if we look at it, that \$5.3 trillion does not come from spending cuts. Looking at a budget table, table 3—and I ask folks at home to take a look at this—99.9 percent of that \$5.3 trillion in so-called deficit reduction does not come from spending cuts, it comes from tax increases—almost \$2 trillion—a savings that is considered to be a gimmick of saying we are not going to spend as much in Iraq and Afghanistan. Everybody knows we are not going to spend as much there. Yet they take credit for that. Already enacted spending caps—remember, the discretionary spending caps were put in place, the so-called sequestration or across-the-board cuts, they take credit for those which have already been enacted and then, finally, the net interest savings from all those policies, which is about \$800 billion, they say.

So again, almost all that so-called deficit reduction over the next decade comes not from spending cuts but, in fact, from either gimmicks, tax increases or things Congress has already done. That leaves very little—about \$4 billion out of the \$5.3 trillion—that is truly spending reductions.

By the way, on top of that, in the so-called baseline that the President bases his numbers off of—in other words, we have to determine what would the spending otherwise be—in that baseline, there is another \$479 billion in new spending on Pell grants, the Medicare doc fix, and so on.

So the spending savings completely vanish when we put all that together. That is not the kind of budget we need right now.

Last year, the President submitted a budget that I thought was a good political document, also, but did not address our budget problems, and we took it to the floor of this Senate for a vote. In the Senate, last year, the President's budget was voted on by Republicans and Democrats, and it lost by a vote of 97 to 0.