

me in the outrage I feel about the dentist in Oklahoma or the endoscopy center in Nevada or the nursing home director in California. In any case where prosecution is appropriate, an investigation should be done properly by State authorities who have jurisdiction, and they should condemn such practices. I ask them to join me in resolution S. 134.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oklahoma, recognizing that he has other accommodations he has to deal with. I ask unanimous consent I be granted up to 4 minutes to speak after the Senator from Oklahoma completes his comments.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask the Chair if I am correct when I say after comments by the Senator from Virginia, the senior Senator from Texas will be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### IRAN SANCTIONS IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, I think we, all of us, late in the week, are on a timeline. I have a very significant piece of legislation, S. 965, called the Iran Sanctions Implementation Act. I spent a long time on the floor yesterday talking about this. It occurred to me it is a little bit complicated. The longer we talk about it the more complicated it gets. I have shortened it. Let me make a couple of brief comments about where we are today in relationship to Iran and some of the other countries in the Middle East, and a solution to which everyone can agree to the problem that is there.

First of all, 70 percent of Iran's revenues come from their export of oil. What we have done successfully is had some modest means of reducing that, so we have actually cut their amount of exports in half over the last 4 or 5 years from 2.5 million barrels of oil a day to 1.25 million barrels of oil a day. That amounts to 70 percent of the resources, the revenue that Iran has.

What do they do with their revenue? First of all, we recognize something that people do not like to talk about; that is, our own intelligence says, and has said since 2007, by 2015 Iran will have a weapon and the delivery system for that weapon.

Our concern, of course, is that one of the things that happened in Barack Obama's first budget 4 years ago was, in addition to other things regarding the military, they did away with the ground-based interceptor in Poland which was designed specifically to take care of a missile coming from the east and, of course, what we had there was the threat from Iran. That is a threat.

The second thing they have, besides their nuclear buildup, is they are helping all the terrorist operations throughout the Middle East. We know they are very significant in assisting Assad in his barbaric slaughter of over 70,000 of the Syrian people. They are able to do this because Iran earns \$3 billion a month in oil revenue, 70 percent of their revenue. If Iran didn't have access to this money, its ability to influence the region would be either stopped or significantly curtailed. In other words, Iran cannot pose this threat without their oil revenues.

U.S. production is now 7 million barrels a day, which is 40 percent higher—put the chart up, please—40 percent higher than in 2008. When we look at the map, we can see back in the old days the oil belt was the western part of the United States. Look at it now. It has all changed. We have the Marcellus up there in Pennsylvania, which is now the second largest employer in Pennsylvania. It is scattered throughout.

The reason for this surge is because the use of horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing has allowed us to reach reserves, reach production we otherwise could not do.

Here is the interesting thing: We have grown by 40 percent in our production, and all 100 percent of it is on State or private land. None of it is on Federal land. In fact, during this boom we are in the middle of right now that is so productive to the economy of most of the States, none of that came from the Federal Government. In fact, we had a reduction during this time in production from Federal lands.

The Institute for Energy Research recently issued a report stating that if we enacted policies that allowed aggressive development of all this off-limits land that is there right now, it would generate \$14 trillion in economic activity, create 2.5 million jobs, and reduce the deficit by \$2.7 billion. Most of all, we could become totally independent from having to import our energy from any other country.

This bill says if the President would, at his discretion—it would require the President to find some area where we can just increase our production from Federal lands 1.25 million barrels a day. That is just a small, minuscule part of all the production we could have. For example, in just this area, that would exceed 1.25 million barrels a day or this up here, in Alaska, or even offshore.

The Senator from Virginia is going to be speaking next. They have actually voted to go ahead and explore this off their shores. Any of these places would do that.

Why do we say 1.25 million barrels a day? That is what Iran exports. This is what would happen: If we were able to do that, that would be 1.25 million barrels a day that we in the United States would no longer have to import, which would open that up to those who are importing from Iran, and it would completely dry up 70 percent of their rev-

enue. Of course, the rewards of that would be great for our country.

We are looking at one of these rare situations where everything is good, everything that would come from this is beneficial. We could dry up their revenues that they are using right now to enhance their nuclear capability and to perform all these atrocious acts in the Middle East. At the same time, we would be able to lessen our dependence and provide all of the benefits that come from the use of this.

Eventually, we would like to be at a situation where we can do not just 1.25 million barrels a day but maybe 10 times that and become totally independent. In the meantime, we are only talking about one very small amount that we would be telling the President of the United States he is going to have to allow us to explore so we can stop Iran from doing the things they are doing today.

I thank those who have allowed me to have a little bit of time today, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Virginia.

#### SEQUESTRATION

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma and wish him good travels.

I rise briefly today to point out one more time some of the ramifications of the policy I have repeatedly called stupidity on steroids, which is our sequestration policy. Word came out earlier this week from the Department of Defense that the Secretary, to meet his sequestration numbers, is going to have to furlough teachers in Department of Defense schools for 5 days and education support personnel for 11 days.

Many of us on the floor of the Senate stand and praise our men and women who serve in the military, who defend our freedoms. I cannot think of anything that is more of an antithesis to those words we say, that we would praise their service, if we say: Yes, you go off and defend our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan; meanwhile, your families and your children cannot go to school.

What makes this particularly difficult to stomach at this point is just today, Blue Star Families—one of our Nation's best veterans organizations, veterans support group organizations—came out and said in a list of priorities for military families, No. 1, the impact of deployments, repeated deployments on military families and particularly children; and, No. 2, military children education.

In my State and many other States, military families, particularly on base, have a military DOD school. Those schools provide a valuable service to those military families oftentimes who have their parents deployed. In my mind, how can we stand on the floor of this Senate and commend those men and women who serve and at the same

time say we support that service: We want to support you at home, but not enough to not have your kids have to miss 5 days of school because their teachers are furloughed or providers of other support services for educational personnel are furloughed for 11 days.

I am going to write Secretary Hagel, and I ask that all of my colleagues join with me in this matter in urging that the furloughs of these educators who educate the children of our military families be exempted from the process of sequestration.

While it begs the large question that the Nation confronts a \$16 trillion debt, I think most of us in this Chamber know that the only way we are going to get to a solution is if those of us on this side of the aisle find a way to make smart and sensible reforms to our entitlement programs. Our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle are going to have to work with us to find ways to generate additional revenues; otherwise, we are going to keep coming back to the kinds of cuts we have seen in sequestration and in domestic discretionary.

We are on a current path that would take domestic discretionary spending from 16 percent of our Federal spending down to 4 percent. As a business investor, I would never invest in a business that spent less than 5 percent of its resources on its workforce and infrastructure.

So today I rise on the issue of making sure we actually honor those military families of whom we speak so often and make sure their kids get to go to school next year and don't have to lose valuable educational time because their teachers are furloughed. I hope my colleagues will join me on the letter to Secretary Hagel.

With that, I yield the floor, and I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### OBAMACARE

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we have been informed that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has become a private fundraiser to raise funds from the very industry she regulates in order to implement ObamaCare. This raises all sorts of troubling concerns. There is an appearance of impropriety and a conflict of interest. There is an appearance that there is basically a shakedown going on—extracting money from companies she regulates in order to implement the President's health care law. This is certainly unethical—representing a conflict of interest—and possibly illegal. However, it has provided us a useful reminder about ObamaCare: that it represents one of the worst examples of crony capitalism that exist today. Unfortunately, that is true of a number of the administration's policies, but let me just explain what I mean.

When the private enterprise and the government become so intertwined as

to become mutually dependent, usually what that means is the people who can hire the most lobbyists, the best lawyers, and others, compete unfairly for government benefits.

The concern is that since Secretary Sebelius is going to be the one who doles out grants and other benefits under ObamaCare, there is the all-too-human temptation to favor those who have gotten you out of a crack and done you a favor.

Let's review how ObamaCare is supposed to work in the first place. The Federal Government is supposed to come up with its own definition of health insurance. What we own right now may not be good enough for the government and its standard for health insurance. It is demanding that private businesses offer their employees this Washington-approved insurance or they get penalized.

It is also demanding that some Americans—many Americans—pay for coverage they don't want, don't need, and may not be able to afford. The best example of that is young adults—sometimes called the young and invincible—who may not think they need comprehensive health care insurance. They may think, well, perhaps I need more of a catastrophic policy or something else that will take care of me if things really turn bad. As a result of ObamaCare, these young people will be forced to buy coverage they don't need. Many of them don't want it and can't afford it.

They will literally see their insurance premiums skyrocket because of a phenomenon known as age-banding. Age-banding is where older Americans cannot be charged more than three times what younger people can be charged. We all know that as we age, we utilize more health care services. Here again, younger Americans are being asked to subsidize their elders in ObamaCare.

One way to look at it is the Obama administration has decided that the purchase of an expensive government-approved product sold by certain private companies is a condition of American citizenship. For those who are American citizens and live here, they have to buy it. If they don't, they pay the penalty. That is one example of crony capitalism.

Private companies are turning into de facto public utilities, and Americans are forced to buy their products but only those products approved by the regulators here in Washington. It is the ultimate marriage of big business and big government, and it is bad for the American taxpayer.

Now Secretary Sebelius has gone a step further. She is using her leverage and power as a regulator over private companies to force them to fund ObamaCare. We all see what is going on. Secretary Sebelius is making the health care industry an offer they cannot refuse. After all, her agency regulates those companies and has enormous influence over their business operations.

Indeed, ObamaCare has expanded Health and Human Services' regulatory power so much, we could say it essentially amounts to a government takeover of one-sixth of the national economy. Anytime there is a dramatic increase in Federal regulation of bureaucratic authority, there will also be a dramatic increase in crony capitalism.

Health and Human Services granted a series of waivers from ObamaCare's annual limit requirements, which fostered the impression that certain companies, labor unions, and other institutions were getting preferential treatment. Why not treat all Americans the same rather than have the government pick winners and losers, with the temptation to pick their friends and political supporters and give them special favors?

We saw this also in the government-run bailout of the Chrysler Corporation when the company's secured bondholders received less for their loans than the United Auto Workers pension fund.

For that matter, we also saw it in the notorious Solyndra project. President Obama's entire green agenda energy policy is based on the idea that the Federal Government should be playing venture capitalist with taxpayer dollars. We all know that when Solyndra went bankrupt, the administration favored private lenders over taxpayers, which was a violation of the law.

But there are many other private companies that have received taxpayer funding for political or ideological reasons, and that is why we say that crony capitalism undermines public trust in government because not everybody is treated the same. The government—those in power—picks winners and losers, political favorites, friends, and family.

I have one final point. We learned about the Sebelius shakedown on the same day we learned that the IRS has been deliberately targeting and harassing some organizations based on their political views.

As we all know, the IRS has a very important and key role in administering some of the biggest parts of ObamaCare and thus will be collecting massive amounts of new information about individual Americans. That was always a bad idea, but now, after we have learned about the abuses at the IRS, it sounds even more dangerous than ever. After what we have learned so far, how can Americans feel confident that the IRS won't abuse these new powers after having abused its current powers? Why should the American people believe what they have been told when they have been lied to time and time again about the IRS's activities?

Back in March 2012, the former IRS Commissioner categorically denied that his agency was targeting certain political organizations. Now we know that he was not only wrong, we also know they intentionally lied. We also know that senior IRS officials—many