

Government shouldn't try to buy everything. It is my job and the people's job to buy the things we need. I don't want the government to think for me. They don't know that I'm a little brother who doesn't like it when my big brothers tell me what to do, because they aren't always responsible for their own things. I don't tell my brothers what to do with their money. I'm smarter than they think I am. They should follow the rules.

Here you have a youngster in Wyoming who knows of values, who is raised in a family where they live within their means, lives in a State where we balance our budget every year, and I think the lesson Eric has for the people of Wyoming and the people of this country is one we should listen to: We should live within our means, not spend more than we have, not continue to borrow. And the threat to our Nation, our greatest threat to our national security continues to be the debt, and it is incumbent upon this institution to deal with that.

I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Casper Star Tribune, July 29, 2011]

SMARTER THAN YOU THINK

(By Eric Mitchell)

What does the government think of me?

Money. Like the banking commercials, I'm not a name, I'm a number.

I think they think I'm not so smart because I'm too young to know what they're doing, like raising the national debt. Don't they know that I owe the country about \$45,000? I'm only 10 years old. I could buy a lot with \$45,000. I could almost buy a home, I could buy property, I could buy a boat and get fish for my family and friends.

I would buy guns and ammunition to hunt for food for my family. I could buy books so I could learn more. Forty-five thousand dollars could buy a lot of stuff. That's more than my dad earns. But it wouldn't buy everything.

Government shouldn't try to buy everything.

It is my job, and the people's job, to buy the things we need. I don't want the government to think for me. They don't know I'm a little brother who doesn't like it when my big brothers tell me what to do, because they aren't always responsible for their own things. I don't tell my brothers what to do with their money.

I'm smarter than they think I am. They should follow the rules.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request that has been cleared by the Republican leader. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 6 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time; further, that at 6 p.m. I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recog-

nized for whatever time I shall consume as in morning business.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there is a simple reason we are all talking about the debt limit increase. It is the fact that this President has spent more money than I ever believed would be possible. So far, he has spent over \$10 trillion in 3 years, and next year, if he has his way, he will spend another \$3.5 trillion.

I remember so well back during the Clinton administration—I think it was 1995—I was outraged. I came down to this podium. I said: Can you believe a President has a budget of \$1.5 trillion? And this President has spent \$10 trillion in this short period. If he had not spent all of this money, then we would not be here talking about a debt limit increase right now. I hate to sound so partisan about it, but it is truly a partisan issue.

The Democrats have supported his spending, and the Republicans have not. The Boehner plan we are going to vote on—they are going to vote in the House today, and I think we may have an opportunity to vote here later on tonight—may not be perfect. None of the stuff around here is perfect. But it is good. It has dramatically improved over the last 12 hours. It allows the debt limit increase but only after we significantly cut spending. Never before have we tied—in the history of this country—a debt limit increase to spending cuts, but it is something we have to do now that we are so far into this mess.

The first step to this plan cuts spending by over \$900 billion in exchange for a \$900 billion increase in the debt limit. That will last the President until around February. I think it is a fair deal. I would like to cut the spending more, but we can only do so much when we only control the House.

The second step of this plan is also good. It establishes a mechanism to quickly consider \$1.8 trillion in additional spending cuts between now and the end of the year.

It also requires Congress to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and send it to the States for ratification. This is something that just happened in the last 12 hours. People were talking about, well, do we really want to do something? A balanced budget amendment is the only way it is going to be good for now and for the future.

We have been talking about this for many years. I remember so well, way back in the 1970s, I was in the State Senate in Oklahoma when Carl Curtis, a very wonderful gentleman from Nebraska—he was a Senator, had been a Senator for quite some time. He was the perennial author of the balanced budget amendment, but he never could get it through. He had an idea. He came to me in the State of Oklahoma and he said: You know, Inhofe, we have been trying to get this balanced budget

amendment for a long time, and they excuse they use is, you are never going to get the required number of States to ratify it.

He said: I have come up with an idea. We will get three-fourths of the States to preratify a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Well, that is kind of ingenious.

He said: Why don't you be the first State?

So I did. We passed, by resolution in my State of Oklahoma, in 1975 I believe it was, a ratification of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that did not exist. That is kind of neat. We actually got up to almost three-fourths of the States, and some of the other forces knocked it down. But that is how long we have been doing this.

But in the intervening years, there hasn't been 1 year where we have talked about a balanced budget amendment that it has not come up for discussion. Well, this is probably the first time it is a possibility because we have never been in the spending situation we are in right now—as I said, \$10 trillion just 3 years.

So right now, we have added that in the last 12 hours. If that legislation passes, the President will get an additional debt limit increase. So we are tying it to behavioral patterns in spending and austerity. That is a smart way to do it.

This proposal would keep the debt limit and the spending debate at the forefront of the national conversation. We must have this conversation. If we do not, we will be worrying about things a lot worse than an increase in the debt limit. The President wants nothing to do with it. He just wants a blank check to increase the debt so he can continue to raise the deficit. Why do I think this? Well, if we undid all of his policies today, the policies that so rapidly increased spending and are killing our economy, then we would not need a debt limit increase.

The President's spending addiction is the only reason we are here talking about a debt limit increase. This is unilateral. This is the President—his budget. It is not a group of people, it is him. A lot of people are asking: Does anyone in Washington really care? One guy doesn't—the President of the United States. His actions are what we are talking about today. We are looking at failed policies.

Referring to the chart, first is ObamaCare. We are talking right now about trying to get something like \$800 billion in these negotiations so we can increase the debt limit. In one fell swoop, ObamaCare was \$1.5 trillion. This plan costs over the current decade, when fully implemented—the 10-year cost nearly doubles to \$2.5 trillion. This law dramatically expands government's influence in the health care sector, and together with Medicare and Medicaid, it will result in the financial ruin of this great country.

Second, we have the failed stimulus plan. We all know it didn't meet any of

President Obama's expectations. It met all of mine because I didn't expect much. It didn't help the economy. It expanded the size of government. Even though we were opposed to it—I am among the most conservative Members, and Senator BOXER is a very proud liberal. She and I together tried to have an amendment to take some of the \$800 billion and put a large amount into infrastructure.

Right now, we have to have roads and highways and bridges. We are supposed to do that here. Of course, they didn't do it. Only 3 percent of the \$800 billion went for that type of infrastructure. Over \$1 trillion of this amount, once you add in the costs, that is how we get up to \$1 trillion, the cost of interest we have to pay for extra spending. That is a total of \$2.5 trillion.

So we have the stimulus of \$1 trillion and ObamaCare of \$1.5 trillion. Then there is the President's relentless pursuit for regulation. Whatever the President hasn't been able to do legislatively, he is attempting to do through regulation—most of it through the EPA. Cap and trade is a good example. We have debated that since the Kyoto Treaty was up. Clearly, the votes are not there. Right now, in this Chamber, we would not get 25 votes for cap and trade. Yet everybody is talking about how it is important to have cap and trade. Now he is trying to do it through regulation. That alone would cost the American people \$300 trillion to \$400 trillion a year—not just one shot; that is a year.

There is the boiler MACT legislation, which is maximum attainable controlled technology. In other words, what can we do? What do we have the technology to do to stop emissions? We don't have it. But he has that, and that was billions of dollars a year.

Ozone regulations: He was going to announce this week a tightening of the ozone regulations that would put 608 of our counties in America out of attainment. I am from Oklahoma, and it would put 15 of our counties out of attainment. They cannot recruit industry in those counties, and they cannot hire people, and many will have to go out of business because of the ozone regulations. It is not, in my opinion, legal the way he is doing it because he is supposed to address it every 5 years. It was done in 2008 on new technology, which is a requirement. Today, he is trying to do it using the same 2008 technology. Again, it is extremely expensive. That casts a tremendous cloud of uncertainty over the business sector, and that is a key reason they announced today that the economy is growing at 1.3 percent a year. That is terrible, especially when we consider the recession we are in.

As a general rule, economies recover rapidly when coming off of a financial recession. It is not unusual for countries to grow at 4, 5, 6 percent for the years following a recession. But we can't even get around 2 percent. That has a huge negative effect on the econ-

omy and the government. The President's regulatory agenda is the reason our unemployment rate is above 9 percent, and it is the reason our economy is growing so slowly. Because of this, our tax receipts are way off their historic levels. If we can get the economy to grow faster at a sustained period of time, the effect on tax revenues is unbelievable. This is pretty well accepted. I always said that every 1 percent increase in the economy equals about \$50 million in new revenue. That is the way to grow revenue.

Certainly, President Kennedy knew it, President Reagan knew it, and so the best way to increase revenue and get the economy moving again is, of course, to increase growth. If the economy grows at a rate that is 1 percent faster than presently forecast for the next decade, Federal tax revenues will grow by \$3 trillion.

I conservatively estimate that the cost to Federal revenues of the President's regulatory agenda has been \$1 trillion. So we have, through his regulatory behavior, another \$1 trillion. That brings our total to \$3.5 trillion.

Then in there is an increase in non-security discretionary spending, which has added up to \$500 billion in spending.

There is the expanded and increased spending on unemployment benefits, which is also a consequence of his regulatory policies that have killed the economic recovery, and the cost of that is another \$500 billion.

Together, all these failed policies add up to a \$4.5 trillion contribution to the Federal deficit.

Since Inauguration Day, the debt has increased by \$3.7 trillion. It is on pace to increase by more than \$5 trillion by the end of the President's first term. If we undid all of these failed policies, we would not find ourselves in the situation we are in today. We would not be debating this because it would not be necessary. It is because of the President that we are even talking about raising the debt ceiling. If we could undo the President's policies, we would not need to raise the debt ceiling at all.

Where is the President? He has been totally absent from this entire debt conversation. Today, he is meeting with terrorists from Cote d'Ivoire, and he is probably going to play golf in the afternoon—I don't know. But he is not participating. He doesn't seem to care about debating the debt ceiling. He wants to raise the deficit. If he did care, he would see the need for the Boehner plan, endorse it, and sign it into law. I guess that is too much to ask.

We are going to have a chance to do that tonight. They are going to have a vote in the House around 6 o'clock on the Boehner plan, and it will come over here, and we will have an opportunity to do that. If the Democrats support us—a handful of them—we will be able to get that passed. We will wait until tonight to see what happens.

HOUSE MEETING

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, there is a terrorist visiting with the President right now. I will elaborate. So many people are looking the other way and don't know what is going on in Africa. I have been on this floor nine different times talking about the atrocities that have been committed in Cote d'Ivoire.

They had a President there named Laurent Gbagbo. He and his wife are great people, friends of this country. An election took place, and I stood here and showed how it was fraudulent, and the guy who won is named Alassane Ouattara.

Right now, as we speak, at this very moment, President Obama is meeting with the rebel leader and potential war criminal Alassane Ouattara in our Nation's Oval Office. This is an unwise and grossly misguided decision on behalf of President Obama. It is, in fact, an outrage that our President would welcome with open arms a man who is responsible for the deaths of at least 3,000 people and the displacement of a half million refugees in Cote d'Ivoire.

Ouattara is an illegitimate usurper who has scandalized Cote d'Ivoire's electoral system and wrongfully ousted democratic incumbent Laurent Gbagbo.

Beginning late last year, Ouattara fraudulently won Cote d'Ivoire's Presidential election, and after Gbagbo revealed the fraud he led a rebel army that violently overthrew the Gbagbo government, with the support of the French military, which wrongly intervened in this former French colony.

This is a picture that depicts one of Ouattara's death squads murdering, maiming, raping. This is happening as we speak.

Who is in the President's office? Alassane Ouattara. As a result, Amnesty International reported on July 28 that half a million Ivorians are displaced in postelection violence and are prevented from returning home because of a "climate of fear" that continues to reign in this country. Amnesty International specifically singles out Ouattara's security forces and his state-sponsored militia composed of Dozos—they are called—who continue to target pro-Gbagbo ethnic groups.

Dozos, traditional hunters, are a mercenary group that both Amnesty International and the International Committee of the Red Cross blame for carrying out a massacre in April of at least 220 people in the western town of Duekoue.

Here they are in this photo. You can see the charred bodies of those murdered by Ouattara, who is in the President's office right now. There are executions going on. There is a photo of a person who was burned and beaten on the back—from the political opposition. That is what is happening today.

Amnesty International alleges that these forces under Ouattara's command are continuing to engage in "documented crimes under international law and human rights violations and