

Mr. KAIN. I say to the Senator, it is impossible—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Speaking from the old days as a Governor.

Mr. KAIN. It is like the old commercial about the price of various things but some things are priceless. There is no way to estimate it. Just off the top of my head, there have been analyses of the degree to which the Federal budget impacts the economy in each State, and the most recent, done by Bloomberg about 16 months ago, had Virginia as the State most affected by the Federal budget. So the prospect of more brinkmanship around shutdown, which has happened in the past, even if it does not occur, creates great anxiety. But if it were to occur, whether it is the nurses caring for our wounded warriors, whether it is the researchers helping us to figure out how to stay ahead of the cyber attacks that are frankly happening to our Nation every day, or whether it is the shipyard repairers at Newport News Shipyard who manufacture the largest in manufactured items in the world, nuclear aircraft carriers, which should be a story of American pride, who would find their jobs at risk—a shutdown and even the negative consequences of playing out of last year's CR, which is backward-looking rather than forward-looking, are significant. And that is why turning and facing forward is the approach we should take.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Senator for his insightful and cogent comments. He is a great fighter from Virginia. I look forward to working with the Senator from Virginia—just as I have worked with Senator SHELBY—where there is no brinkmanship, no ultimatums. We just want to get the job done. We need to do our job so other people get to do their job so America keeps rolling.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I would like to speak for 15 minutes on the topic of revenue sharing.

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

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I did not come to the floor today to speak on the appropriations and CR, but I want to thank the chairwoman and ranking member for working in a bipartisan way. They are working on finding a solution and an ability to ensure that at the end of the day we can keep this government operating and moving forward, and I thank them for that.

#### REVENUE SHARING

Mr. BEGICH. Madam President, I rise to take exception with some of my colleagues—and I hate to say this—on my side of the aisle. This subject is very frustrating. I am talking about a letter I reviewed from March 8. It is a letter from the Senate Energy Committee. The letter talks about revenue sharing and offshore oil and gas development

and how that Federal revenue should be shared.

When I read this letter, it sounds as if there is some evil monster lurking in the deep, which is far from the truth. It is very frustrating—and I hate to say this—to see some of my fellow Democrats trying to make energy policy without talking to folks who are in the energy-producing States.

Let me make this very clear. I am here to talk about revenue sharing. The letter is laid out as if it is about revenue sharing. After reading the letter, I found out that it is really about opposing offshore oil and gas development of any kind. I come from a State that is heavily invested in this endeavor, and to say revenue sharing is inherently inequitable is somewhat comical. What is inequitable is to drain resources from our energy-producing States without compensating them for the impacts of this needed development.

I introduced legislation 6 weeks ago to make sure Alaskans get their fair share of the resources developed along our coastlines. Our communities are greatly impacted by development. My goal is to share Federal energy resources generated off Alaska's coast with the State and local governments as well as Alaska's Native people. It is just common sense.

My bill not only encourages increased and responsible development of Alaska's energy resource, but it also makes sure our communities benefit directly from oil and gas being produced in our State. The idea is to help State, local, and tribal governments pay for the public sector infrastructure required to develop these resources.

My bill also requires oil produced in the Federal waters of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas—for those who may not always know where Alaska is, it is not near the coast of California, which every map seems to show. It is up north near Canada and has an enormous amount of resources in the Arctic area, and it is called the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas.

My bill also requires oil produced in the Federal waters of the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas to be brought ashore by pipeline. This is safer than tanker transport and secures a future throughput for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline that feeds this country.

The bill provides Alaska with 37.5 percent of Federal bonus bids and royalty shares from any energy development—fossil or renewable. Let me make this clear: Again, when I first read this letter, they seemed to be outraged by revenue sharing. As I look at it closer, it is really about how they don't like offshore development. As I read it, it says they don't like oil and gas.

Before I got here, this Congress passed revenue sharing for the Gulf States, but they excluded Alaska. Even though Alaska is the farthest away from the lower 48, and it is one of this country's fuel sources, there is no rev-

enue stream at all—period. We have a huge impact with the development of our housing, transportation, water, and sewer. We need to have the capacity so these communities can support this large development.

My bill provides just what the Gulf States get—37.5 percent of the Federal revenues. We are not adding new taxes. We are taking what is collected—or in the future what would be collected. The 37.5 percent of Federal revenues would be delivered in the following way: 25 percent will go to the local governments; 25 percent will go to the Alaska Native village and regional corporations. In some ways they are similar to the Indian Country in the lower 48 States but different in how they operate. In any event, it will provide services to Alaska Native communities. Ten percent will go directly to tribal governments, and the remaining 40 percent will go to the State of Alaska to deal with the impacts of this.

This bill also requires 15 percent of the Federal share of royalties be directed to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Why is that important? It is important because that not only touches coastal States, it touches every State. Almost \$900 million annually would be directed for the purpose of land and water conservation throughout this country.

Finally, a percentage of the 37.5 percent of the Federal share would be dedicated directly to deficit reduction.

Again, as I read the letter, they make it sound very evil. They make it sound like it is some monster lurking in the waters. This doesn't sound so evil. This is about fairness to our State and any coastal State that develops oil and gas off their shores.

Again, as I read the letter, it is clear that friends and colleagues on my side of the aisle don't get what it means when we have this type of development and what type of infrastructure we have to provide to balance that infrastructure and ensure the people of that State get the resources and the development they need—especially when we extract from our State. People come and extract from our State and use it elsewhere. Our State should be left with some stream of revenue.

They make a point in the letter, which this bill does address, as far as having 37.5 percent of these resources go to the States. The answer to that is simply, yes. Yes, it does. Relying on the Federal Government to determine what is best for these States doesn't always work out so well. We are now finally doing a CR with some modifications, and I am glad we are.

After 4 years of seeing how this place operates, I will put my bet on State, local, and tribal governments to deliver the services we need. If it means that we take money from the Federal Government and give it to these local communities to do the job, I am all for it.

As a former mayor, I know what we can do when we are given the resources

and how we will spend it efficiently and do what is right for the communities we represent.

I appreciate the moment to talk on this issue. It is frustrating to see these letters. The Presiding Officer is from an energy State and knows what it is like when people propose their ideas for their States—and never talk to us about it—or propose what we should be working on. We should have communication.

It is frustrating to have people from my own side of the aisle say we are not sharing our resources with the rest of the country when we do share. It is also frustrating that some of those on my side of the aisle oppose something which makes so much sense. We need to give more control to the local people who are extracting resources from the coastline.

I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to speak.

At this time I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, shortly we will go to our respective party caucuses. I understand that we are going to be joined by the President of the United States so he may share with us his insights and recommendations to deal with our economy so we can get it going.

I know one of the issues that often comes up is the so-called entitlement reform. This is not the subject we are dealing with on the Appropriations Committee, but I would like to talk briefly about how we do impact the funding of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

I would like to take a minute to talk about Medicaid. I want to talk about what Medicaid funds. Remember, Medicaid, by and large, is not in our Appropriations Committee. Medicaid is not in our Appropriations Committee, but the people who work for Medicaid are. And that is a different topic.

I want everybody to understand Medicaid because it is a subject of great debate—and often a prickly debate. Eighty percent of the beneficiaries on Medicaid are children. Usually they are children of the working poor. It helps them to get the health care they need for the early detection of hearing problems. It may also be for a child with diabetes the family is concerned about.

Although 80 percent of the beneficiaries are children, 80 percent of the money goes to seniors or people in nursing homes or assisted-living homes

due to some form of neurological or cognitive impediment.

Now, I don't want to sound like an MD, I don't even have a Ph.D, but from talking to my constituents, I do know 80 percent of those in long-term care facilities are often there due to something related to dementia, such as Alzheimer's or a neurological impediment such as Parkinson's.

Let's talk about NIH—and, remember, NIH does funding at the Bethesda campus in Maryland, and it also gives grants to brilliant researchers who are usually working in academic centers of excellence. Those centers could be Johns Hopkins or the University of Maryland or the University of Alabama or Kentucky. Those grants are competitive and peer-reviewed.

Let me get to the point I am trying to make. By funding NIH and the National Institutes of Aging, we are on a breakthrough trajectory for finding the cognitive stretch-out for Alzheimer's.

I have been on this for more than 20 years because my dear father, who ensured my education and looked out for me all the way through raising me as a young lady, died of the consequences of Alzheimer's. Alzheimer's is an equal opportunity catastrophe for the high and mighty and for the ordinary. Our own endearing President Ronald Reagan died of the consequences of Alzheimer's, as did my father, ordinary people, men and women who helped build America.

So we need to make public investments in research to find the cure for Alzheimer's and, if not a cure, cognitive stretchout. What do I mean by cognitive stretchout? It means if we have early detection, new tools, new MRI technology, new ways of identifying it early on, what could we do to prevent memory loss? If we could do it in 3 to 5 years, we would reduce the cost of Medicaid spending. If we find a cure for Alzheimer's alone—and I am not even talking about Lou Gehrig's disease or Parkinson's—we could reduce the Medicaid budget by 50 percent—50.

Nancy Reagan has spoken about it. Sandra Day O'Connor has spoken about it. BARB MIKULSKI is speaking about it. Most of all, America speaks, through the Alzheimer's Association and other groups. They march for the cure. They march for the stretchout. In that one area alone, we could have a dramatic impact on the lives of American families and on the future of Federal spending in Medicaid. It would meet a compelling human need. When a person has Alzheimer's, the whole family has Alzheimer's. I remember my dear mother, as my father became more and more lost in his memory, had to work a 36-hour day, as the family did as well, looking out for him. We were more than willing to do it.

I was born in the 1930s. I was a school girl in the 1940s and 1950s. There wasn't much talk about educating girls. But not from my father. I have two wonderful sisters. My father wanted his girls

to have an education. He felt that by giving us an education, he could give us something nobody would ever take away from us so we would be ready for whatever life sent us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority time has expired.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no objection but—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Oh, I am sorry. I didn't realize—

Mr. GRAHAM. No objection, I just need about 7 or 8 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Let me just finish this, if I might. I need just 2 minutes. I didn't realize the Senator from South Carolina was on the floor.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I just want to make this point. My mother and father saw to my education. My father's business burned down when I was a senior in high school. My mother moved Heaven and Earth for me to go to college. When my father was stricken with the consequences of Alzheimer's, I was determined to move Heaven and Earth to help him. There was little help available.

It is not just about my father. It is about mothers and fathers everywhere. Let's spend the money where the people want us to spend it. Let's meet a compelling human need now and do the research we need to do to help those families and help the Federal budget in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

#### ENEMY COMBATANTS

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I wish to bring the body's attention to a recent decision by the Obama administration to place the son-in-law of Osama bin Laden, Mr. Abu Ghaith—I think I am pronouncing the name correctly—into Federal district court in New York charged with conspiracy to kill American citizens. He has been presented to our criminal justice system. He is, in my view, the classic example of an enemy combatant.

I will be, along with Senator AYOTTE, writing the Attorney General asking for a rundown of how long he was interrogated before he was read his Miranda rights. I believe this is a classic example of a person of great intelligence value who should have been held as an enemy combatant at Guantanamo Bay for intelligence-gathering purposes as long as it took to get good intelligence. He, in my view, is a treasure trove of information about not only al-Qaeda but maybe things going on in Iran. There is an allegation of his being held in Iran for a very long time as their houseguest, for lack of a better word.

I fear greatly we are beginning to go back to the criminal justice model that