

against political organizations they do not happen to agree with. And we have learned the Obama administration, in the form of the Justice Department, has treated a reporter as if he were a criminal simply for doing his job.

I have seen the explanation of the apologists at the Justice Department. They said just because they identified James Rosen as a potential criminal coconspirator, they never intended to prosecute him. This is part of an affidavit designed to get at certain records that Mr. Rosen and his family maintained, invading their privacy. It makes no sense they would claim in this affidavit, in order to get this search warrant, that he was a potential criminal coconspirator and at the same time they never intended to prosecute him. Those are simply incompatible and inconsistent statements.

We have also learned the Department of Justice has conducted a disturbingly intrusive and broad investigation into the phone records of journalists who worked for the Associated Press.

At the Department of Health and Human Services we have learned that Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, has literally been raising money from private companies she is responsible for regulating in order to fund ObamaCare. That is a conflict of interest, and that is the most charitable thing one can say about it.

We have further learned this culture of intimidation has also given way to a culture of coverups and misinformation. We have learned more about the Obama administration's dishonest portrayal of the September 2012 terrorist attack that killed four Americans in Benghazi, Libya. We have learned the Obama State Department punished U.S. diplomats, whistleblowers, for cooperating with congressional investigators.

Sadly, these abuses are part of a larger pattern that goes back several years. For example, in 2010, when we were considering the matter of ObamaCare, various health insurance companies began alerting their customers about what they believed the impact of ObamaCare would be on them, and that specifically, if passed, it would force them to raise premiums on their own customers. Secretary Sebelius, at the time, threatened to punish these companies and bar them from participating in the ObamaCare exchanges if they followed through in communicating with their own customers about what the impact of this legislation would be on them.

By the way, the same IRS official who led the division to target political speech is now in charge of administering large portions of ObamaCare, which depends upon the Internal Revenue Service to implement so much of it. At a time when the Internal Revenue Service has lost credibility with the American people, it has no business administering a law that will affect one-sixth of our national economy.

The same culture of intimidation we have seen at Health and Human Services and at the Internal Revenue Service has also been prevalent at the Justice Department. That should be the bastion of justice and equal treatment under the law, but, sadly, it is not. The case of Fox News reporter James Rosen is only the latest example.

In recent days we have learned DOJ officials tracked Rosen's movements, got a search warrant to examine his private e-mails, and even obtained his parents' phone records. They treated him like a criminal, which is quite remarkable because, as I said, he was simply doing his job.

As the Washington correspondent for the New Yorker magazine noted:

It is unprecedented for the government, in an official court document, to accuse a reporter of breaking the law for conducting routine business of reporting on government secrets.

I believe national security leaks should be investigated. But what about going after the leaker? We recognize when reporters are targeted, it becomes especially sensitive, given the role of reporting the news and the freedom of the press guaranteed by the Constitution and the need of our society to maintain the kind of openness that only comes with a free and robust press.

In addition to an overbearing surveillance of individual journalists, the Obama Justice Department also targeted whistleblowers in the notorious Fast and Furious investigation. This is where guns were purchased in bulk in the United States and allowed to walk into the hands of the drug cartels in Mexico.

One Department of Justice official, a U.S. attorney in Arizona, tried to smear a whistleblower by leaking a private document. The Department of Justice inspector general called this behavior "inappropriate for a department employee and wholly unbecoming a United States attorney." Meanwhile, a separate Justice Department official was forced to resign her position when she was caught collaborating with left-wing bloggers to slander both whistleblowers and journalists.

As you can see, my conclusion there has been created a culture of intimidation is not the result of just one incident but a number of incidents and data points that, when connected, I think clearly paint that very sad and troubling picture. This culture of intimidation has become entrenched at Federal agencies and departments all across the Obama administration.

This culture of intimidation was troubling before the IRS scandal broke, and it is even more troubling given all we have learned in the past few weeks. So I hope Congress will do its job on a bipartisan basis—as the Finance Committee, under the leadership of Senators MAX BAUCUS and ORRIN HATCH, have already done on the IRS matter—to investigate this in a bipartisan way to get to the bottom of this matter,

recognizing this kind of abuse of power on the part of the Internal Revenue Service can be turned not just against conservative political speech but also against people on the political left or anybody in between. This should not and cannot be tolerated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

THE FISCAL CRISIS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and couldn't agree with him more on a number of the things he listed; in particular, the so-called affordable care act, which is anything but affordable.

I found out, as I traveled across the State of Indiana and spoke with Hoosiers, that this law is having an enormous negative impact on the decisions of employers, on health care providers, and on average citizens relative to what is coming down the line within the next several months and into 2014.

This legislation is a colossal mistake. It is a mess. It is distorting the economy, it is keeping people out of work, and it is keeping employers from hiring new workers. People are trying to manipulate the system now because what is being imposed on them is so Draconian and unsustainable and unaffordable. That is why we need to officially call this "unaffordable comprehensive health care reform" rather than the Affordable Care Act. It is unaffordable.

But that is not why I came here today. I came here today to talk about our current fiscal crisis. That has sort of taken a back seat to the debates we have been having on the Senate floor, even though they are necessary—immigration, which is coming up, the farm bill that we are currently dealing with, gun issues, and others. The looming dark cloud, the big bear in the closet, is our fiscal crisis, and it is not going away.

Last Friday, the Social Security and Medicare trustees issued their annual report on the long-term financial status of the health and retirement security programs, and there was a little bit of good news; that is, the current numbers that exist out there and the rate of spending down on these programs has slowed somewhat. But it is not the kind of news we ought to celebrate.

Some are saying: Oh, well, this takes the pressure off. Now we don't need to do anything about the structural reform of our mandatory spending for our entitlement programs because, look, we just had a good report. Let's just get back to regular business and we will worry about this later.

Well, the fact remains our mandatory spending is not only unsustainable, it is having an immediate impact and will continue to have an even greater impact on other essential functions of government as the cost of funding for the mandatory systems continues to

rise—and rise dramatically in future years with 10,000 baby boomers retiring every day.

Let me repeat that: 10,000 baby boomers are reaching retirement age each day, adding to the cost of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

We have known this was coming for years. We have known it was coming for decades; that an amazing number of people born post-World War II now have worked their way to the point of retirement. This has had an impact on our economy, whether they were babies needing more cribs and diapers, whether they were young children going to elementary school and we needed more schools, going to secondary colleges and universities and we needed to expand those, working their way through the economy, having children—a dramatic impact with this bulge of baby boom babies growing up and working their way through the system. Yet while we knew all this was coming, Congress and the administration repeatedly said: We will deal with this later. It is a crisis, we know, but it is just too tough to deal with now.

What I am afraid of is that this latest report which came out and provided a little bit of relief, a little bit of wiggle room, but it did nothing to solve the long-term problem. What I am concerned about is that this report may be used to basically say we don't have to do anything now.

What is the impact? The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reported earlier this year that spending on mandatory programs and interest on the debt—because we have to borrow to cover this cost—will consume 91 percent of all Federal revenues 10 years from now. Already it is putting the squeeze on discretionary spending because what this means is that all other spending priorities are being squeezed out by spending on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security and some of the other mandatory programs.

If we are interested in a strong national defense, in a solid education system, infrastructure and bridges and paving roads, medical research, food and drug safety, homeland security, border security—and other programs, these programs are getting squeezed every day in terms of the amount of resources available.

Why these groups don't form a coalition and come marching through the Halls of Congress and demand that we take action now on runaway mandatory spending, because it is simply wiping out their programs, is beyond me. But it is the nature of the political beast to postpone the tough stuff, to not have to get to the point where they have to tell anybody no because we want everybody to love us so they will vote for us in the next election. It is incomprehensible that we continue to put this off day after day, month after month, year after year, election after election.

I have been around a while. How many times have we heard people say

we will do that after the next election? That was the mantra in the 2012 Presidential election. Well, no. You see, the President couldn't step up and do this and the ruling party couldn't step up and do this because we had a Presidential election. They said that as soon as the election takes place, then we will have a period of time where we have been reelected to office or we have new Members coming in and we will not have the pressure of an election before us and we will address this problem.

Here we are now into the sixth month of this year, when everyone knows that the first 100 days of the new administration—or a second-term in this case—is the best time to enact long-term good legislation that addresses major problems—the days are slip-sliding away. The days are counting, and we continue debate and talk about and interject issues here that, yes, have importance but don't begin to rise to the level of importance of the need to address our fiscal situation.

The other thing I don't understand is why the young people of this country aren't standing up and demanding that we take action, because we are taking money away from them. We are diminishing their future. We are leaving them with a debt burden they may not be able to pay.

The International Monetary Fund put out a report recently that to cover current obligations for young people, they—not us—will have to pay either 35 percent more in taxes to keep these mandatory funds alive and solvent or receive 35 percent fewer benefits. This is at a time when our Nation's youth already face an unemployment crisis.

It is unconscionable. It is immoral for us to defer and to delay and to simply say we can't take care of these issues now and then move on through our lives, reap the benefits that come from some of these programs, and then hand it over to our children and say: Good luck. You are either going to pay one-third more in taxes or you are going to get one-third less in benefits, lifetime savings, Social Security for your retirement, health care coverage for your later years. Good luck with that one. But we couldn't summon the will to do it. We couldn't bring ourselves to make the hard choices.

Are we going to step up to the plate and be responsible? What is our legacy going to be for those of us who are serving now? What are we going to tell our children and grandchildren? Will we say sorry, we just weren't able to do it? It was just too tough politically, we are worried about the folks back home that they might not take it the right way. It requires a little bit of sacrifice to reform these programs—actually, to save the programs—before they go broke. But, no, we just couldn't do it. The President? No; kind of AWOL on this, hasn't stepped up. We thought for sure that after reelection, not being elected again, we would get some kind of leadership.

I see it slip-sliding away, and now we are faced with that ultimate day of crisis when it hits and we have to make painful choices because we have no other choice.

So why don't we take the rational approach? Why don't we have leadership that steps up and basically says this is what we need to do? Why don't we put the future of America and the future of our children and grandchildren and succeeding generations ahead of our own political interests? It is selfish not to do so. I think it is unconscionable. I think it is immoral for us to continue doing this.

So I am going to continue to come to the floor as much as I can—I have been doing this all year—and I am going to continue to urge the President to work with us. I am not making this a partisan issue. We are working with people across the aisle who understand this and want to do something about it. But we know we can't get it done without the President taking leadership and standing up and working with us.

There is a little bit going on right now, but here we are, 6 months later, and we are not making the progress we need to make.

In the end, maybe we will pass another patch of legislation—a little patch here, a little patch there—and we will deal with the big thing later. We just can't do it now.

For the sake of the future of this country, for the sake of the future of our children and grandchildren, for living up to our sworn oath to do what is necessary to continue the great story of democracy in this Nation, we need to step up and do this. These reforms are necessary. We all know it. We know the numbers. We know they are unsustainable. We know we must address it.

I urge my colleagues to do whatever is necessary to make the tough choices. Interestingly enough, that legacy, if we stand up to do it, will be worth whatever results or consequences come from our making these decisions.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 954, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 954) to reauthorize agriculture programs through 2018.

Pending:

Stabenow (for Leahy) amendment No. 998, to establish a pilot program for gigabit Internet projects in rural areas.