

between Joseph Welch and Joseph McCarthy that changed this city and the world.

Six decades ago, America's national mood was marked by anxiety over the looming threat of communism. The victory of World War II had given way to the gripping tension of the Cold War. Communist power was on the rise in Eastern Europe and in China. American forces were at war in Korea.

Here in Congress the House Committee on Un-American Activities worked to sniff out Communist subversion within our borders, including the infamous Hollywood black list. One man in the Senate set out to exploit the fears of that time, and he came to symbolize the fearmongering of that fretful era.

Joseph McCarthy was a relatively unknown junior Senator from Wisconsin when, in February of 1950, he delivered a speech accusing Secretary of State Dean Acheson of harboring 205 known members of the American Communist Party within the State Department.

The charge was questionable and ill-supported. But the brazen accusation struck a nerve with an anxious American public, and Senator McCarthy rocketed to fame. Thus began a chilling crusade to flush out Communist subversion—real or contrived—from every corner of American society.

McCarthy's anticommunist witch hunt seemingly knew no bounds, as he launched investigations or often just allegations of disloyalty on the part of private citizens, public employees, entire government agencies, as well as the broadcasting and defense industries, universities—even the United Nations.

In 1953, the Republican Party gained a majority in the Senate, and McCarthy ascended to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on Investigations. From those chairmanships, he dragged hundreds of witnesses before scores of hearings, publicly shaming and berating his targets. His fiery rhetoric and his remorseless mendacity intimidated critics and challengers. His accusations carried the power to destroy reputations, careers, and lives.

The effect of McCarthyism on 20th century American society was toxic. Prudent citizens shied from civic engagement. Meaningful political dissent withered. Criticism of American foreign policy evaporated. Even college campuses, our cradles of intellectual curiosity, were cowed by McCarthyism.

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas called it "the black silence of fear." Intimidated colleagues in this Chamber gave Joe McCarthy broad leeway to abuse Congress's constitutional powers of investigation and oversight. Harvard Law Dean Erwin Griswold described Chairman McCarthy's role as "judge, jury, prosecutor, castigator, and press agent, all in one."

This was the regime 60 years ago, in 1954, when U.S. Army officials accused

McCarthy of exerting improper pressure to win preferential treatment for a subcommittee aide serving as an Army private. McCarthy countered that the Army accusation was retaliation for his investigations of them. The stage was set. The countercharges would be adjudicated, of course, in McCarthy's Subcommittee on Investigations.

The so-called Army-McCarthy hearings, held in a packed, smoke-filled Russell caucus room, would last 36 days and be aired on live broadcast television. Twenty million Americans tuned in during gavel-to-gavel coverage of our Nation's first great TV political spectacle—the precursor to the Watergate hearings, the Iran-Contra hearings, and the Thomas-Hill hearings.

Special counsel to the Army in those hearings was an avuncular Boston lawyer named Joseph Welch of the law firm then called Hale & Dorr. Here, in Washington, Joseph Welch was a nobody. He had no office, he had no position, he had no clout. But he was a good lawyer with a dry wit and unflappable demeanor. He also had a sense of fairness—a sense of fairness that was soon to become famously provoked by McCarthy's bullying. And he had that greatest virtue—courage—the virtue that makes all other virtues possible.

On June 9, 1954, Joseph Welch challenged Senator McCarthy's aide, Roy Cohn, to actually produce McCarthy's supposed secret list of subversives working at defense facilities. Since there likely was no such list, McCarthy needed a distraction. So he lit into an accusatory attack in a traditional McCarthyite way on a lawyer in Welch's firm, a young lawyer—indeed, an associate within the firm, Fred Fisher, a young man who was not even in the hearing room to defend himself—accusing him of various Communist associations and inclinations.

Welch responded:

Until this moment, Senator, I think I never really gauged your cruelty or your recklessness.

Had Senator McCarthy been a smarter man, he would have sensed the warning in those words. But he didn't. He pressed his attack and refused to let up on young Fred Fisher. Welch angrily cut Senator McCarthy short.

Let us not assassinate the lad any further, Senator. You have done enough. Have you no sense of decency, sir, at long last? Have you left no sense of decency?

Thirty words. If you count them, it is just 30 words. But with those 30 words, suddenly something happened, something changed. The emperor suddenly had no clothes.

There had been such an avalanche of words from McCarthy over the years—of lies, of accusations, of hyperbole. And these 30 words—these few short sentences—stopped all of that roughshod hypocrisy in its tracks.

Welch declared an end to McCarthy's questioning, and the gallery of onlook-

ers, on behalf of a nation, burst into applause. The black-and-white footage shows McCarthy asking Roy Cohn, "What happened?" What happened was that a spell was broken. The web of fear woven by McCarthy over Washington, DC, began unraveling.

Near the end of the hearing, Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri faced McCarthy down. After an angry exchange, he rose and walked out to come here to vote. As Chairman Karl Mundt of South Dakota gavelled the hearing into recess, Joe McCarthy kept on railing about Communist conspiracies. As he railed on, Senators, reporters, and members of the gathered audience steadily filed out of the room, leaving him shouting. The spell was broken.

Six months later the Senate voted 67 to 22 to censure Senator Joseph McCarthy. Four years later, he was dead at the age of 48. Historians agree he drank himself to death. His fall from grace and demise were nearly as rapid as his rise was meteoric, consistent with the ancient principle: Climb ugly; fall hard.

Very often—indeed, too often—political outcomes in Washington are determined by the political weight and the wealth of contesting forces vying for power. It is brute force against brute force. It makes us wonder, is that all there is to this? Is this just an arena of combat, where huge special interests lean against each other trying to shove each other around, each for their own greed and benefit?

This incident 60 years ago is an eternal lesson of what a difference one person can make. A regular American, a nobody in Washington, good at his craft, good in his character, and in the right place at the right time, a man who knew what was right, broke the fever of virulent political frenzy that had captured Washington; one private lawyer's sincere, direct outrage at a cruel attack on his young associate, a few words from a Boston lawyer who had just had enough turned the tide of history. May we never forget in this world of vast and often corrupt political forces the power of one person to make a difference.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STUDENT LOAN DEBT

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I was the first in my family to go to college. I drove an ice cream truck to work my way through Boston College as a commuter. I did the same thing to go to law school. I lived at home all the

way through college and law school in order to be able to afford to go to college. As a result, I had to take out Federal loans like so many millions of American students have to do today. But here is the thing. If the owner of the ice cream truck company I worked for wanted to refinance the loan he had for the trucking fleet, he could do that. If my parents wanted to refinance the mortgage on their house, they could do that. But if I wanted to refinance my student loans as would every single student today, I was out of luck, and that is not right, that is not fair, and that needs to change.

In Massachusetts, as the Presiding Officer knows better than anyone, we recognize that education is a ladder of opportunity that allows every child to maximize their God-given abilities. It is the best path to middle class success and economic opportunity. The big dreams of college should never be thwarted by the small print of student loan agreements. The economic opportunities that students have because they graduate should not be accompanied by the hopelessness from overwhelming debt—almost like the mythical Sisyphus with a boulder on his shoulders, trying to go up the side of a mountain. That is how students feel with their student debt as they graduate from colleges and universities across this country. So in the same way that mortgage refinancing helps mortgage holders who are underwater, students drowning in debt should benefit from refinancing their student loans at a lower rate.

Today more than 70 percent of America's students borrow money to attend college. The average student graduates from college owing nearly \$30,000. Americans today owe almost \$1.2 trillion in student loans, more than is owed on credit cards. Almost 1 million people in Massachusetts currently owe more than \$24 billion in student debt. Thirty percent of young borrowers nationwide are unable to keep up with their payments and are in default, forbearance or deferment. That kind of debt makes it difficult to start a family, buy a home or save for retirement. Reports show that high student loan debt deters our promising minds from enrolling in graduate programs. That means fewer highly skilled workers, which harms our economy now and makes us less competitive in the world economy in the future.

There is a way to make it easier for those of us who have student loan debts and to put more money in their pockets every single month. That is to listen to the wisdom of our Presiding Officer, to make sure that people here in this Chamber and across our country listen to this guiding light that you are creating for our country to be able to move from this present world where debt so saddles young people that they really cannot ever plan to realize all of their dreams, to a new vision of what might be possible in lowering this burden on young people across our country.

Last year the Congress passed legislation that lowered Federal student loan interest rates for new borrowers but did nothing for existing borrowers. So today interest rates for new borrowers are just under 4 percent while rates for older borrowers are around 7 percent for recent undergraduates and even higher for some older borrowers. The bill which you have introduced as the senior Senator from Massachusetts simply allows 25 million eligible student loan borrowers the option of refinancing down to the rates offered to new Federal student loan borrowers this year.

The bill allows eligible student loan borrowers to refinance their private loans into the Federal program. Many parents cosigned the private loans for their children and are on the hook if their children default on these loans. Your legislation will save existing student loan borrowers thousands of dollars to help them get ahead, not fall behind. This money can be used to help pay for the downpayment on a new home, to start a new business or to start a family. This is one more way to give Americans a fair shot at the American dream. So we thank you for your leadership on this issue. We thank you for laying out a pathway to make it a slightly easier place for young people to be as they leave college, as they have this debt on their shoulders.

When I was in school the interest rate was 3 percent. Those loans were called national defense student loans. Emblazoned over the Boston Public Library it reads: "The education of its people is the best defense of a nation." That is what it says across the Boston Public Library. That is what we have to once again understand, that the first generation that was the beneficiary had 3 percent loans. This generation—in a much more wealthy country—has loans at 6, 7, 8, 9 percent and more, and that just makes it very difficult for them to maximize their God-given abilities in the same way that the Members of the Senate were able to maximize theirs.

We have a responsibility to this generation to go back to that original message, to go back to that incredible plan that was put together after World War II to finally democratize access to education for every family, for every child who wanted to work towards improving themselves. Those national defense student loans understood that the best defense of a Nation is the education of its people. That is how we preserve order and liberty within our society, and that is what your proposal does.

By using the Buffett rule, by using the offset which says to billionaires and millionaires in our country that you are just going to pay the same taxes as the middle class, well, then we finance something that is really critical. We finance the dreams and the hopes of young people in our country, so that the debt they have to shoulder after they leave college is not so bur-

densome that they never really can fully realize their dreams.

So I ask all my colleagues to support Senator WARREN's legislation. I think it is going to be without question at the top of the list of the most important work we do in this Chamber this year, and I call upon my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to respond in the kind of bipartisan way that the American people want, those 40 million families that need relief from this oppressive burden of student loan debt.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer for her leadership.

I yield back the remainder of my time, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, tomorrow the Senate has a historic and magnificent opportunity to increase everybody's fair shot at the American dream—everyone's fair shot at a college education that enables and opens the American dream to people who come from families where college was an unachievable aspiration. I know about those families because I come from one of them. I am the first man in my family to have a college education, not to mention the opportunity to go to law school.

There are a couple of hard, practical facts, apart from all the rhetoric about the American dream. The fact is today college education is a major—maybe the most important determinant—of income. It is one of the major determinants of employment. The employment rate for college graduates is much higher than for those who lack it. In fact, the unemployment rates for college graduates are half or less than what they are for those who lack that education.

College education—in fact, education in general—is the single most important instrument of social mobility in this country. It is a way for people to reach the middle class or for families to stay in the middle class. Right now, the middle class is squeezed in every direction by so many different economic factors and pressures, and the cost of a college education is one of the most pressing of them.

So we have the opportunity tomorrow to enable countless people to take advantage of the American dream in a very hardheaded, practical way by enabling all college graduates or others who have student loans to reduce the charges—the interest rates—on those loans to a lower rate that is the lowest rate acceptable.

I thank the Presiding Officer for her leadership in championing this cause before it reached the Senate floor—way before it became the fashionable and

popular issue it has become. I thank also the President of the United States who, by Executive action, has helped to ease the burden of those college loans to thousands of current student debt-holders. He has recognized the importance of reducing that burden by expanding a program that was passed by Congress in 2010, tying monthly student debt payments to a portion of the debtholder's discretionary income. He has expanded that program to include many of those debtholders before the date that it is currently operative, and I thank him for that step, but it is a minor step compared to what we have the opportunity to do tomorrow in realizing an opening to the American dream for many students who have already been through education and now carry interest rates on their debt of 8, 10, 11 percent. It is an opportunity not only for them to reduce that interest rate but also for the economy to take advantage of their purchasing power that will be unleashed—consumer demands that will be enlarged—because people are more likely to buy homes, start families, begin businesses, become entrepreneurs, be innovators and inventors, who right now are making career choices because they are saddled with debt that forces them to pay interest rates much higher than current students do.

It is not a forgiveness program. They will continue to pay the principal on that debt. It is not a free ride or a handout. They simply get the benefit of the interest rates that our friends across the aisle thought was absolutely right, just months ago, when applied to the existing program.

So this opportunity is a common-sense, simple measure to provide some relief to people struggling under a debt load that is suffocating to them, their futures, their families, and our economy's future.

I believe sincerely there are equally important measures that eventually we need to take in this body, in this Congress, in this Nation, to make college more affordable. The costs of tuition and college expenses need to be brought down. The grants we provide—so-called Pell grants—and scholarships that come from other sources need to be expanded and increased. The opportunities for people who incur debt to work down or work off that debt through public service can be dramatically and drastically enhanced for their benefit and for the benefit of our communities and country that will stand to be forthcoming by their policing, their teaching, their firefighting, their public service that can be, in effect, rewarded and incentivized by enabling them to work down or work off those debts.

These programs are a moral imperative, as is affording the opportunity of students to discharge in bankruptcy those debts when they simply cannot fulfill them, but this idea of giving everybody the benefit of the lowest possible interest rates that will be part of

the bill we vote on tomorrow is a solid and sound and vitally important beginning.

We enable homeowners to refinance and car buyers to refinance and many other kinds of debtholders to refinance but not student loans. That is a discrimination, maybe not unlawful but still a distinction that makes no sense either from the standpoint of our economy or the interests of the debtors. So I hope we will give them a fair shot but also impose a basic and fundamental tenet, an ethos of fairness: If it is good enough for home loans and car loans, why not for student loans?

We should not be adopting policies that encourage people to give up on their dreams. In fact, we ought to be doing just the opposite, making young people feel their dreams are within reach.

I will close by saying to my colleagues that in the last months I have been listening around the State of Connecticut—at roundtables and meetings—to both high school students and college students about this issue of college affordability. What is so inspiring to me, in the meetings I have had—in places such as Ansonia, Windham, and Bridgeport—is the drive and determination of our students to embark on a college education. They know its value, its realistic value, its cost, and they want to do it because they know it is a way up. They are gaining and they are giving back.

But many of them have to make compromises. They have been admitted to schools. Their first choice is a first-rate school, but they cannot put together the package financially that will enable them to go. It is beyond reach financially, even as it is within their grasp intellectually. So they may compromise—maybe the first of other compromises that they will make throughout their lives, as they pursue careers, as they have to make hard choices. But at that age, those compromises should not be driven simply by financial imperatives. They should have the best education that is possible for them, and this country should make it available, not just for their sake but for all of ours.

I have been listening to college students who are leaving—at the commencement addresses I have given at law schools, as well as colleges—listening to students talk about their futures as well, futures that will be compromised because of the debt they have, an average of \$27,000 to \$30,000 in the State of Connecticut alone, and it is similar in many States around the country and the reason we have \$1.2 trillion in debt overall today.

They will compromise in doing a job that may be more lucrative but less rewarding, less so to them and less so to our economy, less so to our society—a lesser way of earning a living in terms of its impact in contributing to our social fabric, quality of life. They may not be teaching, they may not be policing, they may not be doing things that

give back to our society because they need the income, the higher income to pay back that debt.

So those compromises affect all of us as well. They are done because they simply cannot afford either to go to the school of their first choice or the career of their first choice, but the government can afford to give them a lower interest rate. We know the government can do so because right now it is profiting off the backs of students in billions and billions of dollars. The estimates range, over a 5-year period, from \$66 billion to other amounts. We know the government will continue to profit even at lower interest rates from the Student Loan Program.

So let's have less profit to the government, better well-being in our communities, and fairer treatment for our students—a fair shot for them and their families and for all who have as their objective simply to better their lives and gain a fair shot at the American dream.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to speak about a challenge that is confronting our middle-class families all across my home State of Pennsylvania and across the country. The Presiding Officer knows this issue well and has worked tirelessly to enact measures of public policy to confront this problem. We have an opportunity now with her leadership, as well as other leaders in the Senate, to work together on what I think is the kind of legislation that will help those middle-income families.

The Bank on Students Emergency Refinancing Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor, is an opportunity for the Senate, folks in both parties who hear from middle-class families all the time about a range of issues. I doubt there is any issue we hear about more often than the cost of higher education. So I wish—as I am sure many other Members of this body do—to ensure that every student in our States, and for me every student in Pennsylvania, gets something very fundamental, a fair shot to attend college and reach their full potential.

The bill we are considering would help students who have private and public loans in good standing from before July 1 of 2013. It allows them the chance to refinance those loans at a 3.6 percent interest level, the level that was agreed to in last summer's bipartisan student loan compromise. This compromise, as we might remember, passed the Senate overwhelmingly, 81 to 18.

With interest rates near record lows, homeowners, businesses, and even local

governments with good credit regularly can refinance their debts, but few if any students have that same option. Why should more Americans not be helped by the opportunity to pay a lower interest rate?

That is a question I think we all ask tonight and in the days we are debating this issue. More than 40 million Americans owe almost \$1.2 trillion in student loan debt, much more than is owed, for example, on credit cards. According to the Institute for College Access & Success, as of the year 2012 Pennsylvania ranked third in the Nation in the highest average student debt indicated—nearly \$32,000 per student is the number in Pennsylvania—and 70 percent of graduates in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania leave college with debt, the fourth highest of any State in the Union. Too many young Americans cannot get ahead because they cannot get out from under the burden of student debt.

Because of their debt, many Americans are unable to buy a home, save for retirement, start a business or even start a family. This hurts the economy terribly and it makes the American dream so much harder for young Americans to reach. At an 18-year low, the rate of home ownership among young people has been cut in half since 2001. A record-breaking number of young adults are still living in their parents' homes.

This high level of student debt makes it harder for entrepreneurs to start new businesses and create jobs. Entrepreneurial activity among 20- to 34-year-olds is at the lowest level in 20 years. We know this bill can help at least 1.2 million Pennsylvanians and more than 25 million across the Nation, according to the Department of Education.

Based on calculations from the Congressional Research Service, a typical Pennsylvanian who owed the State average, nearly \$32,000 in student debt, would be able to save more than \$4,000 over the life of their loan. This bill would not only save millions for Americans, but the bill itself would save the Federal Government more than \$14 billion over 10 years, based on figures from the Congressional Budget Office.

A college education, we all know, is the surest path to middle-class success and is still the best investment a student can make. Getting a college degree opens the door to job opportunities for the average worker. That means \$1 million more in earnings over a lifetime compared to those who only go as high as a high school diploma.

So college education is indeed tied directly to the economic success of young people across the country. This bill is a step in the right direction and would do much to tackle the problem of student loan debt. However, Congress and the Nation still have a lot of work to do to make college affordable for all of our children. What we are talking about is something very fundamental. All we are asking is that the House and the Senate, both parties,

come together to give students and their families just a fair shot.

That is all they are asking for. They are basically saying to us, especially middle-class families are saying to us: You folks in Washington talk all the time about the middle class, but you need to act on our behalf. Unfortunately, they do not see enough action coming out of Washington that directly impacts their lives, that directly has an impact on their economic fortune, their economic future.

This is one of those rare opportunities with one vote, with one bill we can have a substantial positive impact on the lives of literally millions of Americans as soon as the bill is enacted into law.

I would venture to say that when you talk to any middle-class family, if student loans and the cost of college is not the No. 1 issue they mention, it is certainly in the top two or three. For most middle-class families it is No. 1. Yet they have not seen much in the way of direct action that we can take in Washington to provide a measure of relief—not a magic wand, not eliminating all the pressure and all the worries that people have when it comes to affording college.

This is one bill that can provide some relief, some needed relief, especially when young people are trying to buy a home, invest in their families, start a business, and begin their life after higher education. I ask that we all come together on this legislation and provide a measure of relief to middle-class families and, by virtue of doing that, a badly needed injection into our economy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, tomorrow, the Senate will vote to proceed to a bill that I am proud to cosponsor, to allow students to refinance their student loans at lower interest rates. We must take this commonsense approach to allow those with student loans to take advantage of historically low interest rates.

It should go without saying that student loan costs should not rise so high that students cannot repay. Yet in recent years, average college tuition rates have climbed faster than inflation, far outpacing student financial aid. Since 1985, the cost of attending college has risen by 559 percent, and last school year alone, instate tuition and fees at public 4-year institutions were on average 8.3 percent higher than in the previous year.

Debt caused by student loans has surpassed the level of credit card debt in the United States. In Vermont, there are 99,000 people with Federal student loans representing more than \$2 billion in debt. This not only affects those borrowers and their families, but it has a devastating effect on the economy as a whole—particularly in the housing market. Student loan debt is preventing many would-be first-time home buyers from saving enough to afford a down payment. High student

loan debt, combined with the housing lending climate, has left many unable to secure a mortgage. Experts are worried that the high level of student loan debt is one of the reasons the housing market has been slow to recover.

This bill would help those suffering with the burden of student loan debt by offering them the opportunity to refinance at lower interest rates. We offer refinancing options to businesses, homeowners, and even local governments. These options should be available to students, too. The legislation would help roughly 25 million borrowers keep up with their student loan payments by allowing them to refinance at the same rates that new borrowers receive. Combined with the Executive action announced this week by President Obama to give more students the ability to cap monthly payments, this bill is an important step toward relieving the student debt burden so many Americans face.

I regularly hear from Vermonters about their struggles to afford a college education, and their concerns about student loan debt after they graduate. Many students are forced to take on significant debt, and too often are not able to complete college because of soaring costs. For those students who do go on to graduate, record student loan debt has made getting ahead in today's job market an insurmountable challenge for some students. Students who might otherwise choose to work in the public sector or other historically lower paying jobs like primary health care or teaching professions must make professional choices based solely on their level of debt. Unfortunately, along with the pressure from student loan debt has come an increase in default rates among borrowers, which will affect a student's financial stability for decades.

I have always firmly believed in the importance of a college education. I was the first Leahy in my family to graduate from college. Every young person should have the chance to pursue higher education. Education is a path out of poverty, a road to personal growth, and an access ramp to professional accomplishment and economic security. Everyone wins when access to education expands.

Each opportunity for a young American to earn a college education is also an opportunity for the Nation's future. Our country's ability to compete in the global marketplace in the future depends on our children's ability to finance their education. This does not need to be a partisan issue and should be one where we can find widespread agreement.

I urge every Senator to help us move ahead to support our students, their futures, and our country's future. This issue deserves to be debated in the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO GREGORY SANFORD

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, when Vermonters contemplate the history of our great State, many think fondly of our former State archivist, Gregory Sanford. With his flowing gray beard and quick wit, Gregory is a noted scholar on all things relating to Vermont's history and culture. Gregory retired from his post as the Vermont State archivist in 2012. The appreciation of the extent of Gregory's intellect and influence is not limited to Vermonters. His impressive career was recently chronicled in *Archival Outlook*, a publication of the Society of American Archivists.

Throughout his career, Gregory Sanford served as a critical resource for journalists, legislators, town moderators, and anyone else searching to put today's events into historical context. He brought excitement to the daunting but essential task of preserving State records. It was his vision, passion, and ability to anticipate the myriad of ways that technology would alter the job of State archivist that set Gregory Sanford apart. As the *Archival Outlook* piece notes, Gregory spent his career imagining innovative solutions to difficult problems with limited resources.

During his years as State archivist, Gregory was also an ambitious author who worked to explain how our laws affect the lives of everyday Vermonters, often invoking colorful analogies to do so. His regular column, "Voices from the Vault," never lacked for detail or readership. In short, Gregory brought history to life, and worked tirelessly to preserve it, which is precisely why this profile of Gregory Sanford is entitled, "The Sense of Wonder." My State of Vermont is so fortunate for his many contributions, and I ask unanimous consent that the *Archival Outlook* article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Archival Outlook*]

THE SENSE OF WONDER

VERMONT STATE ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING NAMED FOR GREGORY SANFORD

(By Terry Cook and Helen Samuels)

Most archivists work in buildings devoted, in whole or part, to preserving historical ar-

chives or managing dormant institutional records. Over the course of their careers, some get the opportunity to participate in the design of new buildings for these purposes. A mere handful are privileged to lead teams to conceptualize, design, build, and occupy a combined historical archives and records center. But only rare—and very special—archivists do all that and then have such multipurpose buildings named in their honor—in fact, only one to our knowledge in the United States. Our colleague and friend, Gregory Sanford, is that rarest of archivists. This is his story, or at least the story of why he achieved this signal and singular honor.¹

Professional innovator and leader on many fronts, our Gregory is modest to a fault. Part of this is his genuine belief that he is just working away, trying the best he could to make a difference, in a small state in a far corner of the country, neither looking for nor expecting recognition from practicing a profession that he loves so well. Many people in life who are modest have much to be modest about, but not Gregory, for he has envisioned, thought, and accomplished much, and in so doing set some valuable models for our profession.

One marvels over the scope of his publications, both formal and scholarly, and much more pervasively and influential, his hundreds of newspaper columns and lively speeches given all across his state, in schools, before local societies, in the broader New England region, and beyond, as well as before hundreds of meetings of legislative committees, all extolling the merits of archives and good records management, demonstrating through story and character, wild analogies and moving metaphors (more on that later!) The power of archives to inform, educate, transform, and amuse—and (as the official building plaque notes) create a "sense of wonder" about the past and its impact on all Vermont citizens.

He transformed a state papers office of one person located in a tiny office, with shared records storage in the basement of the executive office building, into a dynamic institution, the Vermont State Archives and Records Administration (VSARA), currently with fourteen staff members, an updated archives and records law (that he authored), and a newly renovated and expanded archival and records center building. In accomplishing this, Gregory has worked tirelessly with legislators, bureaucrats, educators, media, and anyone who would listen, to give records management, and especially for digital records, both visibility and strategic direction for his state in the information world. The result is a resuscitated records management service now exists under the control of the state archivist, rather than languishing in the state's general services department.

His highly innovative use of the archives and its collections to frame and give context to current issues of debate in the state, so citizens and legislators do not ignore the wisdom of past, is especially admirable. This "continuing issues" approach to archival public programming makes the relevance of archives very apparent to citizens and sponsors, legislators and media personnel, beyond the well-known uses of archives for history, genealogy, and general support to government. In effect, and not without some political risk to himself, Gregory has championed the fundamental principle of archives being arsenals for democracy through an informed citizenry. For controversial issues facing the state and its legislators, he repeatedly uncovered past precedents where denials flourished that such existed; outlined forgotten past examples of workable government processes where chaos now reigned until his intervention; showed that sacred cows of

state policy assumed to be sacrosanct since time immemorial had in fact changed many times, and could thus be readily changed again. In his column, *Voices from the Vault*, appearing in the Secretary of State's monthly publication, as well as on the VSARA web site, Gregory applied his vast knowledge of state records and Vermont history, its constitution and laws, and his own wide reading and sense of wonder. Gregory thus for many years kept "continuing issues" burning, showing the relevance of archives and records to living life now. So much so that legislators and media turned to him for "backgrounders" on many public issues, and those he gave them in his interviews and in his *Voices from the Vault* columns—always with flare, good humor, and self-deprecation, but also with dedication, passion, and keen intelligence.

Despite his tiny resource base in the state archives and many pressing home and family responsibilities, Gregory has, as a committed professional, applied for and received several NHPRC grants. He wanted to push the frontiers of archival and records management research, strategy, and best practice, to try to understand, codify, and share more widely the lessons he was learning in Vermont with his wider profession. The most noted of these, in our opinion, was the Vermont State Information Strategy Plan (VISIP), in which we both had marginal roles as consultants, but enough to observe the project first hand.

VISIP was a gubernatorial initiative embracing executive agencies. Though the archives was not originally envisioned as a VISIP participant, Gregory succeeded in getting it a place at the table. He had been impressed by some of the appraisal thinking occurring in the archival profession in the late 1980s centered around functional analysis and macroappraisal. Instead of appraising records by their subject and informational-value content, which is impossible for modern records given their huge extent in paper, their interconnectedness across many creating institutions in our complex world, and their transient digital formats, archival theorists like Hans Booms in Germany, Helen Samuels in the United States, and Terry Cook in Canada shifted the focus for appraisal to the functional context of creation: which functions, programs, and activities within which structural entities would be most likely to produce the best records, including evidence of citizen's interaction with the state, rather than which of the billions of modern records themselves might have potential research value.

Gregory was impressed by these ideas, but he took functional analysis a step further, and built it back into the information system planning of the state. Based on research into the mandates, structures, and especially functions, programs, and activities of every state agency, he automated the results to produce a grid that matched functional activity with the several (sometimes many) offices performing aspects of that activity. He demonstrated that promotion and control of tourism, for example, was spread around nine separate agencies that did not talk to each other, or that a single mother with dependent children at school, when seeking benefits, would have to contact and then fill in similar information on application forms for each of the twelve agencies. By revealing this overlap and duplication, VISIP permitted consolidation, in a virtual sense, of these programs through information systems that talked to each other for greater effectiveness, reduced duplication and inefficiency, made things easier for clients of the government to get service (applying once, not twelve times), helped the state promote itself (tourists now got one effective consolidated message when they wrote, rather than