

other sectors of our economy. Agriculture is a prime example. The Federal Government works diligently to open and maintain international market access for U.S. agricultural producers. This was highlighted very recently by the announcement that Japan would ease its restrictions on U.S. beef imports. Certainly, this is meaningful to my State and the States of others who are in this Chamber right now. This has been a major goal of the current and previous administrations for years, and Japan's decision was hailed by the administration and many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Everyone knows it is a great deal because when you sell products abroad, you both generate wealth at home and expand the size of the market, thereby increasing opportunities for expansion.

The Federal Government should adopt the same perspective with LNG exports. LNG exports will create jobs across the country, bring more wealth to our Nation from abroad, and grow our economy—all at the same time. Meanwhile, we will be providing needed fuel for our allies—Japan, Korea, NATO, and Thailand—who will consequently be able to reduce their reliance on the Middle East.

So it is something that is good for everybody. It is good for our country; it is good for our economy. And all you have to do is, if you want to see that, look up to North Dakota. As I mentioned, a great independent producer, Harold Hamm from Oklahoma, is up there right now, and his biggest problem is they are fully employed.

We have a similar situation in my State of Oklahoma. We have expanded our production to the point where we are not feeling some of the grief you hear in the discussions from the other people on this floor. So I would encourage us to look at this export to keep this market, to get those other 1,600 wells working. This is something that can certainly happen.

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

I notice my time is expiring, but I want to mention something that came out in the State of the Union Message. I hope I will have a chance to do this later on today.

When the President was talking about greenhouse gas, as he has been talking about for a long time, he made several comments. I think this was talked about more in the State of the Union Message than anything else he talked about.

Yes, it's true that no single event makes a trend. But the fact is that the 12 hottest years on record have all come in the last 15.

That is just flat wrong. Even NASA's James Hansen, who officially has been the leader on the other side of this issue, admits that global temperature standstill is real, and mean global temperatures have been flat for the last decade. Later on I am going to go over

one by one the statements he has made. I would only suggest that this is something we need to keep in mind.

In 1895, we went into this hysteria at that time because there was a cold snap: We are all going to freeze to death. Another ice age is coming. We are all going to die.

In 1920, it was the same thing except it was a heat spell. This, obviously, wasn't true at that time, but everyone was getting hysterical. These 20-year cycles keep coming and going. You can set your watch by them. Except in 1945, it was another cold spell that lasted until 1975. The interesting thing about this is that 1945 was the year that had the largest release of CO₂ of any time in the history of this country, and that precipitated not a warming trend but another cold trend. The warming trend, of course, came in 1975.

Anyway, these are cycles. God is still up there. We are going to have these cycles take place. Later on today, hopefully, I want to take each statement that the President has made and show that those statements weren't right.

One thing that is true—one thing that no one disagrees with—is that the cost of having some type of a cap-and-trade system that the President wants would be between \$300 billion and \$400 billion a year. By the admission of the past Director of the EPA, Lisa Jackson—when I asked the question: If we were to incur all these taxes, would something we do in the United States affect the release of CO₂ worldwide, She said: No. Because the problem isn't here. The problem is in China. The problem is in India and other places.

So, again, for those who believe that CO₂ is causing global warming or other climate disasters, keep in mind, even the EPA Director appointed by President Obama agrees that would not reduce any CO₂ worldwide.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, be recognized.

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

THE SEQUESTER

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I am not sure where the Obama administration is getting all of its talking points on the sequester, but the President might want to consider hiring a fact checker.

Even before the sequester took effect, Education Secretary Arne Duncan declared that schoolteachers were getting pink slips. A few days later he had to walk those comments back. He said he was referring to a single school in West Virginia. But when the Washington Post contacted the superintendent of that school, he said not one teacher had gotten a pink slip because of the sequester.

Then President Obama suggested that all of the people who keep the Capitol clean would be suffering a pay cut. But that wasn't true either, according to Capitol Superintendent Carlos Elias.

We have been repeatedly told that the sequester would trigger drastic layoffs of Federal workers. Yet on Monday alone the Federal Government posted literally hundreds of job advertisements.

Finally, just yesterday, when asked to provide evidence for the claim that 70,000 children would be denied access to Head Start because of the sequester, the White House had no details. While the President has been out there playing Chicken Little, Members of Congress have been waiting for the White House to send over its budget.

The law requires the President to transmit a budget by February 4, and we have been now advised his budget will not be forthcoming until March 25. Ironically, that will actually be after the House and the Senate have taken up our own budget, and we will have no input from the President on his proposal.

A few weeks ago I said a second term offers the President a second chance. I still remain hopeful that President Obama will eventually be persuaded to adopt a serious approach for long-term deficit reduction and long-term economic growth.

One of the great tragedies in America today is the fact that our economy is growing so slowly that unemployment rates remain unacceptably high—roughly around 8 percent. That is only after many people have simply given up looking for work. Now more than 20 million people are either out of work or they are working part time when they would prefer to work full time. But that is not going to happen until we get the economy growing again—and that is not going to happen until we get our hands around our long-term deficit and economic growth.

I realize the President and Democrats want to take the House of Representatives back in 2014. The President probably remembers the Halcyon days of 2009 and 2010 when his party controlled the White House, the Senate, and the House. That got us ObamaCare, a \$1 trillion stimulus, and a whole lot more debt, and the Dodd-Frank law—which was targeted at Wall Street but which hit Main Street, including a lot of our community bankers.

There is a time for campaigning and there is a time for governing. But the 2012 election occurred 17 weeks ago and the 2014 election will not occur for another 20 months. Now is the time for governing, not for delivering more partisan stump speeches. In order to govern, the Senate needs to pass a budget, something this Chamber has not done for more than 1,400 days. Over that same period our gross national debt has grown by \$5.5 trillion and we have experienced the weakest economic recovery since the Great Depression.

Since the official end of the recession in June of 2009, the median household income in America has fallen by more than \$2,400. Meanwhile, since the President took office the cost of family health insurance has increased by \$2,300. So not only has household income for most Americans—the median household income, that is—dropped by \$2,400, they are seeing an additional burden of \$2,300 because of ObamaCare.

The bottom line is the American people are tired of the “Chicken Little” stories and they are tired of the fear mongering. They look at what is happening in Washington—I know my constituents in Texas do—and they almost want to turn their eyes in another direction to avert their gaze because they understand that Washington is not serving their interests. If President Obama wants real change, it is time for him to get behind real tax reform and real reform of Social Security and Medicare, something his own bipartisan fiscal commission—Simpson-Bowles—recommended.

After all, the American people did not send us here to kick and scream over a 2.4-percent budget cut. They sent us here to make some hard decisions to ensure long-term economic health and economic prosperity and it is time for the President as the leader of our country and the leader of the free world to take that message to heart.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

BRENNAN NOMINATION

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I rise today to begin to filibuster John Brennan's nomination for the CIA. I will speak until I can no longer speak. I will speak as long as it takes until the alarm is sounded from coast to coast that our Constitution is important, that your rights to trial by jury are precious, that no American should be killed by a drone on American soil without first being charged with a crime, without first being found to be guilty by a court. That Americans could be killed in a cafe in San Francisco or in a restaurant in Houston or at their home in Bowling Green, KY, is an abomination. It is something that should not and cannot be tolerated in our country.

I do not rise to oppose John Brennan's nomination simply for the person. I rise today for the principle. The principle is one that, as Americans, we have fought too long and hard for to give up on, to give up on the Bill of Rights, to give up on the fifth amendment protection that says no person shall be held without due process, that no person shall be held for a capital offense without being indicted. This is a precious American tradition and something we should not give up on easily.

They say Lewis Carroll is fiction; Alice never fell down a rabbit hole, and

the White Queen's caustic judgments are not really a threat to your security. Or has America the beautiful become Alice's Wonderland?

“No, no!” said the Queen. “Sentence first—verdict afterwards.”

“Stuff and nonsense!” Alice said loudly. “The idea of having the sentence first.”

“Hold your tongue!” said the Queen, turning purple.

“I won't!” said Alice.

[“Release the drones,”] said the Queen, as she shouted at the top of her voice.

Lewis Carroll is fiction, right? When I asked the President: Can you kill an American on American soil, it should have been an easy answer. It is an easy question. It should have been a resounding and unequivocal no. The President's response: He hasn't killed anyone yet.

We are supposed to be comforted by that. The President says: I haven't killed anyone yet. . . . He goes on to say: and I have no intention of killing Americans, but I might.

Is that enough? Are we satisfied by that? Are we so complacent with our rights that we would allow a President to say he might kill Americans, but he will judge the circumstances, he will be the sole arbiter, he will be the sole decider, he will be the executioner in chief if he sees fit?

Some will say he would never do this. Many people give the President consideration. They say he is a good man. I am not arguing he is not. What I am arguing is that the law is there, set in place for the day when angels don't rule government. Madison said that the restraint on government was because government will not always be run by angels. This has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican. Were this a Republican President, I would be here saying exactly the same thing: No one person, no one politician should be allowed to judge the guilt—to charge an individual, to judge the guilt of an individual, and to execute an individual. It goes against everything we fundamentally believe in our country. This is not even new to our country. There is 800 years of English law that we founded our tradition on. We founded it upon the Magna Carta from 1215. We founded it upon Morgan of Glamorgan from 725 A.D. We founded it upon the Greeks and Romans who had juries. It is not enough to charge someone to say that they are guilty.

Some might come to this floor and they might say: What if we are being attacked on 9/11? What if there are planes flying at the Twin Towers? Obviously we repel them. We repel any attack on our country. If there is a gentleman or a woman with a grenade launcher attacking our buildings or our Capitol, we use lethal force. You don't get due process if you are involved with actively attacking us, our soldiers, or our government. You don't get due process if you are overseas in a battle, shooting at our soldiers. But that is not what we are talking about.

The Wall Street Journal reported and said that the bulk of the drone attacks

is signature attacks. They do not even know the name of the person. A line or a caravan is going from a place where we think there are bad people to a place where we think they might commit harm and we kill the caravan, not a person. Is that the standard we will now use in America? Will we use a standard for killing Americans to be that we thought you were bad, we thought you were coming from a meeting with bad people and you were in a line of traffic and so therefore you were fine for the killing?

That is the standard we are using overseas. Is that the standard we are going to use here? I will speak today until the President responds and says: No, we won't kill Americans in cafes. No, we won't kill you at home in your bed at night. No, we won't drop bombs on restaurants.

Is that so hard? It is amazing that the President will not respond. I have been asking this question for a month. It is like pulling teeth to get the President to respond to anything and I get no answer. The President says he hasn't done it yet and I am to be comforted. You are to be comforted in your home. You are to be comforted in your restaurant. You are to be comforted in online communicating in your e-mail that the President has not killed an American yet in the homeland. He says he has not done it yet. He says he has no intention to do so.

Hayek said that nothing more distinguishes arbitrary government from a government that is run by the whims of the people than the rule of law. The law is an amazingly important thing, an amazingly important protection. For us to give up on it so easily doesn't speak well of what our Founding Fathers fought for, what generation after generation of American soldiers has fought for, what soldiers are fighting for today when they go overseas to fight wars for us. It doesn't speak well of what we are doing here to protect the freedom at home when our soldiers are abroad fighting for us that we say our freedom is not precious enough for one person to come down and say: Enough is enough, Mr. President, come clean, come forward and say you will not kill Americans on American soil.

The oath of office of the President says that he will, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. He raises his right hand, he puts his left hand on the Bible, and he says “will.” The President doesn't say, I intend to if it is convenient; I intend to unless circumstances dictate otherwise. The President says, “I will defend the Constitution. I will protect the Constitution.”

There is not room for equivocation here. This is something that is so important, so fundamental to our country that he needs to come forward.

When Brennan, whose nomination I am opposing today, was asked directly: Is there any limit to your killing? Is there any geographic limitation to