

but the plan could be almost anything. Nor is there any assurance in the statement that no prisoners could come to the United States until October 1. That is not the kind of assurance that will get the Senate to support this request. As the majority leader said in his classically understated way: "That looks like an issue that could cause a little bit of debate." I am sure he is absolutely correct about that. Surely, we can all agree that the Congress should not approve significant funding requests when we have no idea how the administration will use the funding. Moreover, the stakes are huge. The terrorist population at Guantanamo is dangerous. These are the worst of the worst, some of the most dangerous people in the world.

The 241 terrorists at Guantanamo include 27 members of al-Qaida leadership, 95 lower level al-Qaida operatives, 9 members of the Taliban's leadership, 12 Taliban fighters, and 92 foreign fighters. Among their ranks are Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, who is the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks and who, in the aftermath of those attacks, was planning a followup to attack a west coast skyscraper.

Another is Ali Abd al-Aziz Ali, who served as a key lieutenant for KSM—Khalid Shaikh Mohammed—during the planning for 9/11, and he, in fact, transferred money to the United States-based operative for that plan.

Ramzi bin al-Shibh helped to organize the 9/11 attacks and he was a lead operative in the post-9/11 plot to hijack aircraft and crash them into Heathrow airport.

There is also a terrorist named Hambali, who helped plan the 2002 Bali bombings that killed more than 200 people and who facilitated the al-Qaida financing for the Jakarta Marriott attack in 2004. Abd al Rahim Al Nashire masterminded the attack on the USS Cole which claimed the lives of 17 U.S. sailors in October of 2000.

The prior administration has stated that 110 of these detainees should never be released because of the danger to the United States.

What about those who are considered safe for release? We have been undergoing a review of the prisoners from the time they have been taken, and occasionally we release some because we think they no longer represent a threat. The Department of Defense stated in January that 61 former Guantanamo detainees whom we had released returned to the battlefield against the United States and allied forces in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. This represents in our criminal terms an 11-percent recidivism rate, and who knows how many of the rest of them may also be engaged in acts of terror. One of these recidivists, Said al-Shihri, who was returned to his home in Saudi Arabia after his release from Guantanamo, went to Yemen and he is now the No. 2 in Yemen's al-Qaida branch.

So what are we to do with these people? More than 100 days into the ad-

ministration, we don't know what their plan is. According to press reports, part of the plan may be to allow one group of these detainees, 17 Uighurs from China, to have residence in the United States.

As the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, noted in two letters to the Attorney General, such an action appears to be prohibited under United States law. Senator SESSIONS stated in his letter to Mr. Holder:

Just 4 years ago, Congress enacted into law a prohibition on the admission of foreign terrorists and trained militants into this country. Accordingly, Congress is entitled to know what legal authority, if any, you believe the administration has to admit into the United States Uighurs and/or any other detainee who participated in terrorist-related activities covered by section 1182(a)(3)(B).

Congress obviously must have the answer to this question before it considers funding that could possibly be used to bring these and other terrorists and detainees to the United States.

What of the rest of the terrorists? Will the administration bring them to the United States to stand trial? If so, according to what rules? We have been told that the administration was shutting down the military commissions process set up by Congress, but now it appears that that process may be brought back. Will all of the remaining Guantanamo terrorists be tried in that system or will civilian courts be used? And if civilian courts, which ones?

If you can't imagine these terrorists actually being tried in U.S. civilian courts, you might try to imagine a little harder. The most likely locations of trials are in Manhattan or Alexandria, VA—both very high population areas. The 2006 death penalty trial of Zacarias Moussaoui turned Alexandria into a virtual encampment, with heavily armed agents, rooftop snipers, bomb-sniffing dogs, blocked streets, identification checks, and a fleet of television satellite trucks.

And where will these detainees be held while awaiting trial? Federal prisons, which are already overcrowded, would be overburdened with the obligation of housing terrorist suspects. Zacarias Moussaoui, who spent 23 hours a day inside his 80-square-foot cell, was constantly monitored and never saw other inmates. An entire unit of six cells and a common area was set aside just for him.

If not in Federal prisons, perhaps military prisons. Well, not so fast. Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Detainee Affairs noted that extensive work would have to be done on existing military brigades before Guantanamo detainees could be held there:

You can't commingle them with military detainees, so you'd have to set up a separate wing or clear out the facility.

The structures would have to be reinforced so that they wouldn't be vulnerable to terrorist attacks. He concludes by saying:

And you would have to address secondary and tertiary—

in other words, security—

concerns with the town, the county and the State.

The reality of the situation is that there is simply no better place for these terrorists than the state-of-the-art facility at Guantanamo.

This is why the Senate went on record voting against the proposition that these detainees be brought to the United States. In fact, the Senate agreed to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Kentucky by a vote of 94 to 3. Among the people voting in support of this resolution were the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Vice President himself while they were Members of this body. So key members of the Obama administration have agreed with the language of the amendment which was that Guantanamo detainees—and I am quoting now—"should not be . . . transferred stateside into facilities in American communities and neighborhoods."

If the administration has a plan, I will listen to it, but with approximately 8 months to go before the President's arbitrary deadline, I see no good answers to the complicated questions of what to do with the world's most dangerous terrorists.

Before the President asks for appropriations to shut down the Guantanamo facility, appropriations which could be spent to bring these terrorists to the United States, the least he could do is to provide Congress with a plan that explains how Americans will be safer having Khalid Shaikh Mohammed and his partners as neighbors.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we are soon going to be debating a bill that would place limits on the interest rate increases that credit card companies can levy on their debtholders. I look forward to debating the effects this bill will have on American families.

But before we do that, I wish to consider the debt that the Federal Government is accruing—via the budget and stimulus spending—on the Nation's credit card. That is the debt that all American families will be responsible for repaying because, as it turns out, the comparisons between what you owe on your own credit card—the kind of bills you run up on your family credit card—are actually not very different from the debt we are running up on the Federal credit card, except, of course, that the Federal debt is much bigger.

But the reality is that you owe both: your family credit card debt and your portion of the national debt.

President Obama's budget puts us on a course to acquire debt that will reach 82.4 percent of the gross domestic product by the year 2019. What does that mean? The first point is that the debt is not interest free. There is debt interest charged on that just the same as on our personal credit cards. In fact, from Sunday's Washington Post, there is an article called "The President's Budget" and in it the Post says the following:

The budget relies on so much borrowing that it will cost taxpayers more than \$4 trillion just to cover interest payments for the next 10 years—more than twice what the federal government will spend on education, energy, homeland security, and veterans combined.

Mr. President, \$4 trillion in interest on this debt—just for the next 10 years.

The Government will begin—as a result of the need to pay this back, starting in 2013 we will be paying more than \$1 billion per day on finance charges to the people who hold this Federal debt.

Imagine a billion dollars a day in interest payments. I meant U.S. debt. A billion dollars a day in interest payments equates to \$3.3 million a day for every American. Think about that—\$3.3 million a day to finance the debt for every American citizen.

Can a family play by these same rules and get away with debt that would creep up to 84.2 percent of their total income? Let's use a specific, typical example. A family in my State of Arizona earns an average income of \$47,215 a year. Following the example of the President's budget, this family would accrue nearly \$38,000 in credit card debt to pay for the things it wants. Again, that is a \$47,000 income and \$38,000 in credit card debt. That is the same percentage of the family's income that the Federal Government is acquiring as a percent of the Federal income, our national income.

What would that family's situation be like? First, let's focus on these hefty interest payments that I talked about. Say that the family's credit card has a typical annual rate of 10 percent, which would cost \$3,800 a year or \$316 a month. If the family misses a payment or two, the interest rate can shoot up to 20 or 30 percent a year. That means the family could be spending as much as \$11,200 a year just on interest. That is nearly a third of its total debt and nearly a quarter of its total income—just on interest alone. That is owed in addition to the monthly minimum payments for the principal borrowed. Just as the Government has to, the family probably would need to borrow more to get by, and the downward spiral would get worse and worse.

Needless to say, this kind of debt is not sustainable—not for the family or the Federal Government. It would rapidly lower the family's standard of living. In most cases, it would bankrupt them. Beginning to chip away at that kind of debt would require real sac-

rific—*not* just giving up nonessential spending, such as going to the movies or going out to dinner or going to the zoo but fundamental choices that would significantly lower the family's standard of living.

A family with such massive debt would also be considered a big risk for other lenders, so it would be very difficult to go out and get more credit or a loan. This is the situation we are getting into with China, which currently holds almost 10 percent of our Nation's debt. The Chinese are saying to us: We are not sure you are a good credit risk in the future or that we want to lend you any more money. We are relying on the Chinese to continue buying that debt. But in mid-March, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao voiced concerns about U.S. Government bond holdings. He said:

We have lent huge amounts of money to the United States. Of course we are concerned about the safety of our assets. To be honest, I am a little bit worried, and I would like to . . . call on the United States to honor its word and remain a credible nation and ensure the safety of Chinese assets.

Of course, this is exactly how credit works. Borrow massive amounts of money, and you are in over your head. A huge chunk of your income is reserved for debt repayments and interest, leaving you with little money to get by or for discretionary spending. You continue to borrow more, and your creditors probably get very nervous. Pretty soon, they may cease lending to you or hike up your interest rates to hedge their additional risk. The only way to get back on track is to stop spending—and that is if you can afford to get back on track by just stopping spending and not having to borrow more or taking bankruptcy.

That is a choice the U.S. Government doesn't have. Yet there are no plans in Washington to halt the out-of-control spending. The massive amount of debt we are accumulating in entitlement obligations alone is more than can be sustained. These are things such as Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare. We say that is an obligation we cannot default on. Yet we also know we cannot continue to fund that obligation. As the President's head of the Office of Management and Budget has said, continued debts of the kind we are talking about are unsustainable. There have been some minor reductions in spending noted in the budget. Some are in the area of defense, which is perhaps not the best area to cut back. But the minor amount of spending reduction doesn't go nearly far enough when we are talking about multiple trillions of dollars in spending and debt—\$4 trillion just in debt service in the next 10 years alone.

The overwhelming majority of American families, of course, don't engage in this kind of reckless borrowing and spending. They cannot. They have to make hard decisions to determine what they can afford to do.

Washington needs to do the same. These are hard choices. We need to

make hard choices. The editorial in the Washington Post from last Sunday made the same point. Again, the title was: "The President's budget, Leaving the hard choices for the next one." It notes that when the President was campaigning, he said:

"We can no longer afford to leave the hard choices for the next budget, the next administration, or the next generation," declared President Barack Obama last week as he unveiled his budget.

As the Post notes:

We, yes, but that is exactly what he does.

They conclude that:

We just hope that it is only until the next budget rather than the next administration.

The bottom line is, the budget sent to us by the President doesn't tackle the big issues, it doesn't reduce spending, it doesn't even cut existing programs substantially, with the net result that we are going to be taking on debt that will require financing of \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. As was noted, that is not sustainable. We cannot pay for that, just as a family who makes \$47,000 a year cannot afford to take on \$38,000 in debt. That is the relative proportion.

One more time, the amount of debt we are taking on compared to our national income is the same ratio as a family making \$47,000 taking on \$38,000 of debt on their credit card. I am not talking about a 30-year mortgage on the house but something that has to be paid back at the end of the month. And if you don't pay it, your interest rate goes up to 25 or 30 percent. That is simply not sustainable.

I hope that by putting this into the context of a real family budget, it is clear to people this isn't some hypothetical, unrealistic comparison. When we take on this much debt at the Federal Government level, there are real consequences. When you talk about \$3.3 million a day for each citizen of the United States to repay in interest alone, you see the magnitude of what we are taking on. We have never done this before in the history of the country. There is no experience of how we would possibly deal with this. This one budget, during this one 10-year window, accumulates more debt than all the debt in the United States in our entire history, from George Washington all the way through George W. Bush. In that 220-year history, we have less debt than is represented in this one budget. That is unsustainable.

The American people cannot make enough money to repay that amount of money. Our standard of living will be diminished substantially. The only way out of it is to reduce the amount of spending in the future. We can start with that right now. We don't have to start after next year. We can actually start with it this year.

I ask my colleagues, as we talk about the budget the President has announced, as we start working on the appropriations bills that will be coming from the Appropriations Committee, that we stop and think about

the amount of debt we are imposing on ourselves, our kids, and our grandkids. That debt will come due more quickly than we think. The consequences could be dire.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for weeks, Republicans in Congress have been saying what Democrats are finally beginning to acknowledge: that the administration has no plan for closing Guantanamo and that closing this secure facility without a safe alternative is irresponsible, dangerous, and, frankly, unacceptable.

Over the years, Guantanamo has housed some of the most hardened terrorists ever captured alive, and many of those who remain are the worst of the worst. Some have already killed innocent Americans, and many are outspoken about their desire to kill more Americans. These men are exactly where they belong: locked up in a safe and secure prison and isolated from the American people where they can do no harm.

America has not been attacked at home since 9/11 because of the hard work of our Armed Forces, dedicated intelligence officials, the men and women at the Department of Homeland Security, and State and local law enforcement officials. But another reason we have not been attacked is because some of those most likely to do so are locked up down at Guantanamo. These inmates are not spectators. They are the enemy. They are the plotters, the planners, the funders, the ones who pull the trigger.

The administration says our country would be safer if Guantanamo is closed and its inmates are transferred overseas or onto U.S. soil. If people knew who was down there, I think they would disagree.

One of the men who is locked away safely at Guantanamo is Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, the man who actually organized the 9/11 attacks. We captured him while he was planning followup attacks to 9/11, including a plot to destroy a west coast skyscraper. If we had not captured Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, he may very well have succeeded in carrying out the same kind of attack on the west coast that he carried out on the east coast. This is a man who boasts about using his "blessed right hand" to decapitate the American journalist Daniel Pearl. And he is unrepentant. Earlier this year, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed joined a

number of detainees at Guantanamo in declaring themselves "terrorists to the bone" and proclaiming September 11, 2001, as a "blessed" day.

Another inmate who still declares himself a "terrorist to the bone" is Ali Abd al-Aziz Ali, who served as a key lieutenant for KSM on several plots against the United States and the United Kingdom, including the 9/11 attacks. During what he described as the "blessed 11 September operation," Ali transferred money to U.S.-based operatives and served as a sort of travel agent for some of the hijackers. This man is responsible for the deaths of thousands of Americans.

Another terrorist at Guantanamo who is responsible for the deaths of Americans is Abd al-Rahim al-Nashiri, who masterminded the attack on the USS Cole which killed 17 U.S. sailors in 2000. When he was arrested, Nashiri was planning new terrorist attacks, including a plot to crash an airplane into a Western naval vessel and a plan targeting a U.S. housing compound in Riyadh in Saudi Arabia.

These are just three of the men locked up safely and securely on an island miles from the United States in a facility that even the administration acknowledges to be humane and well run. Americans want these men kept out of our neighborhoods and off the battlefield, and Guantanamo guarantees that. Closing this facility by an arbitrary deadline without an alternative is irresponsible and it is dangerous. It is unacceptable to the American people and unacceptable to an increasing number of lawmakers on both sides of the aisle.

The Attorney General has said that when it comes to Guantanamo, his chief concern is the safety of the American people. Yet, at the moment, the safest option is clearly the one we are exercising. If safety is our top concern, then the administration will rethink its arbitrary deadline for closing Guantanamo until it presents us with an equally safe alternative.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week we commemorate National Police Week, recognizing the service and sacrifice of the men and women across America in law enforcement. We especially honor those peace officers who have been tragically killed in the line of duty while protecting our communities and safeguarding our democracy.

Over 25 years ago, I served as a county executive in Jefferson County, KY, which includes my hometown of Louisville. I got to work with the county's police force and witnessed up close their dedication and their professionalism. In Jefferson County, we pioneered new techniques for tracking down abducted children that met with much success—enough success that other jurisdictions adopted these techniques, eventually leading to Congressional establishment of the National

Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

Decades later, peace officers in Louisville are still proud to protect and serve, even with their lives in the balance. And those we have lost are not forgotten. I was moved to read in my hometown paper recently an article about a memorial ceremony in Louisville coinciding with National Police Week. Fellow officers and family members of fallen officers gathered to remember them and thank them for their service. Police forces across Kentucky reverently marked National Police Week as well. At a service in Richmond, Gov. Steve Beshear watched 120 police cadets march at the State Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, while flags were presented to family members of those lost in the performance of their duties. This Friday in Covington, officers will honor their fallen brothers at the northern Kentucky law enforcement memorial.

This Senate has the deepest admiration and respect for police officers in every community in the Nation. We recognize their work is both an honorable job and a dangerous one. They bravely risk their lives for ours, and America is grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full articles about the recent ceremonies in both Louisville and Richmond.

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

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, May 8, 2009]

FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS HONORED AT JEFFERSON SQUARE SERVICE: COURAGE, COMMITMENT TO DUTY ARE HONORED

(By Jessie Halladay)

Sue Wells' eyes filled with tears as she stood next to a wreath she helped lay at the law enforcement memorial in Jefferson Square yesterday.

Her husband, Forest Hills Police Chief Randy Wells, was killed in October 2007 while working an off-duty traffic detail.

Yesterday, Wells joined other family members and friends of officers killed in the line of duty to remember and pay their respects during a service at Jefferson Square downtown.

"It's wonderful that they remember," Wells said. "It's very heartwarming, but it's heart-wrenching too."

Members of the city's fraternal order of police lodges for several agencies helped plan the event, for which the University of Louisville police union was host.

"When their duty called, they laid down their life for their community, for us," U of L Officer Russell Fuller said during the ceremony. "We will not let their actions fade into history."

Memorials of this type mean a lot to those families left behind, said Jennifer Thacker, who spoke during the service. Thacker's husband, Brandon, was shot in April 1998 while working as an investigator for the Kentucky Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. Thacker now serves as national president of the group Concerns of Police Survivors, or COPS.

She spoke to those attending about the value of always being a member of the law enforcement family.