

Yes" (1981), which sold 3 million copies; he also taught it to students, especially, from 1979, through his Harvard Negotiation Project. Like all good tools, it got better with use. In any negotiation, he wrote—even with terrorists—it was vital to separate the people from the problem; to focus on the underlying interests of both sides, rather than stake out unwavering positions; and to explore all possible options before making a decision. The parties should try to build a rapport, check each other out, even just by shaking hands or eating together. Each should "listen actively", as he always did, to what the other was saying. They should recognize the emotions on either side, from a longing for security to a craving for status. And they should try to get inside each other's heads.

That was the theory, and Mr. Fisher delighted to put it into practice. At the Geneva summit of 1985, for example, Ronald Reagan on his advice did not confront Mikhail Gorbachev, but sat by a roaring fire with him while they exchanged ideas. More summits followed. A border war between Peru and Ecuador was nipped in the bud when Mr. Fisher advised the president of Ecuador (once a pupil of his) to sit on a sofa with the Peruvian president, and look at a map with him. Interviewing President Nasser of Egypt in 1970, Mr. Fisher asked him how Golda Meir, then Israel's prime minister, would be regarded at home if she agreed to all his demands. "Boy, would she have a problem!" Nasser laughed. He then grew thoughtful, having briefly seen their dispute from her point of view.

The Middle East, which caused him personal grief, also brought his most public success. His principles were used all through the Camp David negotiations of 1978, from the brainstorming over Jimmy Carter's draft of an agreement (23 rewrites) to the moment when Mr. Carter presented Menachem Begin, the Israeli leader, with signed pictures dedicated, by name, to each of Begin's grandchildren. Deeply affected, Begin began to talk about his family. The accords were signed that day.

He had his failures. As a Pentagon adviser in the 1960s he suggested several "yesable propositions" to put to the North Vietnamese; Robert McNamara listened, but not the military brass. In 1967 he had fun trying to nurse the tiny, dusty island of Anguilla to independent statehood, but the experiment was overturned. South Africa possibly satisfied him most: the Afrikaner cabinet and ANC officials, trained separately by him in negotiation workshops, agreeing to end apartheid without resorting to violence.

LESSONS FROM THE SOUK

Mr. Fisher's motivation was as clear as his writing. He hated war. His own service had been as a weather reconnaissance officer; in the course of it he had lost his roommate and many college friends. He had also flown often over Japan, harmless morning flights which the Japanese, pre-Hiroshima, had fatally learned to ignore. All those deaths weighed on him.

More light-heartedly, he grew up as one of six children, preferring to strike bargains rather than land a punch. Later on, still bargain-minded, he would stroll the souks of Damascus or Jerusalem, looking to expand his collection of ancient weights. Every one of those pieces represented a tough negotiation successfully concluded. For those who found his principles too idealistic, he could point to age-old haggling tricks he also recommended: pretending not to be interested, refusing to react to pressure, being prepared to walk away.

His most pleasing bargain, though, was the one he made to get his lot on the Vineyard. There he built a glass and shingle house right between the pounding ocean and Watcha Pond, where ospreys nested. When he

first found the place, the owner refused to part with the few acres he needed. He would sell him only the whole property, 60 acres or so, which cost too much. But Mr. Fisher called in friends, they all clubbed together, the deal was agreed; and he spent 50 glorious summers there, in just the sort of sweet, wise, negotiated peace he always wished for the world.

REQUEST FOR CONSULTATION

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask consent that the following letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
November 13, 2012,

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MCCONNELL: I am requesting that I be consulted before the Senate enters into any unanimous consent agreements or time limitations regarding H.R. 6062, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program Reauthorization Act of 2012.

I support the goals of this legislation and believe state and local law enforcement agencies are a vital part of the criminal justice system in this country. However, I believe the responsibility to support, fund, and hold accountable state and local law enforcement agencies lies with the states and local communities these brave law enforcement officers serve. Furthermore, while I do not believe this issue is the responsibility of the federal government; if Congress does act, we can and must do so in a fiscally responsible manner. My concerns are included in, but not limited to, those outlined in this letter.

While this bill is well-intentioned, it could cost the American people approximately \$800 million per year for 5 years without corresponding offsets, totaling \$4 billion. Furthermore, with the exception of the extra stimulus funding in 2009 through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program (JAG) has never received funding at the level authorized in this legislation. According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), JAG funding has averaged \$461 million per year since its first appropriation in FY 2005, and appropriations have actually been trending downward since that time. Without including the 2009 ARRA funding, the most Congress has ever appropriated to Byrne JAG in a single year is \$546 million in FY 2009. I recognize this legislation reduces the overall authorization for the Byrne JAG program; however, I do not believe this reduction is sufficient to address the growing federal spending problem in this country.

It is irresponsible for Congress to jeopardize the future standard of living of our children by borrowing from future generations. The U.S. national debt is now over \$16 trillion. That means over \$51,000 in debt for each man, woman and child in the United States. A year ago, the national debt was \$14.7 trillion. Despite pledges to control spending, Washington adds billions to the national debt every single day. In just one year, our national debt has grown by \$19 trillion or 8.8%.

In addition to these fiscal concerns, there are several problems specific to this legislation. First, the Byrne JAG program dupli-

cates other sources of federal funding. State and local governments can use Byrne JAG funds for projects in seven different purpose areas: (1) law enforcement programs; (2) prosecution and court programs; (3) prevention and education programs; (4) corrections and community corrections programs; (5) drug treatment programs; (6) planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs; and (7) crime victim and witness programs. Several of these broad purpose areas are already covered by other federal grant programs including Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), Second Chance Act grants, drug and mental health court grants, and the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant program, among others.

Second, Congress, particularly the Senate, has not performed sufficient oversight of the Byrne JAG program to justify its reauthorization at this time. Before reauthorizing this or any program, Congress should perform oversight to determine how a grant program is performing, evaluate how grantees use federal funds, measure the results of the program, and analyze whether there are other federal programs funding the same purposes. In my federal deficit reduction plan, Back in Black, I noted that critics on the right and left, along with the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General, agree Byrne JAG experiences waste, fraud, and abuse in a variety of ways and should be reformed. Thus, I do not believe Congress should blindly reauthorize this program without oversight through a detailed review of its policies and practices.

Finally, I do not believe the federal government has the authority under the Constitution to provide federal funds to state and local governments for use on state and local criminal justice systems. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution enumerates the limited powers of Congress, and nowhere are we tasked with funding or becoming involved with state and local criminal issues.

There is no question state and local law enforcement play a vital role in maintaining order and safety in many communities. However, I believe this issue is the responsibility of the states and not the federal government. Despite these constitutional limitations, if Congress does act in this area we should evaluate the program as most American individuals and companies must do with their own resources; we should review current programs, determine any needs that may exist, and prioritize those needs for funding by cutting from the federal budget programs fraught with waste, fraud, abuse, and duplication.

Sincerely,

TOM A. COBURN, M.D.,
United States Senator.

WYOMING TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to submit for the RECORD a document that I think everyone in this body should consider.