United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 2011 No. 96

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, July 1, 2011, at 10 a.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 2011

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEFF MERKLEY, a Senator from the State of Oregon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of liberty, as America's birthday approaches, help us to know in this land the meaning and purpose of our freedom. May our Senators seek freedom with justice, freedom to choose righteousness, and freedom to do the right thing with judicious governmental intervention. Give our lawmakers such liberty of soul that their gratitude might merge with their commitment to honor You in word and deed. Give each of us a sense of responsibility for his or her share in the democratic processes, as we earnestly seek for good government, exercising our influence responsibly.

Lord, we pray that You would bless the members of our departing page class.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEFF MERKLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF MERKLEY, a Senator from the State of Oregon, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MERKLEY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until noon. The first hour will be under the control of the majority, and Republicans will control the second hour. Following morning business, the Senate will be in executive session to consider the nomination of David Petraeus to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

At about 2 p.m., then, there will be a vote on the confirmation of David Petraeus. Additional rollcall votes are possible during today's session of the Senate.

DEBT CEILING NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this weekend we will celebrate Independence Day and 235 years of this country's very proud history. This Nation was founded on the notion of liberty and justice for all. As we celebrate, we should remember that the pursuit of liberty is not just a journey with a destination but, rather, a quest to which we must recommit ourselves every single day. As we commit fully and firmly to liberty and justice, we must commit just as fully and firmly to the idea that the liberty and justice should be truly for all.

It is often said that with liberty comes responsibility. We should take that responsibility seriously. I am confident we do. That is why the Senate will reconvene on Tuesday, the day after the Fourth. We will do that because we have work to do. We will be in session that week—that is next week—with our first vote on July 5. We will determine what time that vote will be on July 5, likely in the afternoon because of the travel problems with the Fourth of July the previous day. There is still so much to do to put Americans back to work, cut our deficit, get our economy back to work. It is very important we do this. That moment is too important, the obstacles too steep, and the time too short to waste even a moment.

I hope my Republican colleagues will put politics aside and help Democrats fulfill Congress's responsibility to the American people. There are some Republicans in Congress who say the U.S. Government has less responsibility to pay its bills than struggling families

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

all across our great country. As a default crisis approaches, Republicans are saying we should simply stop cutting checks for the national equivalent of the home mortgage, the credit card, the car payment. Republicans say this crisis is about spending more or growing government. They are wrong. This crisis is about paying the bills for things we have already bought—for example, a decade of tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, our war of choice in Iraq, the war in Afghanistan, those tax cuts for billionaires and millionaires and the wars unpaid for. What they are not saying is what the consequences would be of such an irresponsible decision to not pay our accrued bills—remember, the bills we already accumulated, have run up. If we did not pay our bills, it would plunge the United States not into a recession, not into the so-called double-dip recession, but into a full-blown depression. That is without a doubt. Without exception, the respected financial voices of our time have said the effects of a default crisis would be felt across the globe, not just here in the United States. I repeat, this would create a worldwide depression.

Many respected voices could not have spoken in clearer terms. From the private sector, the CEO of JPMorgan Chase, a man by the name of Jamie Dimon, said default would be ''catastrophic.'' He went on to say raising the debt limit is our ''moral obligation.''

What does that mean? It means the world should ''know that the United States is good for its money. Period.'' That is what Jamie Dimon said, and I agree.

He is not the only one saying this. Business leaders have said it, economists have said it, banks have said it, and Republican advisers to Presidents Reagan and the first George Bush have said it. Perhaps more importantly, credit rating agencies have said it. Credit rating agencies Standard & Poor's and Moody's have said that if the United States misses even one payment, the Nation will immediately lose its high credit rating, interest rates would increase. Remember, for every 1-percent increase in the interest rates it would cost our country $1.3 trillion—not million, not billion, trillion.

That is one more reason why defaulting on our debt to make a point about fiscal responsibility makes so little sense. If we default, it will actually cost our Nation more to meet our financial obligations in the future, and that is a gross understatement.

Democrats believe we must create jobs and get our economy moving again. We must cut spending and live within our means. We all know that. We must eliminate tax loopholes for millionaires, billionaires, and oil companies. Republicans must not put the economy of this country and the world at risk for the sake of protecting special interests and the big donors. It is time we returned to the type of fiscal discipline Democrats brought to Washington in the 1990s, when Democrats in Congress and the White House balanced the budget and used the surplus—to do what? To pay down the debt. We were being criticized for paying down the debt too fast. President Bush changed that very quickly.

But a default crisis would do nothing to get our fiscal house in order. Instead, default, in effect bankruptcy, would derail our fragile economic recovery and plunge this Nation and the world back into not just a recession but a full-blown depression. I said that earlier. It is the truth. It would also risk millions of Americans' jobs, tax refunds, Social Security checks, Medicare payments, and paychecks for our troops.

There was a nice report written the day before yesterday by Alice Rivlin and one of George Bush's Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury and they said the same thing but in much more detail. Frankly, reading that was very frightening. Those risks are simply not worth taking.

Today, middle-class families in America are struggling to survive economically. They are living paycheck to paycheck in many instances. Meanwhile, Republicans walked away from the negotiations. Why did they walk away from the negotiations that would have cut the deficit and averted a catastrophic default? They did it in order to protect tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. That is obvious. Republicans are willing to risk our economy to keep tax breaks for corporations and ship jobs overseas. Meanwhile, average Americans are struggling to find work here at home. Republicans are willing to risk our economy to protect tax breaks for owners of corporate jets and yachts and oil companies, while the average Americans are struggling to afford gas for their cars. Republicans are willing to risk our economy to protect tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires and average Americans are struggling to meet their mortgage payments for their homes.

I have said it before. Republicans simply have the wrong priorities. They have made it their mission to stand and shout for the richest few. We Democrats consider it our responsibility to stand and shout for all Americans. That is what this debate is all about.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this has been cleared by my counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent the order of Wednesday, June 29, with respect to the Finance Committee meeting today be vitiated.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S.J. RES. 23

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a joint resolution at the desk that is due a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 23) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the resolution on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Chair.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LANCE CORPORAL TIMOTHY MATTHEW JACKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I want to speak about a young man from Corbin, KY, who gave his life in service of our country. LCpl Timothy Matthew Jackson, a U.S. marine, was tragically killed while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan, on September 30, 2010. He was 22 years old.

Lance Corporal Jackson was deployed with the 2nd Battalion, 9th Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force, Fox Company, based out of Camp Lejeune, NC.

For his heroic service, he received many awards, medals, and decorations, including the Purple Heart, the Combat Action Ribbon, the Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, three Sea Service Deployment Ribbons, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, two Iraq Campaign Medals, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the National Defense Service Medal.

Lance Corporal Jackson—who went by his middle name, Matt—attended Corbin Elementary School, Corbin Middle School, and Corbin High School, where he graduated in the class of 2007.

Many who knew Matt in school knew of his desire to serve in the military after graduation. He was an enthusiastic participant in his school's Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps.

''All he ever wanted to do when he graduated was join the Marines and serve his country, and that's what he did,'' says COL Rick McClure, Matt's senior instructor in Corbin High's JROTC program.

Matt was an ''outstanding young man. He was quiet. Always had a smile. Just a super young man,'' Colonel McClure says. ''And as long as I knew him, what he wanted to do was to graduate from high school and be a marine . . . I'm just so thankful that we have guys like Matt that will go and give their lives for the freedoms we enjoy.''

Matt's wife Nikki remembers the surprising way Matt asked her to marry him. It was on Christmas Eve. Matt and Nikki were with family, opening presents. One present was addressed to both of them, and Matt opened it to reveal a Cracker Jack box.

''He handed it to me and said open it,'' Nikki says. ''When I did, everyone's hand shot for some, and by the time I could pour some in my hand it was crumbs. There fell the ring in my hand, and I looked at him and he was down on one knee and asked me to marry him. Of course I said yeah.'' Matt and Nikki were married on May 22, 2009.

For Matt's mom Jody Tonkin, it is too hard to pick just one memory of her son. ''I don't have just one,'' she says. ''As his mom, all my memories are the best.''

Matt's aunt Theresa Jackson Hopkins, remembers when Matt was a little boy and went on a trip to Disney World. ''He had a smile on his face the whole time,'' she says. ''That had to be the highlight of his life, until he met Nikki.''

Matt worked hard to prepare himself for the service, and joined the Marine Corps right after high school. In 2008 he was deployed to Iraq. He also served on missions in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Cuba. After his military service concluded, he was looking forward to a career in law enforcement.

Matt's uncle Tom Jackson, remembers the day Matt came home from Afghanistan for a hero's funeral. At the terminal of the London-Corbin Airport waiting to meet the plane carrying Matt's body were over a hundred Patriot Guard Riders, with American flags on their motorcycles, there to escort the fallen marine to the funeral home.

''As we followed the hearse from the airport, the Riders slowed, and there beside the road was a small group of men, women, and children waving flags as tears ran down their faces,'' says Tom Jackson. ''I could read their lips saying 'thank you' and at that point in time there was an outward burst of emotion that I just could not contain. I was crying like a baby, a sight that I'm sure that my daughter and grandson had never seen from me.''

The number of people who wished to thank Lance Corporal Jackson for his service was so great the funeral home chapel could not accommodate them all. The city of Corbin graciously donated the use of the Arena at the Southeastern Kentucky Ag & Expo Complex, where hundreds came to pay their respects.

We must keep Matt's friends and family in our thoughts as I recount his story for the Senate today. We are thinking of his wife, Nichole A. Jackson; his father, Timothy Wayne Jackson; his mother, Jody Tonkin; his brothers, Jerricho Tonkin, Barry Daniel Powell, Dustin Johnson, and Wayne Spurlin; his stepmother, Lorrie Johnson; his stepfather, Billy Bowers; his grandmothers, Mary Jackson and Carol Gable; his uncle, Tom Jackson; his cousin, Michael Ryan Hopkins; his aunt, Theresa Jackson Hopkins; and many other beloved family members and friends. Matt was preceded in death by his grandfather, Edgar Jackson.

Matt's Uncle Tom can still recall a time he and a 9-year-old Matt were walking in the woods after dark and Tom feared they were lost. Matt was scared, but put on a brave face nearly until the end—when he finally said, ''Uncle Tom, hold my hand,'' just as the two of them reached the truck.

The family of LCpl Timothy Matthew Jackson must be very proud that little boy grew up to become one of our country's most honored heroes, a brave marine. I want them to know this U.S. Senate honors Lance Corporal Jackson for his life of service. And we honor the immense sacrifice he made on behalf of a very grateful Nation.

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

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

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, we are involved in a very important national debate about our finances, our deficits, our debt, investments in our economy, including the creation of jobs, and how we take on those problems in the most effective manner to build a strong financial foundation for our Nation going ahead and a strong set of opportunities for families to thrive. In the course of this debate, there has been a very interesting development that merits our attention, and that development is this: Some of my colleagues across the aisle have, over time, chosen to put key programs for the wealthy and well connected not in an appropriations bill but in tax legislation. There are advantages to doing so. With appropriations, programs have to be defended year after year. It has to be reviewed in committee. It may have to go through an authorization process as well as an appropriations process. But if a program for the wealthy and well connected is placed in the Tax Code, then, unless a sunset clause has been instituted, that program is a gift that keeps on giving, unexamined in the course of the standard appropriating process.

By putting these programs for the wealthy and well connected into the Tax Code, some of my colleagues across the aisle have said that as a result, there is an additional advantage. We can claim these programs are off-limits, and we can claim that if anyone seeks to examine these programs for the wealthy and well connected, they are seeking to ''raise taxes,'' and we will scare the American citizens into revolt against that effort to examine these sacred cows.

I think this attitude, quite frankly, underestimates American citizens. American citizens understand very well what is up. They understand there is an effort to put programs for working Americans in legislation where it has to be authorized regularly, where it has to go through the appropriations process annually, but the programs for the most wealthy and well connected are put over here behind the fence where they don't have to go through that process, and then they say those are sacred cows and we can't touch them.

There is a big difference between fighting for fairness for working Americans and fighting to defend the benefits for the best off in our society. This is a debate that must be on the floor of the Senate.

It was in 1976 that I came here as an intern to Senator Hatfield. As it turned out, I was assigned to the Tax Reform Act of 1976. In that assignment, I was reading all the mail from Oregon. Then, as the debate came to this Chamber, I would meet Senator Hatfield at the elevator doors, just outside these double doors to the Chamber. Of course, in those days we didn't have a television camera in the Chamber, and in those days we didn't have e-mail to communicate. So staff members would line up and meet their Senators coming off the elevator and brief them about the debate: What were the ups and downs, what were people back home saying, what type of vote it was, whether it was an up-or-down vote, a motion to table, and so on and so forth. Then I would run up to the seats for the staff to observe the debate, and then I would come back down when the next vote on an amendment came up.

That review in 1976 was a tough discussion, because anytime we talk about cutting a program, anyone who benefits from that program is very upset. But there was an understanding on both sides of the aisle that we owed it to the American taxpayer to spend every dollar in the best possible fashion, and, therefore, there could be no fence walling off programs for some for consideration, while the programs for

others merit full examination. Everything needed to be talked about. Everything needed to be weighed as to the value it provided.

Again in 1986, a decade later, an even larger effort—a major effort—was undertaken to examine every tax program, whether it was one that benefited people here or people there, to weigh it in the context of our fiscal responsibility to the Nation. It was Senator Hatfield from Oregon who was head of the Finance Committee and who led that debate on the floor of the Senate. I emphasize that Senator Hatfield was a Republican. Republicans back then believed in fiscal responsibility. They didn't believe in setting off one part of the Tax Code for the wealthy and well connected that would never be examined again, while the programs for working Americans were on the table. No. They looked at everything across the entire spectrum.

So here we are not in 1976, not in 1986 but in 2011. It has been a quarter century since we have had a serious review of the programs embedded in the Tax Code. I must say we have every reason to examine every program funded, whether through the appropriations code or the Tax Code, because we face serious financial circumstances. It is in this context that I would have expected to hear the echoes of 1986—that every program is up for examination and every program is going to be tested against a rigorous set of circumstances to say it is the best use of our dollars. But, instead, my colleagues across the aisle take the position of putting up a very high fence around the tax provisions for the wealthy and well connected, saying their No. 1 goal is to protect those provisions. Programs for seniors are on the table. Dismantling Medicare is a Republican plan. Programs for those who don't have enough food to eat are on the table. Unemployment has been on the table. Funding for the infrastructure we need to rebuild our country is on the table, but this set of sacred cows is not, this set of sacred programs for the wealthy and well connected.

Quite frankly, that is wrong. That must change. We must bring that debate to the floor of the Senate as our colleagues did a quarter century ago, as our colleagues did 35 years ago.

So when it comes to these programs, there must be no sacred cows and there must be no sacred horses. This chart says ''running away with our tax dollars.'' One of the tax programs my colleagues across the aisle are insisting be walled off from examination is a special writeoff for thoroughbred racehorses. Yes, racehorses. This is the bluegrass boondoggle which allows millionaire and billionaire racehorse owners to write off the cost of their horses in an accelerated manner, reducing the normal 7-year period to just 3 years. This bluegrass boondoggle will cost U.S. taxpayers, over the course of the coming 10 years, $126 million, according to CBO estimates, after modeling the impact of this tax provision. This is equivalent to us writing a check over this coming decade for $126 million. This is equivalent to a grant program. This is equivalent to subsidizing a loan program. No program, simply because it is in one bill—the tax bill—rather than in another bill—an appropriations bill—should be off-limits. Horseracing may have been called the sport of kings——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The Senator will suspend.

The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President. Is there a 10-minute rule in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe I am the next speaker. I ask unanimous consent to cede the Senator from Oregon 3 minutes of my 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. I thank my colleague from New York, and I appreciate those 3 minutes.

So horseracing may have been called the sport of kings, but that doesn't mean owners of horses—those millionaires and billionaires supporting those horses—need royal tax treatment. As long as these tax subsidies are preserved, the richest and best off will remain in the winner's circle, while working families don't even get a chance to compete.

There is no doubt that closing this loophole alone isn't going to solve our deficit problem, but it is a good place to start because, otherwise, we are going to cut $126 million from Head Start or $126 million from Medicare for our seniors or programs that help retrain laid-off workers. Giving ''triple crown'' treatment to millionaires, while workers are put out to pasture is not right, and it is not the American way.

I have proposed searching through the Tax Code to find wasteful tax subsidies and eliminate unnecessary giveaways. This year is the right time to start. No one program should be singled out. We should set a series of standards and test each tax program against those standards on whether they create jobs, whether they make a stronger economy, whether they take America forward, and whether that $126 million spent in this category or that is more important to the Nation than other cuts we might be entertaining. Those are the tests that need to be applied in a thoughtful and thorough manner. It is time to stop walling off the programs for the wealthy and well connected while attacking programs that make working America go forward in a stronger fashion.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first hour and the Republicans controlling the second hour.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oregon. Once again, he is forthright, he is courageous, he is on the money, and people should listen to him because he says a lot of good things about a lot of subjects, including this one. I appreciate what he has said.

After weeks of stops and starts, we are now approaching crunch time in the debt ceiling talks. I believe a grand bipartisan bargain is possible but only if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take off their partisan blinders. Neither side can afford to cling to their ideological positions any longer.

To get the economy humming on all cylinders again and avoid a default crisis, we need to say goodbye to a few sacred cows. Yet, mere weeks after voting to repeal ethanol subsidies, the other side's leader, the Senator from Kentucky, has drawn a line in the sand against including any and all revenue changes in the debt deal. He has said that repeal of special interest tax breaks is ''politically impossible.'' Well, that is a curious idea given that the Senator from Kentucky and 33 of his colleagues are on record as supporting the end of ethanol giveaways. It seems Leader MCCONNELL would rather end Medicare as we know it and force cuts to Pell grants and cancer research than institute a little shared sacrifice.

On this side of the aisle, we want to repeal tax breaks that have no purpose whatsoever other than to bloat our budget deficit.

Today, I want to highlight one of the most egregiously wasteful loopholes in the Tax Code: the tax break for yacht owners. Yes, believe it or not, Uncle Sam subsidizes the purchase of sprawling, luxurious, 72-foot Viking yachts. As long as your yacht has a place to sleep and a place to—how shall I put it—relieve yourself, you can classify it as your ''second home'' and claim the mortgage interest deduction. That's right. The deduction Congress helped create for middle-class families to realize the American dream of home ownership is helping millionaires and billionaires get a 35-percent discount on their yachts. In fact, how-to books on tax avoidance advise readers that ''if you're paying for your yacht in cash, you're paying too much.'' Millionaires who would otherwise write a six-figure check for their yacht without batting an eye instead take out a loan so they can claim the mortgage interest deduction. The IRS's only requirement is

that the yacht owner provide proof that they spend 14 days a year on the boat. If only Gilligan and the Skipper had taken a 14-day trip instead of a 3-hour tour, they could have expensed the cost to the S.S. Minnow.

There are tough choices ahead as we seek to achieve our dual goal of creating jobs and reining in the deficit. But repealing this insane tax break for yacht owners is not tough at all—not by a mile or, to put it in terms our nautical friends would understand, not by a league.

I want to make clear that I have nothing against yacht owners. God bless them. They are doing well for themselves, and in America we celebrate success and say: Enjoy your success. That is a great thing. But at a time when the government is tightening its belt and we are grappling with painful cuts to vital programs, it boggles the mind to continue to give boaters a tax break they do not need and never should have had in the first place.

It is a question of priorities. Both sides are for deficit reduction. If our side dug a line in the sand and said: No cuts to programs, we would be regarded as way off the deep end and not really wanting to compromise. Well, the mirror image is exactly true. Just as we must endure program cuts we consider painful, the other side must endure cuts they may consider painful on the tax side.

We will not get anywhere unless both sides compromise, and what we are doing here today—the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Illinois, myself, and many others—is we are showing that there is plenty of room on the tax side—these are small; there are larger ones—there is plenty of room on the tax side to eliminate waste, just as there is plenty of room on the spending side to eliminate waste, and we will not come to a compromise unless—we will not be able to raise the debt ceiling and get our fiscal house in order unless both sides give.

Lines in the sand do not help this country. I would plead with my colleagues, no more lines in the sand. There are just as many wasteful tax expenditures as there are program expenditures.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I spoke in this Chamber, and I quoted former Comptroller General David Walker saying that we as a country face ''large, known and growing structural deficits that could swamp our ship of state.'' To get our ship of state in trim, we need to make adjustments; we need to reduce the deficit and the debt.

I also discussed that when Republicans demand that all ''revenue raisers'' be taken off the table in our discussions about how we reduce that deficit and that debt, as the Republican leader has done just this week, what they are really defending is tax subsidies for profitable big oil companies; what they are really defending is corporations that dodge their U.S. taxes by setting up phony business locations in the Cayman Islands and elsewhere; what they are really defending is ultra-high-income individuals—the highest 400 income earners in the country—paying a lower actual tax rate than ordinary working Americans, in some years lower than truckdrivers, in some years as low as a hospital orderly.

Just last month, Republicans filibustered a measure that would have ended $21 billion in completely unnecessary subsidies for the largest oil companies. We know those oil companies are enjoying record multibillion-dollar profits, the highest, in some cases, profits any corporation has ever made, and they do not need continued support from the American taxpayer—they just do not, not when these other cuts are being thought of. But our Republican friends went to bat for the big oil companies, and they fought back our attempt and they protected that bill oil subsidy.

To keep our ship of state afloat, Republicans are willing to end Medicare, kick children out of Head Start early education, knock down Pell grants, and eliminate PBS. But they will fight to protect special subsidies and tax breaks for big corporations and billionaires.

Today, I rise to discuss one such unjustifiable tax giveaway—a tax break for private jets for the use of CEOs and other top corporate executives that has no public policy benefit whatsoever.

The way this works, under current law companies that buy private jets—planes which can cost upward of $50 million each—can deduct the value of that jet from their taxes over 5 years. There is a 5-year depreciation schedule. Airline carriers, on the other hand, the folks who carry 99 percent of the American public through the air, must depreciate the value of their planes over 7 years—2 years longer than for the private executive jets. Now, this may sound like a minor accounting anomaly, and I am sure that is what the corporate lobbyists who got this through and stuck into our Tax Code said when they got it done, but this is one that may cost the government $3 billion in lost tax revenue over the next decade.

The special treatment of corporate jets, its advantage relative to jets that regular people fly on when they take to the air, is just one more example of a Tax Code that is riddled with custom-made provisions, earmarks in the Tax Code that benefit corporations and the wealthy. While middle-class families struggle to make car payments and face ever higher prices at the gas pump, our Tax Code subsidizes the private jet travel of millionaires and billionaires.

In a time of austerity, when we are being asked to cut education, when we are being asked to cut science, when we are being asked to cut health care, it is no time to be protecting a private jet subsidy that ordinary taxpayers have to make up for through their own taxes, and we should repeal it as part of a package to lower our budget deficits. I was disappointed when Senate Republicans rejected our attempt to repeal Big Oil giveaways, and I hope they will not do the same when we bring up a corporate jet loophole repeal for a vote.

As we continue to debate ways to close the budget gap, I hope my Republican colleagues will rethink their determination to defend tax loopholes for corporations and the wealthy while they are trying to get rid of Medicare. That is a terrible set of priorities. It is simply unconscionable for them to talk about cutting education and research and health programs while they are fighting on the floor to protect, at all costs, special interest tax subsidies that are on the books.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island.

So people understand this debate, we have a deficit problem—serious. We borrow 40 cents from other countries for every $1 we spend. We cannot sustain that. Our economy may be the strongest in the world, but it is being called into question every day. Look what is happening on the streets of Athens, Greece, and in Portugal and in Ireland because they went too far, they crossed the point beyond which their creditors would not go. They were so deeply in debt that their creditors basically said: We are not going to loan you any more money unless you change dramatically the way you run your country.

That is the pain that is going through these countries today. We want to avoid that pain in the United States. To do it, we have to address the deficit honestly. We have to take a look at this debt we have and deal with it in honest terms.

Most people have forgotten the fact that 10 years ago—10 years ago—we were running a surplus in the Federal budget. The last 3 years of the Clinton administration were surplus years, and now we are in the deepest debt we have ever been as a nation. We are generating about $1.4 trillion of additional debt every year.

How did we reach this point? Well, there are a lot of explanations. When you fight two wars and do not pay for them, it adds to the national debt. When you pass programs and do not pay for them, it adds to the debt. When you are already in debt and you give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, it makes your debt worse. Those, incidentally, were the three policies of the previous administration, which led us to the point where a surplus, in 8 years, became the biggest deficit in American history. So now we have to address it.

What we are saying to our friends on the Republican side of the aisle is, for goodness' sake, to end a deficit, you cut spending, right? Right. But to end a deficit, you also cut wasteful tax subsidies. If you listened this morning to my colleagues, you heard them describe a few.

The Senator from Oregon talked about in the Tax Code a tax subsidy for people who raise thoroughbred horses. I love horses. I like going to race tracks. But to think we are going to subsidize them at the expense of Medicaid recipients, the poorest children in America, makes no sense.

Then my colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER, talked about tax subsidies for people who own yachts. For goodness' sake, if we cannot float the boat of Middle America, help working families across this country survive, why in the world are we giving a tax subsidy to yacht owners?

My friend from Rhode Island came and talked about corporate jet deductibility. I am sorry, I ride jet planes, but they are commercial jets. The fact that United Airlines and American and the rest of them do not enjoy the same preferential tax treatment as the wealthiest businesspeople in America and their yachts is just plain wrong. It is a subsidy we cannot afford. We should not be subsidizing highfliers in America when the Republican budget is calling for us to end Medicare as we know it. It makes no sense.

There is one other provision in the Tax Code I really find troubling. We literally subsidize American companies that want to ship jobs overseas. We give them one of the biggest tax breaks in the Tax Code to leave America, put their production facilities overseas.

So what is happening? Take a look at what has happened since the year 1999 and the number of foreign employees of U.S. multinational corporations. It goes up every single year—now up to 10 million foreign employees of American corporations. Now take a look at the U.S. employees of these same multinational corporations over the same period of time. Since the year 2000, the number of American employees of U.S. multinational corporations has continued to go down, almost without exception.

It is not just a matter of companies saying if they build a production facility overseas it is the right economic judgment for their business. It is a matter of the U.S. Tax Code that rewards them if they do it. What is wrong with this picture? Why are we not rewarding patriotic American corporations whose owners stay in this country, employ our people, pay a decent wage with benefits, and want to prosper here? Should that not be our highest priority rather than encouraging companies to move production overseas by giving them tax breaks?

Well, it is an issue I feel strongly about. I want to end the subsidy to ship American jobs overseas. At a time when we are facing unemployment in record numbers in some parts of our country, we should have a Tax Code that helps companies create and save jobs in America. I ask my friends on the Republican side of the aisle: Do you want to stand for the subsidies that ship American jobs overseas or do you want to stand by American workers and patriotic American companies that want to stay right here at home and create jobs?

Those are the choices. Anyone on the other side of the aisle who argues that to eliminate tax subsidies is to raise taxes—come on. What we are doing is giving a tax earmark, a tax special favor to those who are benefitting, whether they own yachts, racehorses, or whether they are trying to ship jobs overseas. These are the folks I think have to be willing to step up and sacrifice so we can reduce our deficit and do it in a meaningful way.

I see my colleague from Maryland is here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the crisis America is facing. We are facing two crises. We are facing a significant debt crisis, and we are facing a political leadership crisis. We need to deal with both. We need to be sure all things are on the table and all people are at the table trying to find sensible, pragmatic solutions to be able to move our country forward and stabilize our economy so we can grow our economy.

Now, I am going to talk first about the debt crisis. Then I am going to talk about what we need to do to act like Americans. I am for a more frugal government. We have been voting on cuts in discretionary spending. I supported the ban on discretionary spending earmarks. You were a reformer in that area, and I joined with you in that area, Mr. President.

I also voted for $41 billion in cuts in the continuing resolution. In April I voted for $78 billion more in cuts. I wanted to avoid a tea party shutdown and work for this more frugal government. But now we have to lift the debt ceiling, and in order to do that we need to have a path forward dealing with both the deficit and debt. In order to do that, we need to, just as we cut the earmarks on discretionary spending, cut the tax break earmarks, those tax break earmarks that have gone to the well connected but who are disconnected from how we can help our economy grow.

I never thought a budget deal would be easy, but I believed we could agree on a few key principles. Well, we have not. The Republicans want to close Social Security Offices. I want to close tax loopholes. They want to get rid of teachers. I want to get rid of sacred cows. That is why I voted last week to end the tax break on ethanol production. Wow. Talk about a tax break earmark. It is ethanol. It has serious consequences to our budget. It also artificially raises the cost of corn. So what does that mean to BARB MIKULSKI?

Well, right now one of the most important industries on my eastern shore is poultry. Poultry has helped make Maryland great and provided jobs for thousands of Marylanders, people who work hard, get dirt under their fingernails, salute the flag.

Well, they want us to act like we salute the flag and work under the flag. Corn is now $7 a bushel. I have companies that have been around for over 100 years filing for bankruptcy. Well, I cannot allow that to go on. We have to get rid of the artificial subsidies and deal with it and use that money to go into deficit reduction.

So I want part of any agreement that we make to make sure that eliminating the tax break earmark on ethanol is also in the budget. I also want to get rid of oil and gas tax breaks. Gas has reached $4 a gallon in many parts of my State. Yet at the same time, the five biggest oil companies made $36 billion in profits in the first 3 months—3 months they made $36 billion.

Well, companies making billions in profits should again pay their fair share. We Democrats voted to end those subsidies and devote $2 billion a year to deficit reduction. Now, the Republicans want to keep tax break earmarks. I want to get rid of tax break earmarks. But they refuse to end these giveaways.

There are others. Senator DURBIN spoke eloquently about the tax breaks that send jobs overseas. Those jobs have left. They went on a slow boat to China, a fast track to Mexico. Other jobs are in dial 1–800 anywhere but in the USA. We have to have a patriotic Tax Code where we crack down on the tax cheats and invest the money back here at home.

It is not only the tax cheats, we legally give them money. We take the money of people who worked in manufacturing, who paid taxes, and when they paid those taxes, we gave subsidies to send their jobs oversees. Wow. No wonder people are mad at Congress. They ought to be mad at Congress.

But I worry about the consequences also of default. When I go around Maryland, people do not understand what that means. They think when we raise the debt ceiling it is going to raise their interest rates on their credit cards, their student loans, or their mortgages in some way if they have a variable rate. Oh, my gosh. It is just something. We need to make known in plain English what this means.

The fact that the United States of America might not pay its bills on August 3 is frightening. It is frightening from the standpoint of national honor. America should pay its bills. It has always paid its bills. Also, it is important for our economy. The consequences could be Draconian, unprecedented, and even well beyond the Armageddon of the Great Depression. We could, on August 3, not be able to pay our Social Security benefits. We could

not be able to pay our veterans benefits.

This is shocking. We cannot allow this to happen. So we have to come to the table. That is why I said at the opening of my remarks we all have to be at the table, and all things have to be on the table.

Now, I am going to talk about political leadership. I want to talk about all of us at the table. I lived through a very serious crisis when Ronald Reagan was President, and Ronald Reagan, Tip O'Neill, and Howard Baker provided the political leadership. It was tough. It was scary.

In 1982, we were scared that we could not meet our obligations, that our Social Security checks would go out. The trust fund was running on fumes. America faced the fact that we would go into default with our senior citizens. President Reagan provided leadership. I did not agree with everything President Reagan wanted to offer. But he said: We have to put America first. He called up his friend Tip O'Neill. Tip O'Neill brought Democrats to the table. Bob Byrd was our party's leader in the Senate. Those two men stood together as Americans, not as Democrats. We turned to Bob Dole, chairing the Finance Committee, and Howard Baker. They came to the table, not as Republicans but as Americans. That is what we need now. We have to come to the table as Americans.

I love being a Democrat. My family were Democrats. We are going to be Democrats forever. But what I love more is being an American. I got into politics as a protester. In other countries they would have thrown me in prison. Here they put me into politics to stand up for the people. I would not have been able to go to college; I would not have been able to pursue the American dream.

I love America and I want America to have a great future ahead of it. We have to stop acting as if we are the Red Party and the Blue Party. We have to start behaving as if we are the Red, White, and Blue Party.

Now, I have heard about these pledges to Grover Norquist. But I take one pledge. I take a pledge to the flag of the United States of America. One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice—justice—for all. That is what we need to do.

I take an oath on the Constitution to protect and defend the people and the law that governs it. Let's get real and let's realize whom our first pledge is to.

So I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Go back to your Republican history books. Read what Ronald Reagan did in 1982. Read what Republican leadership did in 1986. I will do the same for Democrats. When Tip O'Neill brought us to the table, I had to make tough votes. We drank strong medicine. But you know what. At the end of the day we made our obligations. Seniors got their checks, we got the Social Security trust fund out of that crisis, and we became a stronger economy and a better America. We can do it. But let's realize to whom we take our pledge. Mine will always be not to the Democratic Party but to the United States of America. So let's be at the table and put all things on the table.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise for a moment during this time of morning business to talk about what everybody is talking about—the crisis with our debt ceiling, the approaching deadline, and what we should do. Last night, as I thought about what I would say this morning, I thought back to that horrible month of September and October of 2008, when the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression hit the United States. I was a Member of the Senate, and I was here the night the TARP vote came before us to try to salvage and save the financial system of the United States. That was probably the toughest vote I ever took. It was the right vote, because we stabilized the financial system. At that time, we were reacting to a crisis we were not in control of.

Today, we have a crisis we are totally in control of. It is ironic to me that 30 or 35 days before the deadline of August 2, we are fiddling around arguing with each other, when we should be talking to each other, looking at those things we can do to avert a crisis and move forward. I see that our leader has come to the floor. I will shorten my remarks so he can have his full time. This is a crisis of which we are in control, unlike 2008. We can make a difference.

The balanced budget amendment proposed by the Republican conference of the Senate is the straitjacket and the discipline we all need. When I was a State legislator for 17 years, we had a program on drug abuse that said ''just say no.'' We taught kids not to use drugs. We need a way for Congress to ''just say no'' to spending, and have the discipline to have a constitutional restriction on our ability to have runaway spending without any accountability. It is the kind of discipline almost every State imposes upon itself.

In Georgia, we cannot deficit spend because our constitution won't let us. We cannot borrow more than 10 percent of our entire budget because the constitution will not let us. Those are the types of disciplines the Congress needs.

Before I yield to the leader, I will end the way I began. When the financial crisis hit in September 2008, we were dealing with issues over which we had no control. Today, we are dealing with an issue upon which we have total control. It is time to put on the straitjacket—the procedure and process to balance the budget and run our country as every American family has to run its budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

REDUCING THE DEFICIT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to say a word about the President's press conference yesterday.

What I heard him propose is that we solve the debt crisis by spending more money—solve the debt crisis by spending more money; that we solve the jobs crisis by raising taxes—solve the jobs crisis by raising taxes.

I want to know, is there a single Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who thinks it is a good idea to raise hundreds of billions of dollars in new job-killing taxes at a time when 14 million Americans are out of work? If so, I haven't heard from any of them. But that is what the President was trying to defend yesterday.

Who thinks the answer to a $1.6 trillion deficit is a second stimulus, that the answer is more deficit spending? Where in the world did that idea come from? That is what the President was trying to defend yesterday.

Look, the President needs to get serious about this. He said yesterday that reducing the deficit grows the economy. That part of his press conference he got right. Reducing the deficit grows the economy.

His own Small Business Administration has told him not to enact one of the tax hikes he was proposing at the press conference yesterday. This is what they said over at SBA: ''This can force many small businesses to close their doors.''

Fourteen million people are out of work, and he wants to take an action that could force small businesses across the country to close? That is his vision of shared sacrifice?

I think the American worker has sacrificed quite enough already. Besides, all of us know that Congress isn't going to approve hundreds of billions of dollars in tax hikes. It is simply not going to happen. We have known that for 6 months, and we have been saying it all along.

The President does not seem to get it. So let me do something that I think would be constructive. I want to invite the President to come to the Capitol today and meet with Senate Republicans anytime this afternoon that he is available; come on up to the Capitol and meet with Senate Republicans. That way, he can hear directly from Senate Republicans why what he is proposing will not pass. So I invite him to come up today and meet with Senate Republicans, hear directly from them, and we can discuss what he has

in mind. Maybe we can start talking about what is actually possible.

The President says he wants us to get working. I can't think of a better way than to have him come right on over today—we are waiting—and hear from our conference about the legislative realities in Congress right now.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Nebraska.

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

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, our Nation has an over $14 trillion debt and unless we can get a handle on it—I have a chart which I think shows what our future will look like if we stay on the current trajectory. You can see that the path leads higher and higher in debt to GDP levels. That level is unprecedented in American history. You have to go back to World War II when we had this kind of debt to GDP. The chart shows we are going to face an ever increasing burden and debt.

Without shoring up our finances, we know what our future will look like. This week, we saw that the country of Greece had to approve an austerity package to be eligible for their next disbursement of a multibillion dollar bailout loan from the IMF and other European countries. This austerity package included 28.4 billion euros in spending cuts and tax increases. That is exactly what will happen if we don't do anything. We will reach a time when we will be facing massive cuts in spending and tax increases, if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

But that isn't necessary, because there is a better way to solve this problem. Instead of more debt and spending, we can pass a balanced budget amendment that would prevent us from spending more than we can take in. We know what the effect of this will be on our future as well.

We have States across this country—49—that have some type of balanced budget requirement, including South Dakota. That is the reason why our State's budget is always balanced. Our legislature cannot go home until that happens. We need that same sort of discipline here in Washington, and a balanced budget amendment would bring that about.

I have with me on the floor a colleague from Nebraska, Senator JOHANNS, who also served as his State's Governor. My understanding is that the Senator from Nebraska, when he was Governor, had a balanced budget requirement in Nebraska's constitution. I wonder if he can explain the effect that had on his State, and whether it forced them to make some of the tough choices necessary to get a budget balanced.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak about a topic that I think has made all the difference in the world for my State of Nebraska.

I did have the privilege, a few years back, of serving as the Governor of the State of Nebraska. Until I came out to join the Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture, I served about 6 years. Before that, I was the mayor of our State capital in the community of Lincoln, a great community. We followed the same pattern at the Governor's office that we did at the mayor's office. And we Governors had a simple principle: We did not spend money we did not have.

Before I talk about the balanced budget amendment, let me explain how that worked as mayor of Lincoln. My budget staff would go to work. They worked on the budget pretty much year-round—really, it was a year-round endeavor—and at some point in the process I would get a stack of paperwork that was about an inch thick, with line after line after line after line of items they were proposing we needed to spend money on to keep the city running. There would be everything from police cars to whatever, to salaries. I mean, imagine what it takes to run a city, and it would be on that list. I would go through item by item, page by page, studying each entry. Ultimately, we came to a conclusion for each entry: Yes, I believe this is necessary to keep our city going.

Well, somewhere in that thick stack of paperwork, I would turn over the page and I would come to a page where there was a red line drawn through the items. The significance of that red line was that everything above that red line we had money for and everything below that red line there was no money for. So if the next entry below the red line was something that I wanted to see happen as the chief executive of that community, I had to cut spending to eliminate something else because, you see, when I went to the city council I couldn't go to them and say: For operations, we are going to borrow a whole bunch of money. That didn't change at all when I became the Governor of the State of Nebraska.

Our constitution requires a balanced budget. It is very straightforward. It basically says: You can't spend more than what is coming in. You can't buy things you don't have money for.

Let me add another piece to this—and this makes our State quite a bit different, I think, than virtually any other State in the United States. Way back when our constitution was written, those who sat down to write the constitution—with amazing foresight—said: At some point politicians, in their passion to get reelected, are going to say to the people, they can have all of this, and then finance it by borrowing money. Well, they didn't want that. So there is literally a provision in our constitution that, in essence, says: You can't borrow any money. I think the limit is something like $100,000 or $500,000, and that is it.

If you drive across the roads in Nebraska, I will just point out, they are paid for. Why? Because we don't spend money we don't have. Our constitution will not allow us to do it. So year after year, when we get together, we look at the priorities of State. It might be education, it might be something relative to human services, it might be roads. But whatever it is, the executive branch—me, as Governor, working with the legislature—would decide what we are going to fund and at what level.

Now, I could guarantee the people of Nebraska three things would happen by the end of the legislative session: No. 1, a budget would be passed; No. 2, it would be balanced; and, No. 3, we would not borrow money for those first two things to happen. A budget would be passed, it would be balanced, and we weren't going to borrow money to make that happen. That has been going on for decades and decades and decades.

Some of my colleagues are probably ready to rush down to the floor and say: Oh, MIKE, that sounds so backward. But here is what I have to say. During this very difficult economic time—and all of us agree it has been one of the toughest times since the Depression—unemployment in Nebraska has not gone over 5 percent. Unemployment today in Nebraska is 4.1 percent. Let me say that a bit differently. Ninety-six percent of people able to work in Nebraska have a job—96 percent.

This year our legislature actually recessed early and—I believe I remember this correctly—they unanimously passed the State budget. There are Democrats in the legislature, there are Republicans in the legislature, and there are Independents. One might ask: How did they do that? They did it because they felt a responsibility to the State and to their constitution to get a budget done, to make sure it was balanced, and not to borrow money to get there.

Let me contrast that with what is happening out here. What is happening out here is that for decades and decades and decades, we, as the Federal Government, have said to the people: Don't you worry. We can be all things to all people. We can give you this and we can give you that because we have this big credit card. Well, that credit card today is now at $14.5 trillion and growing—growing and growing and growing.

When I go back home and do townhall meetings, and I look across the room and I see young people or children, it pains me to tell them that I know who is going to be responsible to pay off the credit card. It is not MIKE JOHANNS, who turns 61 this year, although it should be my responsibility;

it is going to be our children and our grandchildren who will have their own priorities, their own desires, and their own wishes. They are going to be saddled with trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars of debt before they can even address their own priorities.

I will end with this thought. What is the merit of a balanced budget amendment? Well, when I was 20 years old, our Nation owed $380 billion—$380 billion. It is projected that when I reach 65, just 4 short years from now, our Nation will owe $20 trillion. It is time to be honest with the American people. We will not solve this problem unless we put discipline in place—as our States have done; as the great State of Nebraska has done—which would essentially say, year after year, President after President, Senator after Senator, House Member after House Member, we have to live within our means.

That is what the balanced budget amendment is about. You see, without this, there will always be a way to get around it, to do something and not accept the responsibility of running this country with fiscal responsibility.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Nebraska. As a former executive—both as mayor and Governor—he, obviously, has had to make the hard decisions necessary to get the books to balance both in the city of Lincoln and the State of Nebraska. As he has observed, the economic circumstances the State of Nebraska finds itself in today are so much better than other places around the country.

Now, granted, there are lots of factors that contribute to that. Part of it has to do with the business climate in some States around the country. But, clearly, it is also a function of the discipline the State of Nebraska imposes on itself through its balanced budget amendment and the decisions of the leaders in that State, both legislators and Governors, in order to make that possible.

So I think the experience of the Senator from Nebraska is valuable in helping us shape the debate that ought to occur on this balanced budget amendment. I would say one of the features of the balanced budget amendment that we are both cosponsoring is that it caps spending at 18 percent of our entire economy. That is not a number picked out of thin air. It is a number that comes from the historical level of taxation for the past 40 years. In the past five times the budget was balanced in Washington—and bear in mind five times probably in the last 40 years—spending averaged just under 18.7 percent of GDP—not too far off what the cap under the balanced budget amendment would require.

Further, we know in 2007—a year in which we had tax laws that are very similar to current tax laws—revenue was 18.5 percent of GDP. So if we could constrain spending to 18 percent of our entire economic output, we would be able to balance the budget without raising taxes.

Our colleagues on the other side continue to claim the problem could be fixed if we would only raise taxes on a few rich people, tax corporate jets, stop giving tax breaks to American energy production, and those sorts of things. The truth is, the tax proposals from Democrats put only a relatively minor dent in the deficit. To truly balance the budget through tax increases we would have to see astronomical rate increases that would hit not only high-income earners and corporations but the middle class and small business as well.

This is clearly not what the American people want. It is not what I want. Simply raising taxes on job creators isn't going to improve our economy. It is only going to hurt it more. And tax increases aren't the only threat to our economy. We also know these current levels of debt are costing us about 1 million jobs a year as well, and these debt levels are only predicted to increase.

In his experience as a Governor, I guess I would ask my colleague from Nebraska whether when it came time to make these hard decisions about balancing the budget, did the notion of raising revenues, increasing taxes, come into play? I am sure that was a debate that was always raised. It always is. You can either reduce the amount of spending or you can raise taxes on someone.

It strikes me the problem we have in Washington is not that we don't have enough revenue. We have plenty of revenue. We just have too much spending. I am curious to know in the State of Nebraska what his experience was in terms of this debate we have about more taxes or less spending.

Mr. JOHANNS. We adopted the philosophy in the State of Nebraska that we wanted to be job creators. We wanted to have that low unemployment. So we recognized it is not government that is going to create the jobs. After all, people don't want a bigger, grander, greater State government—or Federal Government, for that matter. Our responsibility was to create the right climate so a small business had an opportunity to grow and expand; that a large employer, looking across the United States for a great place to locate, would know they had an opportunity to grow and expand a business in the State of Nebraska. So we fought tooth and nail.

Let me give a current example. If we dial the clock back to about November of last year, our current Governor, David Heineman, was faced with a great challenge. He had about $1 billion he had to somehow make up to balance the budget over a 2-year cycle. For a State such as Nebraska, that is a powerful amount of money. In Washington, where we talk about trillion-dollar programs, such as the stimulus, et cetera, that may not sound like much. But it is a huge amount of money to our State.

I suppose our Governor could have said: Well, if we just hit the taxpayer here more, and hit the taxpayer there more, then all of this will balance out. But he adopted very much the opposite view—which is exactly what I expected of Governor Heineman. He said: We are going to balance the budget, and we are going to do it without raising taxes. That philosophy is absolutely right.

Families are tightening their belts, they are balancing their budgets, and they are doing everything they can. They are suffering through economic times that are tough. Why would we hit them harder? Why would we go to our families, who are already struggling, and say: I have to take more money out of your billfold and send it to the State capital?

So he led and he stepped forward and he said, Here is a plan to deliver a balanced budget. And do you know what. He didn't send somebody else to go into that room. He went himself and said this is the plan that I believe in for the future of our State. He was there through every minute, every hour, every second of the legislative session, and at the end of it, with no tax increases, they balanced the budget. I would have to check this, but if memory serves me correctly, I think that plan passed unanimously. In our State legislature we have members who are more liberal than others, more conservative; we have some who are Democrats, some who are Republicans. But do you know what. Our chief executive led. And, again, I draw a sharp contrast here.

There is one nationally elected official in our Nation, and we call him Mr. President. The President pays the filing fee and convinces the Nation that he or she is the right person to occupy that office, and there is no substitute for their leadership.

We need to have our Chief Executive, the man we call Mr. President, deliver a plan that he believes is the right direction for our country. That is the key to this issue.

I will be very clear. I like the plan of Governor Heineman. In tough times, you pull back. When the revenues are a little bit better, you can do some things and establish some new priorities. But what happens out here is there is no prioritization. It is spend on everything. Spend on everything that walks by. Some day our kids and grandkids are going to have to pay off the credit card. I don't think that is right.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his observations. In a minute I want to turn to the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee to talk about setting priorities, because that is something we are not doing here.

I do want to point out in the course of this discussion, however, that what you have said is exactly right. You cut spending and you grow the economy. One of the things you need to do is you have got to create jobs, you have to get economic expansion going. The way not to do that is to raise taxes, and

that is the prescription many of our colleagues on the other side would like: Let's get more revenue and raise taxes.

That is absolutely the opposite thing that you would do when you have got a downed economy and you are trying to create jobs. What we ought to be looking at is how do we reduce the size of government, get us living within our means, and getting the economy growing and expanding again and creating jobs.

I want to point out one thing. This is important, in my view. We are planning right now, to the extent that there is any planning going on here—and, unfortunately, without a budget it is very difficult to prioritize. But there are expectations about what revenues are going to be for the foreseeable future.

There was an interesting op-ed piece earlier this week in the Wall Street Journal written by Larry Lindsey, who is a former economic adviser to President Bush and also former Federal Reserve Governor, who pointed out that the current predictions for the debts and deficits in the coming years are very optimistic for a couple reasons.

One is that the White House and the CBO are using very optimistic numbers for growth in our economy. While I hope they are correct, I am concerned that they could be very much overstating the potential for growth in our economy. If more realistic numbers were used, what Larry Lindsey recognized in that story was that the impact of the financial crisis on our economy, our debt numbers could jump by an additional $4 trillion over the next 10 years by assuming a more historic growth level, given the times that we have been through.

At the same time, the President and the CBO are also predicting that interest rates are going to remain much lower than they have historically. What Mr. Lindsey pointed out in this op-ed was that if interest rates normalize—in other words, reset to what are the historical averages—it would cost us an additional $4.9 trillion more over the next 10 years to finance our debt than what we are currently expecting. So those two factors alone would have an $8.9 trillion negative impact on these forecasts for the next decade. Again, it points to the importance of getting spending under control and doing it now.

He finally pointed out that the new health care law is another significant hidden cost. If you look at what employers are increasingly being faced with, many of them are going to choose to dump their employees into these public exchanges and you are going to see the additional costs of anywhere from about $74 billion to $85 billion a year over the next 10 years.

You start adding that up, you add in the economic growth assumptions—again, I hope they are right. But assuming they are wrong, you have lower levels of economic growth, which I think are probably more realistic levels. If you have more realistic interest rates at least in terms of historical averages, these long-term predictions get awful in a real hurry.

The nice thing about having a balanced budget amendment is you are forced to make those decisions every year. Instead of dealing with these long-term predictions, which are often inaccurate, each and every year the budget has to be balanced. So if interest rates go up, the budget has to be balanced. If employers put their employees on the exchanges, the budget has to be balanced. If there are fictional savings from these independent payment advisory boards that are being created and those aren't realized, the budget has to be balanced. If taxes don't produce as much revenue as predicted, the budget has to be balanced.

This is the very simple solution that, as the Senator from Nebraska pointed out, so many States have come to, so many States have concluded that you have to have some sort of a requirement to balance the budget is the most powerful fiscal reform we could have here in Washington, DC.

We have credit agencies that are questioning our long-term budget outlook. If we did a balanced budget amendment, I think there wouldn't be any question that our country would be able to pay all of our bills.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives back in 1997. I think the Senator from Alabama was here at the time. There was a vote on a balanced budget amendment at that time. We didn't vote on it in the House because the Senate voted on it first. The Senate came within one single vote of passing a balanced budget amendment. Had they done that, we would have been able to pass it in the House. We had the votes for it. We could have sent it on to the States. I can't help but thinking how different our fiscal situation would be today if they had had that one additional vote back in 1997 to get us a balanced budget amendment.

Many of our colleagues here campaigned on a balanced budget amendment. Hopefully when we get a chance to vote on it—and I hope we do here in the next few weeks—we will see whether the rhetoric matches the actions.

But all that is to say we have a major fiscal challenge facing this country. For all the reasons the Senator from Nebraska noted, we are handing our children a burden of debt that is not fair to them, trillions and trillions of dollars. We have to bring some discipline to the process of budgeting around here. What is unfortunate—and this is why I want to turn to our colleague from Alabama, because he is the ranking member on the Senate Budget Committee—we have done nothing in 792 days to prioritize spending.

This Federal Government spends $3.7 trillion annually of the taxpayers' money, and we have not passed a budget for 792 days, let alone one that actually balanced.

My State of South Dakota spends annually about $3 billion. This Federal Government borrows $4 billion every single day. The borrowing of the Federal Government exceeds in 1 day what the State of South Dakota spends in an entire year. That is the dimension of the problem we are dealing with. All that being said, it has been 792 days since we produced a budget here in the Senate.

I say to my colleague from Alabama, clearly this is a problem that needs to be addressed. Wouldn't the Senator say this is reflective of the lack of political courage, the lack of political will, the lack of discipline around here? We have colleagues on the other side who say we don't need a balanced budget amendment. That is a gimmick. All we have to do is balance the budget. Well, where is it? Where is the budget, and where is the budget it is supposed to balance? It is not happening. So I think the balanced budget amendment is a simple, straightforward way in which to deal with a massive challenge facing us in the future, and we need some discipline imposed upon Federal spending on the Congress that so many States have, and as the Senator from Nebraska pointed out, as the Governor of his State he was able to exercise.

I would refer to my colleague from Alabama to ask him his thoughts about where we are with regard to the budget, and is our lack of discipline here—or, I should say, is our lack of willingness to pass a budget not a reflection of a lack of discipline that exists in the Congress today and an unwillingness to make the hard choices that are necessary to get this fiscal train back on track?

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator THUNE so much for his comments, and that of Senator JOHANNS. They are raising a fundamental question.

We have never, ever been in a financial situation in our country that is as systemically deeply dangerous as we are today. You go through a war and you borrow a lot of money. You go through a recession, maybe your debt goes up some. We are systemically in a recession, but we are also in long-term projections of a dangerous surging level of debt, as your chart shows.

Last year the Democratic majority moved a budget out of committee. Senator THUNE is a member of that committee, and remembers that debate. Senator REID declared that he wasn't going to bring it up. It was never brought up on the floor of the Senate or even debated.

This year, apparently the majority leader decided once again we would not have a budget, and directed that the Budget Committee not even mark up a budget. So we have not even commenced work on a budget this year.

Indeed, the majority leader said it was foolish for the country to have a budget this year, which is stunning, since during the 792 days we have been without a budget the debt of the United States has increased some $3.2 trillion. It is a stunning thing.

So, yes, I believe that history shows in the past, and based on the real crisis

we face in the future, there has never been a more important time for us to do what so many States do: Have a balanced budget amendment that requires us each year to balance that budget. I believe this is the right thing for us, and it would be so much better for our country.

Senator JOHANNS is here, and he talked about executive leadership. You and Senator THUNE were talking about how dangerous the debt path we are on is, how much greater it was in Nebraska's situation. Alabama has had to cut spending. But we are not cutting spending at all here. We haven't been. We have been increasing spending here.

I wanted to ask you a serious question. Do you feel that the first responsibility of a Chief Executive of the United States, the President, would be to honestly tell the American people that this is not just a political dust-up, but that we are facing a very serious debt crisis that could actually put us into an economic tailspin again, knock us down again, and the debt numbers we are seeing will look even worse? Do you feel he has that responsibility, and do you feel it has been met?

Mr. JOHANNS. Senator SESSIONS raises an excellent point. Having served in the executive branch pretty much exclusively until I came to the Senate 2 years ago, there is only one leader. I not only believe that the Executive—in this case, the President of the United States—has that responsibility, but I feel very strongly that that responsibility has not been discharged.

I fully appreciate the need to go out there and drive a message and get votes and get yourself elected or reelected. That, of course, is what democracy is all about. But there is a point at which the election is over and that needs to be set aside, and there needs to be someone who can lead on behalf of the entire United States.

We are all Senators, but it is the people of Nebraska who vote for me. We only have one nationally elected official, and that is the gentleman I referred to previously who is called Mr. President. There is no substitute for that, not in our system of government. It is absolutely incumbent upon the President to lay out in terms U.S. citizens can understand what we are facing.

I will be very candid. I could not be more disappointed with the President's comments yesterday. It is his podium. He is free to talk about whatever he chooses to talk about, and he does not need the advice of MIKE JOHANNS. But I will tell you what a great opportunity that was to talk about the dire situation of our budget and to lay out in stark detail what brings us to this situation and invite the American people to understand the difficulty we are facing and, most importantly, to put a plan out that the President stands behind.

Let me tell you what happened this year. The President put out a plan. The plan came to the floor of the Senate. It was so disregarded it did not get a single vote. It was not a serious plan. No one took it as a serious plan.

Think about that. No Republican, no Democrat, no Independent, no liberal, no conservative, no moderate said this is the right plan for the future of this great Nation; not a single one in this Senate. That is a very serious situation for our Nation.

It is time to be serious about this and present a serious proposal that makes the hard choices. Don't tell me you can solve this problem by, well, everybody is going to pay higher taxes who makes over a certain level. I did the math on that. When I first heard that I said: OK, let me understand that better. If you earn over $250,000 a year, what would the tax rate have to be for those earners just to balance the budget for that year? I am not talking about the massive amount of debt that lies in front of our children and grandchildren. Just to balance the budget that year, the tax rate would be 90 percent. It has gotten worse because our deficit has grown to $1.6 trillion—but 90 percent. Actually, I think, if I redid that math, it would be closer to 100 percent.

That may be a great political talking point. It may be tested, it may be polled, it may be a 70-percent talking point, it may be an 80-percent talking point, but I tell you what, it is not going to solve the problem this Nation faces. It is not the pathway that deals with the massive problem we have, and there is no one else who can speak to the Nation like the President of the United States.

Senator SESSIONS cannot, Senator JOHANNS cannot, Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID, with all their stature, cannot either. That bully pulpit is unique to the President of the United States, and we have yet to see that responsibility met.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator, the former Governor for those comments. I do believe it is difficult for Congress to ask the American people to make sacrifices if the President does not acknowledge clearly and articulately the deep crisis we are in and why those sacrifices have to be made. It is not that we want to; it is because we do not have the money and we have to make some changes in what we do. That is why a number of us called on Majority Leader REID to not recess next week. Let's stay and do something about the debt.

I understand we may now be staying next week, but I am not at all sure that the plan is to deal with anything involving the greatest threat to our Nation, which is our debt. Apparently, they want to talk about other issues. That was not what drove the concern. It was not about a patent bill—much as I would like to see it passed. That was not what we were concerned about when we said we need to be in next week. It is because, by the end of this month, maybe the first of August, we will see a monumental bill of some kind produced by the Democratic majority in the Senate, brought out here, and we are going to be asked to vote for it in a matter of hours, being told every minute that the country is about to sink into oblivion if we don't sign it and vote for it, not knowing fully what is in it, not fully having studied it, the American people not knowing what is in it. That is wrong policy. We object to that.

I believe the regular order in this Senate should be conducted, that we ought to have a proposal brought forth so it can be amended, so it can be analyzed, so it can be accounted for. How much taxes are going to be raised by the President? What taxes does he propose to raise? What does Senator REID want to do? Let's see those numbers and let's debate them and let's have amendments. That is why we need to be here next week, not to deal with a patent bill or some other legislation. That is why we called for it and I am prepared to work and I believe our colleagues are, but it needs to be on something significant.

The history of our Congress and the surging debt crisis we face is so significant that we have to have a balanced budget constitutional amendment. We almost passed that before. It would have been so much better had we done so. Let's do it this time and change the course of our country. Nothing clears the mind so well as the absence of alternatives. When Senators and Congressmen have no alternative but to live within their means, they will figure out a way to do it. But if we can find an alternative, history tells us too often we will, and we will act irresponsibly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 7 minutes 25 seconds.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I was, frankly, shocked by the comments of the President of the United States yesterday at his press conference, telling Congress it needed to get to work. I guess the President forgot his party controls the Senate, and Republicans, being in the minority, have no ability to place matters on the agenda or to force a vote on issues over the objection of Senator REID, the majority leader, and the Democrats who control the Senate.

I guess the thing that rankled me so much is, rather than hold a press conference and tell Senator REID to get to work on the budget, the President should have picked up his telephone or invited Senator REID to come to his office and said: HARRY, we need to pass a budget. We need to take care of this debt crisis. We need to take care of this cliff we are getting ready to fall off on August 2, that Secretary Geithner has warned us would have, perhaps, calamitous impacts on markets and on the economy and on interest rates charged

on our national debt, among other things.

I guess the most galling thing, listening to the President make this kind of outrageous speech, engaging in blatant electioneering, campaigning sort of rhetoric, class warfare, is that this comes from a person who, since January 2011, has had 31 fundraisers, including one tonight in Philadelphia. I wonder if he is going to cancel his fundraiser in Philadelphia tonight to meet with Leader MCCONNELL and Speaker BOEHNER to try to work on this threat that he was so emphatic about yesterday. I predict he will not cancel his fundraiser in Philadelphia tonight to get to work on something that only he can do, which is to negotiate a grand bargain with Republicans and Democrats that will solve this problem.

We know he had time on Monday to videotape an appeal to his donors who wanted to solicit donations from people so they might win a dinner with President Obama and the Vice President. He had time to do that. Yet it was not until Monday of this week that the President himself first took ownership of this issue, after Majority Leader CANTOR and Assistant Leader KYL said we cannot negotiate with the Vice President because they keep insisting on raising taxes, and we are not going to go there.

The President had his first meeting with Republican Leader MCCONNELL and the majority leader to talk about this issue that he was flailing Congress about not doing its job just yesterday. Frankly, he should be embarrassed. But, unfortunately, the threshold for embarrassment here in Washington seems to be much higher than in the rest of the country.

The President said Republicans were blocking the deal on the debt limit because they had taken tax increases off the table. That is right. We believe it is a terrible mistake, with unemployment at 9.1 percent—much higher in many regions of the country—to raise taxes on the very people whom you are depending on to create jobs. What is his message to people who cannot find a job because people are not hiring? What is his message to people who are out of work and they cannot pay their home mortgage and they lose their home? It is higher taxes. Let's just raise taxes and everything will be fine.

We do not have a taxing shortfall. The American people pay plenty of taxes already. What we have is a spending binge by the Federal Government. Tax revenue is roughly 18 percent of our gross domestic product, but spending is 25 percent, hence the $1.5 trillion deficit this year and the $14.3 trillion debt so far, which threatens our Nation's future.

Frankly, it rankles many of us to have the President engage in such blatant demagoguery and blame-shifting, when he himself is unwilling to take responsibility for his duties, which are to lead by example. We are ready to work with the President to try to solve the Nation's problems. The House has passed a proposal. It is not perfect. I don't necessarily agree with all of it. But there are plenty of other proposals out there that will fix the Nation's fiscal problems, one of which is the President's own fiscal commission itself. He appointed it, a bipartisan fiscal commission that reported back in December, entitled ''Moment Of Truth,'' otherwise known as the Bowles-Simpson Commission, a bipartisan commission the President appointed himself. But he has ignored it.

There is another one, the Domenici-Rivlin Commission, a bipartisan commission that made recommendations. The President has ignored it.

The President yesterday said: ''Call me naive, but my expectation is that leaders are going to lead.'' That is what the President himself had the gall to say yesterday to the American people when he himself has displayed an astounding lack of leadership. As I said, we are ready to work with the President. I know Senator MCCONNELL invited him to come over to Congress and explain how this increase in taxes was somehow going to create more jobs in America; how we were going to solve the problems with Medicare—which is going to run out of money in a little over a decade. I hope the President takes him up on that invitation.

It is not a partisan issue. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said our national debt sends a message of weakness internationally.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, said that ''the single greatest threat to our National security is our debt.'' If America goes broke, how are we going to pay for our national defense and security that not only Americans depend on but so many countries around the world depend on America being strong to protect them from tyrants and dictators and terrorists? But if our economy goes bust, if interest rates go up to historic norms, our economy could spiral out of control. But there is not going to be a bailout for the United States of America. Our economy is simply too big. The International Monetary Fund, the Europeans, and others are not going to bail us out while we continue to spend recklessly about 43 cents out of every dollar in money borrowed from these young men and women here sitting in front of me. Every baby born in America today comes into this world $46,000 in debt. It is irresponsible. It is wrong.

The American people sent a message in November of 2010 that they were sick and tired of Washington operating business as usual, and they were not going to take it anymore. And the American people should not take it anymore.

I believe we have an opportunity here. In Texas, we don't recognize problems; we recognize challenges and opportunities. We are a positive bunch of folks. This is a grand opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to come together to do the Nation's business, to be serious, not to be reckless, not to give speeches like the President gave yesterday as part of his reelection campaign. Absolutely disgraceful. He should be ashamed. I respect the office of the President of the United States, but I think the President has diminished that office and himself by giving the kind of campaign speech he gave yesterday.

We do have a solution. The Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, and others of us have sponsored a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. This would be a responsible way to deal with this problem, and I hope we will get a vote on that shortly. But in the meantime, there is no reason we cannot solve this problem. All we need is the President to step up and give us a proposal. So far, he has laid back and criticized everybody else and said: Where is your proposal? How come you haven't done your work? Well, he has not done his work by proposing a responsible solution.

We will have a debate. We will have amendments. We will make constructive suggestions. We will do it in the light of day and not behind closed doors, which is where these negotiations are occurring now. Why does this need to be done in secret? Why, as Senator SESSIONS said, are we, the elected representatives of the American people, left with a fait accompli shortly before the deadline that says: You either pass this or the country's economy goes down the tubes. That is not what the American people expect of us. That is not what they deserve.

Sure, there are going to be differences of opinion, but that is what this Senate is for—to work those out. We all understand we are not going to get what we want 100 percent of the time, but we do deserve to have a fair and open process, transparent and visible to the American people. I get to offer suggestions, they either win or they lose, and then ultimately the majority vote determines the outcome. We respect that as the process by which these differences are resolved. But we cannot do our job when the President doesn't do his job and make a responsible proposal, when Senator REID will not bring a budget to the floor.

It has been 2 years since the Senate has had a budget. No one in the United States of America or anywhere around the world can operate with that sort of recklessness and irresponsibility. Everybody has to have a budget. My family has a budget. Every business has a budget. Only by having a budget can you determine what your priorities are. What are the things you have to have or do? What are the things you can put off until tomorrow? What are the things that maybe would be nice to have but you cannot afford?

Every family, every business has to go through that process but not the Senate and not, apparently, the President of the United States. The proposal he made, which doubled the debt in 5

years and tripled it in 10 years, called for huge new tax increases. Yet, when it came up for a vote—and only because Republicans forced a vote on that—it lost. It didn't get any support. I think it was 97 to 0. Not even our friends across the aisle could support the President's outrageous proposal back then. So why doesn't he come back with a new one? Why doesn't he stay at the table? Instead of going to Philadelphia tonight and raising money, why doesn't he call Senator MCCONNELL, Speaker BOEHNER, Minority Leader PELOSI, and Majority Leader REID into his office and sit down and do his job, just do his job?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. On my way here, Mr. President, I had the great pleasure of running into the Redway family, a few minutes ago, visiting from the State of Connecticut. Jack Redway is a former public servant in the State, and he is here with his wife Sue and other members of his family. When I told them I was on my way here to talk on the floor of the Senate, they asked me what the subject was. When I told them the Senate is debating the debt, the deficit, and the budget, one of them said: Same old, same old.

We are here on the same old, same old issues. But the American people have had enough. They have had enough of the tax breaks and the special giveaways and the sweetheart deals that go to the special interests and that have driven our deficit to sky-high, intolerable levels. We are now at a turning point and really at a precipice where we simply cannot afford these kinds of tax breaks and sweetheart deals any longer, and the people of Connecticut are saying enough is enough to the same old, same old deals with these special interests. We ought to come together on a bipartisan basis. Not only do we have a right and opportunity, we have a responsibility and an obligation to say enough is enough and to eliminate these kinds of tax breaks that squander and waste scarce resources.

The ethanol subsidies have been voted on by this body, overwhelmingly, by Republicans and Democrats, rejected. And the reason is quite simply that we can save $400 million each month, close to $2.5 billion by the end of this year if we eliminate these subsidies on ethanol. We shouldn't be divided on this issue going forward. We ought to be united on a bipartisan basis because these scarce resources are necessary to make sure we do not burden our children and their children with this kind of debt going forward.

The loophole that enables corporate jets to be depreciated at a faster and higher rate than commercial airplanes adds to the debt and the deficit in hundreds of millions of dollars. If we are serious about debt reduction and addressing the deficit, we should eliminate that loophole. It is about making the Tax Code fair and effective.

Over the last decade the big five oil companies have taken home more than $1 trillion in profits while enjoying tens of billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies. Those moneys, whether you call them revenues or taxes or breaks, whatever the nomenclature, whatever the rhetoric, they are a loss to the taxpayers and the people of the United States of America without any reason because these five oil companies are among the most profitable and lucrative in the history of the world, and they don't need that money.

It is time to say enough is enough to the kinds of hidden subsidies that go to special interests, and there are others that we ought to scrutinize and eliminate in the name of fairness and effectiveness in our government so that we can be serious about addressing our debt and our deficit.

Budgets are about choices. Some choices are not easy. We face tough choices, but we ought to put to use the common sense of the American people, to say enough is enough to the same old, same old hidden subsidies, tax breaks, special giveaways to special interests. Cutting Medicare benefits or Medicaid will not make us stronger. Firing teachers will not make us stronger. Forcing kids out of college will not make us stronger in Connecticut or across the country. None of these measures will make us stronger or fairer as a nation, nor will rolling back our investments in innovation and research, which are vital to the high-tech jobs of the future, nor will cutting our investments in the essential means of transportation—high-speed rail, so important to Connecticut. None of these cuts will bring back jobs, which has to be our priority.

Economic growth and job creation must be put first, and the way to do it is to eliminate the wasteful tax subsidies, the breaks for special interests. Eliminating them will make us stronger, it will make us fairer as a nation.

I urge us to come together and put aside whatever the labels and the rhetoric and the nomenclature as we call them and do the right thing to make our Nation stronger and fairer.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DAVID H. PETRAEUS TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David H. Petraeus, of New Hampshire, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Madam President.

I come to the floor as the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence to speak about the nomination of GEN David Petraeus to become the Director of the CIA. I wish to thank the majority leader for bringing this nomination to the floor in such a quick fashion because the committee, only earlier this week, on Tuesday, unanimously approved the nomination of General Petraeus.

I think there is no doubt but that General Petraeus is among the finest military officers and strategic thinkers of his generation. We are very lucky to have his service. He wrote the Army's counterinsurgency strategy and then applied it in Iraq, securing a military victory from what had appeared to be a descent into chaos and violence.

One year ago to this day, the Senate confirmed General Petraeus to replace GEN Stanley McChrystal as the leader of American and International Security Assistance Forces in Afghanistan. Since then he has shifted the strategy, implemented the troop surge, kept our coalition together, and today our military and intelligence analysts point to gains in the security situation and in the Afghan military and ability of the police to secure their nation.

General Petraeus's willingness to take on the Afghanistan mission also demonstrates his extraordinary commitment to public service. At the time, he was serving in Tampa, FL, as the Combatant Commander for Central Command, no longer directly in charge of a war zone but with the responsibility for not just Afghanistan but for 19 other countries as well. He agreed to what was a step down in the military ''org chart'' to take on the hardest military challenge in the world and to deploy from Tampa to Kabul. The Nation certainly owes General Petraeus a debt of gratitude for 37 years in uniform.

When he is confirmed, General Petraeus will be taking off the uniform to become Director Petraeus. He has clearly considered the differences in culture and mission between the CIA and the military, and now he will shift

his style to lead intelligence collectors and analysts rather than officers and enlisted troops.

As a matter of fact, in our hearing in Hart 216, there was a bit of levity when General Petraeus was asked the question about how he would transition from a four-star general to a civilian role as Director of the CIA. He said: You can be sure that when I arrive at the CIA, I will arrive without an escort and just simply get out of my automobile and walk into the building. Well, as we looked out in the audience at his confirmation hearing and we saw a phalanx of officers accompanying the general, it became very clear that it was, indeed, going to be quite a transition.

I believe—and I think this is the importance of this nominee—that General Petraeus understands the difference and is prepared to move into a civilian organization at a difficult time. Of our 16 different intelligence agencies, one is generally—and hopefully but generally—led by a civilian, although there have been seven military commanders in our history who have led the CIA. Of course, Leon Panetta is, in fact, a civilian.

I think we have to consider the timing of this: the winddown of two wars, Iraq and Afghanistan; the operation in Libya; a restive Middle East where the changes in an Arab spring are not fully known; an Israeli-Palestinian situation that has to it crisis dimensions; the North Korean situation with respect to the nuclear weaponry of that country; Iran, a very dangerous country with the potential of becoming a nuclear country; and, above all things, the fact that this September is the tenth anniversary of 9/11, and where there is nonspecific intelligence that this country may well have a revenge attack against it. Therefore, I think General Petraeus's military service will come in handy. I think his analytical skills and ability will come in very handy. I believe he is the right man for the job at this time.

Through the confirmation process, the Intelligence Committee has sought to understand General Petraeus's vision for the CIA and how he will lead it through the challenges I have just mentioned. I believe he has answered these questions and has laid out his views.

General Petraeus has testified that he had discussed this possible move to the CIA with Secretary Gates as far back as last year. He even demonstrated that he knows the CIA culture and the lingo, saying that right after being sworn in he will call an ''all-hands'' meeting for all CIA employees and ''will tell them up front right there that you all should know that I'm here to recruit you and I know that you're here to recruit me.''

He has met with just about every CIA former Director and received their advice on running the agency, and he plans to put that advice into practice.

General Petraeus has written and testified he fully appreciates the mission of the CIA is to provide unvarnished intelligence assessments to policymakers, whether they like it or not. That is a fundamental point. The intelligence must stand on its own. It must be good intelligence, it must be streamlined intelligence, and it must be intelligence which has been subject to the best of analysis and red-teaming.

This was one of the questions raised during his confirmation: Would General Petraeus put aside his military commander's assessments and carry forth the agency's analytic view? He answered the question head on, pointing out that he has experience in the analytical field and in debating assessments to reach the best judgment possible.

General Petraeus specifically pointed to his academic background as well as his military command experience. He, in fact, has earned—and I don't think many people know this—a master's of public administration and a Ph.D. in international relations from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He has served as an assistant professor of international relations at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, from which he graduated, and as a fellow at Georgetown University.

So the culture and debate in the CIA's Directorate of Intelligence will not be new to General Petraeus, and he understands the importance of presenting clear analytic views.

While all Members are familiar with General Petraeus's recent positions in Iraq and Afghanistan, let me touch on some of his prior experience. Prior to command in Iraq, he served at Fort Leavenworth, KS, during which time he oversaw the development of the Army and the Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Manual. The importance of that manual is that it has stood the test of time since then.

Earlier in his career, General Petraeus served in Bosnia, where he was the Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations of the NATO Stabilization Force and the Deputy Commander of the United States Counterterrorism Task Force-Bosnia.

Prior to his tour in Bosnia, he spent 2 years at Fort Bragg, NC, serving as the Assistant Division Commander for Operations of the 82nd Airborne Division, and then as Chief of Staff of the Airborne Corps.

In addition, he has served in a number of staff assignments, including aide to the Chief of Staff of the Army; Military Assistant to the Supreme Allied Command-Europe; Chief of Operations of the United Nations Force in Haiti; and Executive Assistant to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Not only is this a man who has great experience, this is a man who has commanded, who understands the military, and who has produced for the United States of America.

From my meeting and discussions with him, his responses before, during, and after our confirmation hearing, and based on his remarkable background, I am absolutely confident General Petraeus will make an excellent Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I hope his confirmation vote will be unanimous. That makes it a real mandate.

While we are here to consider the nomination of David Petraeus, I also wish to note and recognize some other people. First and foremost, Defense Secretary Bob Gates, a former Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense whose term ends today.

Secretary Gates has been a tremendously dedicated public servant throughout his career but never more needed and appreciated than his last 4½ years as Secretary of Defense. He has presided over the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. He has managed the largest organization in the world at the Pentagon. He has earned the complete trust and respect of both President Bush and President Obama and of every single Member of this body. That almost makes him an endangered species.

Secretary Gates is the model of the professional government official, and his leadership and his character is truly an example to us all. I wish him well as he goes back to the State of Washington. Candidly, on a personal level, I will never forget his service to our country.

Next, today is Leon Panetta's last day as Director of the CIA. I was very proud to be able to introduce Director Panetta as a native Californian at his confirmation hearing to be Secretary of Defense earlier this month. I can't say enough about the job he has done and my appreciation for the relationship we have had over the past 2 years. I think it is well known that when it first cropped up that he might be considered for CIA Director, I thought the service could be best served by someone with CIA experience. I can say here I couldn't have been more wrong. Director Panetta has stepped in when the Senate has had a hard time finding agreement and put together a note of confidence in this body that is unsurpassed, and I believe that is true at the agency as well. He has raised morale. He understands the priorities. He has set the priorities. And he was eminently prepared to be the commanding officer in the takedown of Osama bin Laden. Mr. Panetta's service as CIA Director was both unique and very special. And it is worth noting that, in a time when the Senate has a hard time finding agreement, Leon Panetta received 100 votes on his confirmation to be the next Secretary of Defense.

I hope and expect the vote on General Petraeus will be overwhelming as well. It speaks of the President's choices of such qualified and respected nominees and of their willingness to continue service.

Quickly, I would also like to recognize a person who will be, as of tomorrow, the Acting Director of the CIA, Michael Morell.

I notice that the vice chairman of our committee, the distinguished SAXBY CHAMBLISS, is on the floor. I believe both of us think that Mike Morell has given our Intelligence Committee nothing but the unvarnished truth. He has come in to meet with us; he has been prepared to answer questions; he has presented the facts. He is an articulate, strong briefer. He knows the Agency. I believe he is going to lead the Agency well until the beginning of September, as General Petraeus will complete his tour in Kabul in July, and then there will be a transition period as he returns home and resigns his commission. In the interim, Mike Morell will be in charge at the CIA. I think we both believe the Agency will be well served by his service as Acting Director.

Finally, I want to thank Mrs. Holly Petraeus, the wife of David Petraeus and the Assistant Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, responsible for the Office of Servicemember Affairs.

General Petraeus mentioned at his hearing that Holly has been with him for 37 years and 23 moves, and we thank her for continuing to share her husband with our country.

Madam President, you and I both know how difficult it is when we have a spouse somewhere else, let alone having a spouse somewhere in great jeopardy in wartime far from America, in countries at which we are waging war, year after year after year. She, indeed, is a very special woman, and I think the general is very lucky to have her as his spouse.

In the position of Director of the CIA, he will carry out one of the most important posts in our government. The Director is a senior member of the President's national security team and provides candid and objective analysis on every single national security issue this Nation faces. But the Director is also in charge of clandestine and covert operations around the globe. It is one of the reasons our oversight responsibility is so important in these areas: to see that the law is followed and to see that missions are carried out with the full oversight of our committee. The CIA Director is responsible for the security of the people of his Agency and for making sure their efforts are in keeping, as I said, with the Nation's laws and ethics. It is a unique and difficult combination of management, of intellect, and, most importantly, of character because things can go awry and one might elect not to follow the law. I believe that will not be the case with General Petraeus. I believe he will follow the law and he will do an excellent job. So I fully, 100 percent, absolutely support his confirmation.

I am very pleased to yield the floor to the distinguished vice chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, first of all, let me thank and commend the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence for her great work not only on this issue but on every other issue we have had the opportunity to work on together over the past 6 months. She has, No. 1, reached out to me and my staff every day to make sure we are doing the intelligence work in the way we both agree it ought to be done. She has done a magnificent job of leading the committee.

The nomination of David Petraeus is a classic example of how she has led our committee; that is, we need a very smooth transition, a very quick transition when it comes to the leadership of the intelligence community. What Chairman FEINSTEIN did was, as soon as the announcement was made on Director Panetta's move to be the nominee for Secretary of Defense and David Petraeus was going to be the nominee for CIA Director, she made sure all the background was done immediately so we could go ahead and schedule a hearing well in advance of the movement by Director Panetta to the office of Secretary of Defense, preparing for the confirmation of General Petraeus to be the next Director of the CIA. That is not always easy, but she made sure it got done.

I wish to commend, too, the majority staff director, David Grannis, as well as the minority staff director, Martha Scott Poindexter, for their work in doing the background that was needed to be done to allow this nomination to move very quickly.

It is a pleasure to work with Chairman FEINSTEIN. She certainly has the best interests of America and Americans at heart from an intelligence standpoint, and she is doing a terrific job. It is a pleasure to work with her.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I also rise to speak in favor of the nomination of David Petraeus to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. General Petraeus has had an exemplary military career, and I look forward to his confirmation as the Agency's 22nd Director.

Before I talk about him, I, too, would like to acknowledge his wife Holly for her service and support. In addition to supporting a military family during a number of long and unprecedented deployments and 23 moves, Holly Petraeus has also worked to protect military families from predatory lending practices. I appreciate her longstanding commitment and support of our men and women in uniform and want to thank her for joining her husband in answering our Nation's call of duty.

The strain on a military family cannot be overstated, and Holly Petraeus is certainly an individual who exemplifies everything that is good about how a military family needs to support the military member. I truly commend her for her great service to our country in that respect.

The nomination of David Petraeus comes at a pivotal moment in our history as we face threats from across the globe. As a warfighter, he brings a unique perspective, having seen firsthand the tactical value of accurate and timely intelligence. This experience, in an era of unparalleled cooperation between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense, will not only benefit the military and the intelligence community but also the American people.

General Petraeus graduated from West Point in 1974, but he has spent the better part of the last decade on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. No matter what the task, David Petraeus has always answered this country's call. Most recently, after turning around the war in Iraq and putting us on a path to success, he left his position as commander of U.S. Central Command when he was again called upon for an unexpected deployment to Afghanistan. General Petraeus understood the importance of the mission and accepted the assignment with vigor.

After leading the surge in Afghanistan, many expected him to retire from the military and public service, but not David Petraeus. He has decided to accept one of the most challenging positions in the U.S. Government. As Director of the CIA, General Petraeus will face a number of critical challenges, many of which cannot be anticipated. However, without a doubt, the threat from terrorism will remain the focal point for the CIA and for the new Director.

The successful strike on bin Laden removed al-Qaida's leader but not the threat from terrorism. The al-Qaida core has been weakened, but their extremism and violence continues to spread through affiliates such as AQAP in Yemen and other like-minded radicals. General Petraeus understands these threats, and I look forward to working with him to make sure the Nation remains vigilant through these very uncertain times.

I recall very vividly my first encounter with David Petraeus. It was in Iraq when he was in charge of the training of the Iraqi security police and the military personnel. I remember standing on a rooftop outside of Baghdad and observing an operation, a training mission that was going on where Iraqi security police and military personnel were interacting and carrying out this training mission with U.S. military personnel. Just being around David Petraeus that first day, you could sense there was something special and something different about this great leader. The respect he commanded from all of his subordinates and the respect he showed to his superior officers was evident, and it was pretty obvious there was something very unique about David Petraeus.

Obviously, he has gone on to provide the right kind of leadership that America has grown to expect from our great military leaders, and certainly David Petraeus has exemplified the very best the U.S. military has to offer.

It is also important that we note, as Chairman FEINSTEIN stated, that there are some other folks who are moving to different positions or leaving public service who have been so valuable to the intelligence community.

I have had the privilege of working with Secretary Bob Gates as a member of the Armed Services Committee on a fairly regular basis. Secretary Gates will be the first one to tell you, he and I have not always agreed on everything. That is part of what makes this institution work so well and what makes our country such a great country. But what a professional individual he is. He has provided the exact kind of service as Secretary of Defense that has been needed during his years at the Pentagon, which have not been easy years. These have been very difficult years to move through the Iraq situation, the surge into Afghanistan, as well as to deal with all the other myriad of issues—from personnel, to health care, to weapons systems—the Secretary of Defense has to deal with on a daily basis.

I admire and respect Bob Gates so much, and obviously we certainly wish him the best in the private sector.

Leon Panetta moving from the CIA to the office of Secretary of Defense is a natural. As I have stated on this floor previously, I will miss him as the Director because I think he has done such an exemplary job. He came in without a lot of the experience from an intel standpoint that some folks thought the Director should have. But having worked with Leon Panetta when he was Chief of Staff to President Clinton, having worked with him as Director of OMB under President Clinton, I knew what kind of man he is. I knew Leon would adapt very quickly, and that is exactly what has happened.

He rolled his sleeves up and went to work. He has traveled around the world meeting not only with leaders of other nations, but he always makes sure he goes down and visits not just the station chief in the countries where he is visiting but the personnel who really are out there putting their lives on the line every day to try to protect America and Americans.

He has certainly gained the respect of every individual at the CIA, as well as Members of this body. Not only has he gained respect, but the morale at the CIA today is probably the highest it has been since I have ever been involved over the last decade with the CIA. I think he has done a magnificent job, and he is going to do likewise as the Secretary of Defense.

The chairman is right—Mike Morell stepping in for the next couple months will allow us to have a very seamless transition during the interim because Mike is such a gifted professional. He appears before the committee on a regular basis, and he does provide the direct, unfiltered, raw kind of information we need to hear. He is a great individual. He has been a great leader as the No. 2 person at the CIA, where he will continue to serve. During the interim, he is going to continue that kind of leadership we again have grown to expect from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. So I am very pleased Mike Morell is in the position he is at this point in time so we will continue to have the right kind of leadership at the Agency.

Let me say, we had a unanimous vote in the committee on reporting out the nomination of David Petraeus. I, like the chairman, hope we have a very outstanding, unanimous vote today for General Petraeus to be confirmed as the next Director of the CIA.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman for his remarks. I would like to thank him also for his willingness to work as a bipartisan team, which, as he said, we have done. I think the dividends have been great for our committee in that we have been able to get an authorization bill passed, we have been able to effect some changes. We have been able to work together. Our staffs work together. In particular, I would like to thank Majority Staff Director David Grannis, and I would like to thank Minority Staff Director Martha Scott Poindexter for her work in this regard.

I think it is extraordinarily important that Americans know there is in the Senate of the United States a team of oversight that is, in fact, working together on a true bipartisan basis.

So I say to the Senator, Mr. Vice Chairman, thank you so much for that—it has been wonderful for me—and particularly for your friendship as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I rise today to applaud the military service of GEN David Petraeus and voice my support as he transitions from leading our Nation's troops in Afghanistan to leading our Nation's intelligence professionals at the Central Intelligence Agency. He is a man of outstanding moral integrity who has had a distinguished career in the U.S. Army.

Four years ago, General Petraeus was called ''General Betray Us'' by Moveon.org and other leftist groups. While I have always supported General Petraeus, others in this body have not. The general's rise, since 2007, to national prominence that supersedes party and ideology is indicative of the incredible nature of his service to our country.

When analysts discuss success of the Iraq surge in 2007 and 2008, credit is given to counterinsurgency tactics or to counterterrorism tactics. The ''awakening'' of the Sunni leadership has often been touted as the decisive factor as has the marginalization of the Shia extremist militias. But I would submit to the Senate that the success of the surge had a singular root in the leadership of General Petraeus.

After successfully leading U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq, our Nation once again called upon General Petraeus to lead combat operations in Afghanistan. As in Iraq, he developed and executed a strategy that took the momentum away from the enemy and began the process of providing a lasting stability in Afghanistan. General Petraeus has acknowledged that we have only begun to ''get the inputs right'' in that war-torn country. His leadership, rapport with the troops, interaction with our coalition partners, and efforts with the Afghan government have been decisive to the successes we have had in Afghanistan to date.

General Petraeus now moves on to a new challenge. He will lead the Central Intelligence Agency, which is now rightfully riding high in the wake of killing Osama bin Laden. His nomination to this position is an inspired choice that I am very happy to support. In General Petraeus, we have a leader whom we can trust as our Nation continues to prosecute the global war on terrorism.

Our Nation and its people owe General Petraeus and his family a debt of gratitude for their selfless service. They are an inspiration to this Nation, young and old, to spend their lives in service and support of our Nation—in the military where possible or in government service or private endeavors. There will be many speeches and many accolades for this inspiring leader, and rightly so. But let us give General Petraeus the tribute that any leader really craves—to look behind him, and see followers.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, it is my great honor to speak today in support of President Obama's nominee to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, GEN David Petraeus.

I want to take a few moments to describe what, I believe, Dave Petraeus has meant to our country and why he will be a great CIA Director.

GEN David Petraeus is the most distinguished general officer of the U.S. Armed Forces of his generation—and his generation has many impressive general officers. He is a true American hero who has twice been called upon by our commander-in-chief to assume leadership of a faltering war effort. And twice he has not only answered that call, but led our forces out of the jaws of defeat and onto the path of victory. To my knowledge, no one else in American history shares that record with Dave Petraeus.

At a moment when cynicism too often infuses our national politics, and partisanship too often affects our national security, General Petraeus has

won the confidence, gratitude, and respect of the American people—Democrats, Republicans, and yes, Independents. While commanding our extraordinary military in wars that have divided our country, General Petraeus has inspired and united our American family.

At a moment when too many of our fellow citizens fear our best days are behind us, General Petraeus' life and leadership have been a reminder that America is still a land of heroes—and that Americans are still very capable of achieving greatness.

This special debt of national gratitude extends beyond Dave Petraeus to his family, beginning with his remarkable wife, Holly. Holly Petraeus shares her husband's strength of character, intelligence, and devotion to the cause of public service. As many of you know, she is currently leading a noble mission of her own—protecting our military families from exploitative and manipulative lending practices.

By my rough calculations, General Petraeus has spent more than twice as many months deployed in Iraq or Afghanistan over the last 8 years as he has back home in the United States. Throughout all that time, Holly has been supportive of her husband's service and taken care of their gifted children. So today I know we all want to say: Thank you, Holly Petraeus.

General Petraeus' background and accomplishments would make him a superb candidate for any of the top national security positions in the U.S. Government. But there are a special set of reasons why I believe he will make a truly superb Director of the CIA in this time of war.

First, GEN David Petraeus is someone whose very name inspires the trust and confidence of America's friends, and the fear and anxiety of America's enemies. As our commander in Iraq, at U.S. Central Command, and now in Afghanistan, he has stood at the epicenter of some of our toughest, most intensive, and most effective counterterrorism operations. David Petraeus knows our enemies.

At the same time, General Petraeus has also built close personal relationships with our key partners and allies in the Middle East, South Asia, the Euro-Atlantic community, and around the world. Dave has also proven himself to be a capable leader of large organizations, larger even than the CIA. And because he is a scholar as well as a soldier, he is well-suited to oversee and improve the critically important analysis done by so many who work at the CIA.

After all he has done, General Petraeus would be well-justified in seeking a quiet, personal retirement now. But fortunately for the rest of us, service to a cause larger than himself is General Petraeus' creed and destiny. The brave and skillful men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency will be in very good hands when he is given the opportunity to become their leader, and all Americans will be fortunate indeed, and safer, when General Petraeus is at the helm there.

And that is why I feel so personally honored to vote today for the confirmation of GEN David Petraeus to serve as the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am pleased to support GEN David Petraeus to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. For the second time in as many weeks, this body endorsed an exceptional nominee for a critical post. General Petraeus brings to his new position an incredible resume of warfighting knowledge and experience, strengthened by meaningful excursions into academia. After leading our troops in combat operations overseas for nearly a decade, I think he is well qualified to lead our foremost Intelligence institution to serve the needs of our Armed Forces and the Nation at large.

One of the most respected military thinkers of his generation, General Petraeus literally rewrote the manual on counterinsurgency operations. Understanding that the ability to think is as critical as knowing how to fight, he translated difficult and sometimes counterintuitive principles into a winning formula for a flagging Iraq campaign. In his latest post, his leadership has inspired hope for a positive outcome to our endeavors in Afghanistan.

Threats to our national security are ubiquitous, with those who plot against us living in all corners of the world and in the elusive halls of cyberspace. To defend our liberty and way of life, we rely on an intelligence service that is agile and proactive to swiftly defeat threats before they can harm us. General Petraeus has the rare combination of professional acumen and keen intellect to lead the Central Intelligence Agency in a way that anticipates the moves of our adversaries and keeps them off balance.

General Petraeus and his wife Holly will again unselfishly answer the call of public service at a time when our Nation demands great leaders. After 37 years, they continue to serve with vigor and distinction and I look forward to following their continued success.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today in ardent support of the nomination of GEN David Petraeus to be the 20th Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA.

First and foremost, General Petraeus deserves our Nation's unending gratitude for his unwavering commitment to this country over the nearly four decades that he has served in uniform. Since graduating from the U.S. Military Academy in 1974, General Petraeus has accumulated exceptional knowledge, acumen, and experience worthy of the legendary military giants who have matriculated at West Point. Throughout his long and distinguished career, he has demonstrated the highest levels of integrity and performance, exceeding our Nation's expectations time and time again.

His numerous awards, distinctions, and decorations reflect the fact that General Petraeus is one of the superior military leaders of this or any generation, as he is the recipient of the Bronze Star Medal for valor and two awards of the Distinguished Service Medal. His accomplishments extend beyond our own beloved shores around the world, as he has also received the Gold Award of the Iraqi Order of the Date Palm, the French Légion d'Honneur, the Polish Order of Merit, the Order of Australia, and the National Defense Cross of the Czech Republic. Such accolades are a testament to the extraordinary leadership of General Petraeus and speak to an individual whose name is synonymous with excellence and respect.

One of the finest officers our Nation has produced, General Petraeus also possesses a brilliance that is only matched by his bravery. Consider just a few of the military milestones that have occurred under General Petraeus. He has directed operations that have halted and reversed the momentum in such Taliban strongholds as Kandahar and he positioned the United States to secure victory in Iraq when defeat often seemed inevitable. His tactical and strategic faculties are universally admired and are second to none. And as the commander leading U.S. and Coalition forces in both Afghanistan and Iraq, he clearly understands the absolute necessity of coordination between military special ops and intelligence covert actions—an imperative that was underscored with the remarkable May 1, 2011, take down of Osama bin Laden.

And I would be abjectly remiss if I did not recognize General Petraeus's wife Holly, their son Stephen, who has followed in General Petraeus's footsteps by serving in the Army, including a recent tour in Afghanistan, and his daughter Anne. His assignments since September 11, 2001, have taken him away from his family, far too often and for far too long. In fact, it is my understanding that General Petraeus has been deployed for more than 6½ years over the past decade, and I am sure that there have been many missed birthdays, holidays, and other family moments along the way. And so I would like to take an opportunity to acknowledge the family that has endured ''23 moves'' and state that all of you deserve recognition for your sacrifices and dedication to the Nation. Indisputably, our phenomenal military families at every level and in every branch of our Armed Forces are nothing short of indispensable to America's ultimate success in our missions. Our servicemen and women could not perform their duties as effectively without you nor could our Nation. Your sacrifices are your service and we cannot thank you enough.

Today, the U.S. Senate considers General Petraeus to lead the CIA at a time when daunting challenges to our

national security threaten America's unique position and stature in the world, when the threat of retaliatory strikes in a post-bin Laden landscape are alarmingly high, when uprisings across the Middle East and northern Africa continue to spread, when Iran continues to flaunt its nuclear ambitions, when the makeup of the Libyan opposition is still unclear, when the threat of cyber intrusion and attack is distressingly persistent, and when Islamic extremists continue to control large swaths of territory in such locations as Yemen.

Former Director—and now Defense Secretary—Leon Panetta has left the CIA on firm footing, having successfully rebuilt the agency's relationship with Congress, implemented efficiencies, and defended the best assets of the agency. General Petraeus will undoubtedly continue on this path, while striving to close such key intelligence gaps and others, as our security may depend on such efforts.

General Petraeus also will be tasked with leading the agency during a time of national austerity. As Senator FEINSTEIN, the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, stated during General Petraeus's nomination hearing, ''the nation's economic and financial struggles are requiring a new level of fiscal discipline, which means that the major increases of intelligence resources since 2001—and the CIA budget has virtually doubled in that time—will likely end and the intelligence community will have to do more with less.'' The arduous calibration between seeking efficiencies to reduce costs without diminishing in any way the agency's pivotal role in the national security apparatus requires the discerning vision and deft judgment that have been hallmarks of General Petraeus's illustrious tenure in service to our country.

General Petraeus must at the same time strengthen the bridges between our military commanders on the ground and the analysts in Washington. Intelligence assessments, which are so critical to the creation of sound policy, must accurately depict the situation on the ground and take into account the most recent tactical and strategic developments—fortunately, General Petraeus is supremely positioned to understand the needs of those commanders and to ensure that our intelligence meets their needs. As he stated during his nomination hearing, General Petraeus intends to ''strive to represent the Agency position'' and ''convey the most forthright and accurate picture possible.''

Like my colleagues in this Chamber, I applaud General Petraeus, who upon assuming the directorship, has pledged to retire from the military to which has given every fiber of his being. He recognizes and understands the necessity for independence. General Petraeus stated that he has ''no plans to bring my military braintrust with me to the Agency'' and that he would ''in short, get out of [his] vehicle alone on the day that [he] report[s] to Langley'' underscoring that understanding and avoiding the mistakes of some of his predecessors.

General Petraeus has described the professionals of the CIA as, ''the ultimate selfless servants of our Nation, individuals with extraordinary expertise, initiative, integrity, and courage in the face of adversity and physical danger.'' I could not concur with this assessment more, and frankly, we would be hard-pressed to find a nominee with stronger credentials than General Petraeus to lead this key national security organization.

The trust and the confidence that are lynchpins of General Petraeus's sterling reputation among all who have served under him extend to the U.S. Congress and the President. There is no doubt whatsoever that the general will arrive at Langley with an unprecedented combination of intellect and courage, and without reservation of any kind, I could not be more pleased to vote to confirm General Petraeus as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona

Mr. KYL. First, let me acknowledge that two of the great leaders of the Senate have just made very ringing endorsements of General Petraeus to head the CIA, which we will be voting on in about an hour and a half. I associate myself fully with their remarks because they are in such a good position to know, as chairman and ranking member, respectively, of the Intelligence Committee.

I think my colleagues will defer to their judgment about this. But more than that, most of us have gotten to know General Petraeus because he has been so involved in so many of the important policy decisions of this country, that we have all been able to form our own judgments and reach the same conclusion that the chairwoman and ranking member of the committee have articulated so well just now. I am glad to associate myself with their remarks.

Noting that no one else is on the Senate floor to speak further about this nomination, I would ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

HIGHER TAXES

Mr. KYL. Madam President, we are going to be foregoing a July 4 break to go back home to visit with our constituents in order to stay here, ostensibly, to work on the problem of the accumulating budget deficit and huge debt that the United States has taken on and the need to do something about that, in conjunction with the President's request that we raise the national debt ceiling.

What I would like to briefly address today is what seems to me to be an obsession on the part of the President to raise taxes. In fact, he is so fixed on this, it is so important to him to raise taxes, that he is willing to risk an economic crisis knowing that Congress will not raise taxes as part of this debt ceiling increase. And we should not. Not because we are trying to protect somebody but because higher taxes on an already weak economy would just make things worse.

Now, we can point to a lot of what the President has done since he took office that has made things worse, but I do not know of a single economist who believes that American businesses will be more likely to hire people, will be more likely to create jobs, if they are faced with paying higher taxes.

They will not. Everyone knows that. So when the President talks about raising taxes, he is talking about killing jobs, and I would like to speak about the three specific taxes that he has talked about. I know because I was the Senate Republican delegate in the meetings with the Vice President at which this was discussed.

I am not going to break the commitment that we all made to each other to not discuss things that the President has not already made public. So I will not discuss the many things the Democrats took off the table. They talk about Republicans taking things off the table, I think they have already made it clear that, for example, they took any changes in ObamaCare off the table. I will not get into that. I will not discuss other things that were a part of our conversations.

But since yesterday the administration's spokesman and the President specifically identified three of the things they did put on the table and wanted to discuss with us, I believe I might as well explain to you why we are not willing to raise these kinds of taxes. They are all job-killing taxes. They would all inhibit growth, which is exactly the opposite of what we should be doing.

What are these job-killing tax increases on small businesses and American families and other businesses? It is not, first of all, just on millionaires and billionaires and corporate jets. President Obama and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are obviously using poll-tested rhetoric about only raising taxes on millionaires and billionaires and corporate jets. That sounds good. They want ordinary Americans to believe they will not be affected by the President's tax increase proposals. But the truth is, the provisions they put forward during the debt limit meetings with Vice President BIDEN would target small businesses and other job creators and many Americans who are far from being millionaires or billionaires.

I should mention right off the top that they never discussed with us in these meetings anything having to do with corporate jets. So I have not gone to look to see how many American workers are employed in the general aviation business.

I note that it was on a list that they gave us, but they never checked—I suspect that is more in the realm of political rhetoric since it does not, even under their proposal I have seen, raise very much money. But in any event, what have they actually discussed with us?

Well, the first thing they discussed was repealing something called LIFO. LIFO is a term—last in, first out—that is used by accountants as one of the methods of inventory accounting. For years there has been a question—and more than one-third of American businesses use this particular method of accounting. It is perfectly appropriate and legal and so on. But there has been some talk: Well, should we have everybody use the same standardized method of accounting? There have been proposals to do that in the past.

The problem is, what the Obama administration wants to do is not just to conform everyone to the same type of accounting but to actually go back and retroactively tax the businesses that have been using this accounting practice, which is perfectly legal, totally recognized by the IRS, and nothing is wrong with it. But they are going to go back and say: Because we are interested in rasing revenue, we are going to put a retroactive tax on all of you who have been using this method of accounting.

They are more interested in getting money than in tax fairness, and that is why we are opposed to this. It would represent a retroactive tax increase on the 36 percent of American businesses that use this perfectly legal method of accounting.

Now, who uses it? Mostly it is people in retail businesses and manufacturers, many of whom are small businesses, I might add. To show what the impact of this would be—by the way, we first talk about creating jobs in the retail sector where consumers come in and buy things and in the manufacturing sector where they are made. These are the very folks who use this method of accounting.

Here is the effect that it would have on small businesses. In September 2009, the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy—which is under the Obama administration—wrote to the Tax Reform Subcommittee of the President's own Economic Recovery Advisory Board that repealing LIFO ''would result in a tax increase for small businesses that could ultimately force many small businesses to close.''

Why on Earth would we impose a tax retroactively on folks who probably—at least according to the President's own Small Business Administration—would ultimately have to close their business as a result of the imposition of this tax? Why would we do that? Should that not at least be taken into account before you propose something such as this or are you so obsessed with finding somebody to raise taxes on or getting revenue that it does not matter?

With unemployment at 9.1 percent, we should not raise taxes on America's job creators.

Here is the second one they discussed: capping itemized deductions. They proposed capping itemized deductions for upper income taxpayers either at the 28 or 35 percent level. Obviously, this reduces the ability of taxpayers to buy homes, to make gifts to charity, to pay medical expenses, all of the things for which deductions are taken.

As the Wall Street Journal editorialized on June 29:

The political point of this exercise is to raise marginal tax rates without appearing to do so.

That is exactly what would happen. That editorial points out that President George H.W. Bush agreed to a similar proposal as part of his 1990 budget agreement that broke his ''read my lips'' promise not to raise taxes. But the fact is, half of all small business income falls into the top two brackets. So the ability of small businesses to grow and create jobs would obviously be harmed by this proposal.

The fact is, most high-income taxpayers—individual taxpayers—already lose the benefit of tax deductions and credits at their income level because of what is called the alternative minimum tax. Each year we eliminate the effect of the alternative minimum tax except on those making, I believe it is above $250,000. So the very people who would be capped are already capped under the AMT. Who would get hurt?

Well, we know 50 percent of the taxes paid by small businesses are paid by these two upper brackets because they pay individually. It is those folks who cannot take this that would get hit by this because they have to take the deductions as part of their businesses. They would end up having their deductions capped and be unable, therefore, to invest that in hiring more people. Moreover, the tax increase would hit a much larger segment of American families than just millionaires and billionaires.

According to the IRS, in 2008, the last year for which we have numbers, only 319,000 tax returns showed income of $1 million or more. But in that same year, the number of returns falling in the 33- and 35-percent brackets, which are the brackets most affected by this proposal, numbered more than 3.6 million. In other words, more than 10 times the number of filers would be hit if only millionaires and billionaires were affected.

So while the President likes to claim he only wants to tax millionaires and billionaires, the fact is his proposal would hit small businesses and millions of Americans who are not millionaires. But as I said, most importantly, it affects job creation because the people who would be hit by this are the people who are small business entrepreneurs, who pay their taxes under these provisions, and would no longer be able to deduct their business job expenses.

Why, with economic growth at just 1.9 percent in the last quarter, would Congress want to raise taxes on small businesses and on American families? It just does not make sense.

Finally, oil and gas. It is always popular to talk about attacking Big Oil. Of course, millions of Americans and retired Americans own stock in oil companies, and raising taxes would have the effect of both reducing what they get in their pensions and so on, as well as undoubtedly result in higher gasoline prices because most of these kinds of taxes are passed right on through to the consumer.

So they want to raise taxes on U.S.-based oil and gas companies—not foreign-owned companies—U.S.-based oil and gas companies. Obviously, this tax could result in higher gas prices which contradicts the reason for releasing oil from the Strategic Oil Reserve. Why do that if it is going to get canceled out by imposing a new tax?

It could, obviously, hurt job creation because this industry supports over 9.2 million American jobs. It does not just target oil companies because they get some kind of special benefit. What these provisions do is eliminate a tax provision applicable to all businesses—any manufacturing business, for example, has the benefit of these particular three tax provisions.

So why single out one particular group of taxpayers, only about five in number, who would no longer be able to take advantage of provisions that every other American business can take advantage of? They are broadly available to American businesses in one form or another. They are three specific things: First, the so-called section 199 deduction available to all manufacturers. Second, the U.S.-based businesses are generally able to prevent double taxation. When they have to pay taxes abroad, those taxes are then credited against their American tax burden. Third, most businesses can expense their research and development costs.

These are the three things that would be taken away just from oil companies, the folks who find American oil so that we can drive our cars and conduct our businesses. So raising the cost of producing American oil would help our foreign competitors and make us more dependent on them, ship high-paying jobs offshore, increase our dependance on foreign oil, cause gas prices to rise, and hurt American families already suffering with high food and energy costs.

Why would we want to do this except to demagogue a political issue? Because it sounds good to punish success. America has never been about punishing success. America has been all about creating opportunities, and this President's ideas of raising taxes as the sine qua non of an agreement to achieve an increase in the debt ceiling, as he has proposed, would be absolutely contrary to what we are all trying to do right now—which is to help our economy get healthy so that it can create more jobs, so we can reduce this

tremendously high unemployment rate that we have right now, put Americans back to work, and help our families ironically, by getting healthier economically, making more money, and producing more revenue for the Federal Government to tax under our existing taxes. So if we want economic growth, improvement in the economy, the last thing we should be doing when our economy is ailing now is imposing a higher tax burden on it.

Why the President is so obsessed with this, I do not know. But I will tell you one thing: Republicans will resist these job-killing tax increases, not because we are trying to protect somebody—except the American people—but because we know that it is bad for our economy, for our families, for our businesses, and for job creation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal editorial to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 29, 2011]

A STEALTH TAX HIKE—THE RETURN OF THE DEDUCTION PHASE-OUT GAMBIT

The White House wants Republicans to agree to tax increases that no one wants to call tax increases, and for an insight into this political method let's focus on one proposal in particular—the phase-out of itemized deductions for upper-income taxpayers. We hope the tea party is paying attention, because this kind of maneuver is why people hate Washington.

The idea is that once taxpayers earn a certain amount of money (say, $200,000), they would begin to lose the value of the various deductions they're entitled to under the law. These include such IRS Form 1040 line items as the personal exemption, the deductions for state taxes and charitable contributions, even those for spouses and children. Earn enough money and soon the value of those deductions goes to zero.

The political point of this exercise is to raise marginal tax rates without appearing to do so. The top statutory individual rate would remain at 35%, so the politicians could claim they hadn't raised rates. But for those losing their deductions, the marginal rate would increase by between one and two percentage points until the phase-outs were complete.

We raise the alarm now because this sneaky bit of political fiddling last became law during a previous bipartisan budget summit—in 1990. Democrats proposed it then, too, and President George H.W. Bush and his budget chief Dick Darman agreed to it so they could appear to be raising tax rates less than they really were.

Those deduction phase-outs continued to be part of the tax code until the 2003 tax law finally phased out the phase-outs. They are scheduled to return when the George W. Bush tax rates expire at the end of 2012. While the statutory top rate will then rise to 39.6%, millions of taxpayers will pay a top rate closer to 41% as they lose their deductions. This is in addition to the 3.8% payroll tax increase on investment income that will hit millions of these same taxpayers when ObamaCare gears up in 2013.

Only six months ago, President Obama endorsed the extension of the Bush rates (and the end of the phase-outs) for two more years, but now his negotiators want to renege on that deal. They want to reintroduce the phase-outs as part of a debt-ceiling deal, apparently so they can claim they got Republicans to agree to some ''revenue increases'' in return for spending cuts. Some Republicans might be tempted to go along claiming they didn't raise tax rates.

They'll deserve only scorn if they do. Republicans will be signing on to a tax increase, and one of the more dishonest varieties at that. The phase-out gambit is an attempt to shoe-horn more progressively into the tax code without admitting it, and to do so in such a way that only tax experts will know what's going on.

One goal of the tax reform that Republicans and Mr. Obama keep talking about is to simplify the tax code, but deduction phase-outs make the code far more complicated. Phase-outs make it impossible for taxpayers to add up their income, look at the tax tables, and know what they owe. The IRS taxpayer advocate service and even the head of the American Bar Association's tax section urged their repeal in the 1990s.

Democrats keep telling us Americans support raising taxes. If that's true, the least they can do is try to raise them honestly.

Mr. KYL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Madam President, I thank Senator KYL for his eloquent speech on the issues of the day that are obviously very serious for the American people.

Madam President, I am here to speak on a couple of issues—first and foremost, regarding the Asset Forfeiture Responsibility Act of 2011, an act that I have filed and will speak on in a moment.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Madam President, I want to comment on Secretary Gates' last day over at the Pentagon. I was over there doing some work, and I noted that he was being honored today. I thank him for his dedication and service to our country. He leaves behind an incredible record of service.

Our military and families, while strained, have never been more prepared to fight and win in today's conflicts. From my interaction with him, I have gained an enormous level of respect for his tireless leadership and committed resolve on behalf of our men and women in uniform and their families.

Mr. Secretary, thank you for your incredible service to this Nation. You have made us all proud.

Madam President, today, one of our Nation's finest officers, GEN David Petraeus, leaves behind a distinguished record of military service and moves on to a new job. The wealth of experience he brings to this critical post will be invaluable as he and the other dedicated public servants at the Agency work to keep our Nation safe from harm. I have the utmost faith in his leadership and look forward to the contributions he will make to the Agency and to our country.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1312 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. On a side note, I am hopeful that we will continue to work together and try to get through a lot of these fiscal challenges we have. I, for one, along with many others, look forward to finding common solutions to move our country forward and step back from the financial precipice we are approaching.

I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be divided equally to both sides, and I yield the floor.

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

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in morning business.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I take this time to talk about the budget issues and the debt ceiling vote that is approaching. It is a serious issue that we need to deal with.

First, I think it is important to know how we got here. I say that because we don't want to repeat the mistakes we made in the past. It was just 10 years ago when we had not only a balanced budget, we had a budget that looked like we were going to pay off all of our privately held debt. I was part of the Congress that moved us toward that balanced budget and surplus. It was the Democrats who were prepared to do what was necessary to balance the Federal budget in the 1990s, and we got there. We didn't have a single vote from Republicans, but we balanced the budget in the 1990s. It was the right thing to do for our economy. As a result, our economy picked up and did extremely well.

We also know that the previous administration cut taxes twice, in 2001 and 2003. We also went to war in Iraq—a war that was one of choice—and we went to war in Afghanistan, and we didn't pay for either one of those wars. It was these unpaid-for wars and tax policies that led us from a surplus to a deficit. Our economy then turned, and we now have these large deficits. I say that because we need to pay attention to how we got here to make sure we have a credible plan to get us out of this deficit.

I think it is very important that this country move toward a manageable debt. It is very important for our economy, and for job growth, that we manage our deficit and bring it down.

Let me give you what I think needs to be done in any plan that is presented to us for consideration. I hope we all agree that we need to raise the debt ceiling. That is after the fact. We have already spent the money. Now we have to pay the bill. We also would like to see a plan to bring our deficit under control. To do that, we have to have a credible plan, one that really does

bring us within the realm of a manageable deficit.

Secondly, it has to be fair. I notice that my Republican friends ask our children to give up some of their help for a college education. They want to cut the Head Start Program, and they want seniors to pay more for health care. How about the well off? Should they not be part of the plan? I think we need to have a fair plan in order to accomplish our goal.

Third, we need to allow our Nation to move forward with economic growth. Jobs are critically important to deal with the deficit. As we create more jobs, we help our economy grow, it brings our budget into balance.

I am for a credible plan. To me, a credible plan needs to get the job done. Managing our deficit needs to be fair, including all elements of government spending, and it includes tax expenditures. It has to allow for economic growth. If we are going to get the job done, we have to bring down spending—we all acknowledge that—on the domestic side and the national security side. We can do better in bringing our troops home from Afghanistan and save military dollars.

There are things we can do, and we need to do that. But we also have to deal with the revenue side. Quite frankly, we can't get the job done without dealing with the tax loopholes and shelters that we have in the Tax Code. I am concerned that the Republican leader said we could not consider any revenue. Well, I have heard from a lot of my Republican colleagues who disagree with that. We need to include revenues in a credible plan or it can't get done. We cannot manage the deficit without closing those loopholes and eliminating those shelters.

Yesterday, I talked about one of those—the ethanol subsidy. We have nearly $3 billion that we can save there. The ethanol subsidies are not needed. The market is there. More damaging, it is hurting our economy. I have the honor of representing the people of Maryland and the Delmarva Peninsula. The poultry industry is suffering because of the ethanol subsidies. It is costing more to produce poultry, making the industry less competitive. We can save and create jobs by eliminating the ethanol subsidy, which will help us in balancing the budget.

Today, I want to talk about another tax shelter and loophole that we can deal with, and that is the section 199 manufacturing tax break used by the oil and gas industry. It is very interesting. We have seen gasoline prices rise, and we have seen the negative impact of that on our economy. But guess who is benefitting from the increase in the gasoline prices? You are right; it is the oil and gas industry. Their profits are up, while our economy has been suffering.

In the first 3 months of this year, the gas and oil industry, the five largest companies, had record profits of $35.8 billion. Big Oil benefits from a variety of subsidies, including section 199, that amount to some $4 billion annually. So we are subsidizing the Big Five, who are on course to make a projected $140 billion profit in 2011, with $4 billion in taxpayer contributions. It is not needed. These funds could be used to help reduce our deficit instead.

The worst part is that section 199 came about as a result of our Foreign Sales Act. What was that about? We wanted to put American manufacturers and producers on a level playing field for international competition. We tried to do that with a direct subsidy to help exporters, but the World Trade Organization held that to be illegal. So then we came back with this general manufacturers' credit, section 199, to try to help our exporters.

The gas and oil industry are not manufacturers exporting a product. They should never have qualified for this taxpayer-funded subsidy. I asked that question in the Senate Finance Committee when we had the Big Five oil companies' chief executive officers (CEOs) before us. Not one of the CEOs could justify the fairness of this subsidy going to the oil and gas industry. Their only answer was: Well, everyone else is getting it.

We need to reduce unnecessary government spending, whether it is on the appropriations side or the tax expenditure side. With regard to the oil and gas industry, repealing section 199 and the rest of the $4 billion or so in subsidies these companies receive each year could help us balance the budget.

But the minority leader says we can't even consider that. He says we can't consider any of the revenues. To me, it is not a fair proposal, not a credible proposal, unless we tell the most wealthy and those companies that don't need the subsidies that they are going to be part of the plan to bring our budget into balance.

There are many more provisions in the Tax Code we can look at where we can get the savings. I have just mentioned two. If we are going to have a credible plan that will allow for economic growth and allow us to create jobs—and the best way to deal with the deficit is to create more jobs—then we have to have a fair approach. So I urge my colleagues to get together on this.

Look, I understand it is not going to be the budget the Democrats want, but I will tell you this: it will not be the budget the House Republicans want either. We have to work together, Democrats and Republicans. I think we can find common ground. Earlier this year, I think 62 Senators signed a letter saying, let's use the framework of the debt commission. So I think there was that willingness. Let's get back to that.

Let's get the Democrats and Republicans working together in true compromise. We don't have to compromise our principles. We can get the job done, and that job means let's get our debt into a manageable state, let's do it in a way that is fair, so the well off also are part of a solution that includes revenues, and let's do it in a way that allows America to do what President Obama said we can do—out-educate, out-innovate, and out-build our competitors so we can create the jobs that won't just help us balance our budget but will keep America prosperous, too.

That is our charge. That is what we need to do. Let's get on with the work.

With that, I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, before I start my remarks, I would like to say that in about an hour we will start voting on the nomination of General Petraeus to lead the CIA, and I am going to enthusiastically support that nomination because I do think General Petraeus has shown the kind of military leadership that makes our country proud. He has come in at some of the hardest times in both Iraq and Afghanistan. I have met with him in Iraq to see exactly what he was doing, how he was implementing his counterinsurgency proposals, and I think he is a gifted leader.

I also believe in this war we are in—the war against terrorists—the CIA and the military have such a necessary link, and in many ways they are codependent on the information and the capabilities that each uniquely has. So I think he will do the same great job he has done in public service in this kind of arena that has become much more closely linked to the military, for sure. So I will support his nomination.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, today, so many people have been talking about this debt ceiling issue, which should be what we are talking about because we have perhaps only as long as 1 month—we are not exactly clear—when we will reach that over $14 trillion debt ceiling. This is the most serious issue facing Congress and the President today, and we shouldn't be doing anything else except talking about how we are going to bridge this gap that would allow us to go forward with significant reforms.

I will not vote to raise the debt ceiling unless there are not significant reforms that assure we will not have to do it again; that we will begin to bring down the deficit that is causing this huge debt to accumulate. So I am looking for the leaders who are meeting in the different meetings—some I am privy to—to essentially come to an agreement so we can send that message.

People have talked about the message that would be sent to the world if the debt ceiling isn't lifted. I am concerned about the message that would be sent if we lift the debt ceiling without reforms. I wish to send the message to the global marketplace that we are going to deal with our financial situation, and we are going to deal with it responsibly; that we are going to cut the spending that has caused this debt to accumulate to such alarming levels. The message I wish to send to the world is, we are going to take this

problem and we are going to solve it together; that we are not going to just do another pro forma lifting of the debt ceiling as if it were business as usual. Because business as usual it is not. We don't have a tax problem in this country, we have a spending problem, and we must attack it if we are going to have credibility.

That brings me to a bill I have introduced because I think it is important, as we are looking at this looming deadline, to have a plan B. If, in fact, we are not going to be able to come to an agreement—both Houses of Congress and the President—that would cut the spending levels sufficiently enough that many of us would be comfortable with in order to pass a bill raising the debt limit ceiling—if we don't meet that test—we should have a responsible plan B. This would be a plan that would say: If, in fact, we can't agree on what it will take to lift that debt ceiling, this is how we are going to treat the money that will be coming in. Because at that point our government will be limited in its expenditures by the revenue that is coming in.

We can allocate that revenue, and that is where I think we must have a plan B. We must make sure certain things are done. The No. 1 thing we all know that is going to be paid is the interest on the debt. That is our No. 1 responsibility because that will keep us from going into default, which none of us wants to do. The second thing is to pay our military—the people who are deployed overseas, in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the places that are supportive of those efforts. We must assure we are paying those people on time so their families, who are thousands of miles away in other parts of our country, will know they can pay their rent and are not going to go into extremist positions.

MILITARY PAY

I wish to talk about a bill I have introduced that has 80 cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator HELLER of Nevada to be a cosponsor of S. 724.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

S. 724 is the Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act of 2011. There are 80 cosponsors of this legislation. It is very simple and straightforward. It ensures that in the event of a government shutdown, our Nation's men and women in uniform would continue to receive their military pay and allowances. That is what it does. This legislation will protect all Active-Duty men and women, including those in the Coast Guard and Reserve components.

I introduced this bill earlier this year because we were in the process of having a meltdown with our appropriations. We need to have a law that assures if there is a shutdown, whether it is on an appropriations issue or on a budget issue or on a debt ceiling issue, we know where the money will go—where the protections will be. I think our military should be front and center. I also think Social Security recipients should be front and center, but this bill is for the military because they are in harm's way as we speak in many places around the globe and we don't want to disrupt their families or have them worry for 1 minute about their families while they are doing their duty.

These military families have faced stress from repeated deployments since 9/11. The last thing they should worry about is not receiving their paycheck on time because Congress and the President have not been able to do the job they need to do.

Immediately after introducing this bill, I was contacted by a military spouse. Her husband was on his 10th deployment in support of operations in the Middle East. The spouse was at home raising their 1-year-old son. She was very concerned about whether she was going to be able to pay her bills. Multiply that story by many thousands and one can imagine the stress of these families across our Nation who have loved ones in harm's way. This should not be compounded by adding an unnecessary financial stress that is the fault of a Congress unable to pass an appropriations bill or a Congress and President unable to reach an agreement to cut our deficit so the debt ceiling will not have to be raised again.

At a time when our Nation has 100,000 troops in Afghanistan and 45,000 in Iraq, it would be unconscionable to ask our troops to serve on the front lines without ontime pay. From my home State of Texas, there are more than 28,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines currently deployed. This is second only to California in the highest number of deployed troops from one State.

I would like to especially recognize the soldiers from the 36th Infantry Division of the Texas National Guard. They are currently serving in the southern region of Iraq and are doing a great job. These brave Texans are working long hours in the extreme heat, facing a dangerous enemy. But the most remarkable aspect of their service is they all raised their hands to volunteer to do it. The very least we can do is pay them on time. It would be tremendously damaging for morale to tell our troops to go on long deployments, maybe multiple deployments, away from their families, and then not pay them at the normal time.

I know if there is one thing this Congress can agree on, it is our tremendous pride and support for the brave men and women in uniform. I think Congress has shown that time and time again. We all learned a lesson after what happened during the Vietnam war and after the Vietnam war, when the disagreement about the policies of the war were actually imputed to those who were following orders to implement that war. We will never let that happen again. It hasn't happened since, and it will not happen. There is not one Member of Congress who doesn't respect our military and the service they are giving—even if they disagree with the policies, which many often do. So I wasn't surprised when I introduced this bill to get 80 cosponsors immediately.

It is becoming clear that negotiations on a long-term deficit reduction plan may go down to the wire. The President said yesterday he will insist on tax increases to pay for a continued Federal spending spree. Republicans are clear: We must lower government spending to affordable levels, and there must be fundamental changes in how Washington spends the American taxpayer dollars. Now is the time for Congress to vote to assure that our troops will not miss a paycheck due to gridlock in Washington, not at midnight on August 2 or whenever we are adjourning, hopefully, for a recess so Members can get home and work in their districts.

If the Senate cancels its July 4 holiday recess—which is now on the books—it is time for us to spend that time on nothing else but this issue—long-term deficit reduction. We should start our work by making sure we have a plan B that our troops and their families will not be political pawns in the struggle between raising taxes and cutting spending. If we are here, it should be for one purpose and one purpose only; that is, debt reduction and the preparation for what happens if that deadline passes and there is not an agreement.

I can't think of a better way to say we are preparing for the worst while we are hoping for the best, and that is that we make sure certain essentials are done.

Obviously, interest on the debt is our first obligation. The second one is to pay our military personnel who are overseas, who are deployed, and to make sure they are not worrying about their families at home having the money to pay the mortgage and the bills that must be paid on top.

So I hope the Senate will take up this bill, and I am going to ask that we consider the Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act of 2011 is on the agenda if we are in session next week. That seems to be what is in the works right now. If that is the case, let's do something productive. I can't think of something more productive and more reassuring to our military than to pass S. 724, with 80 cosponsors. If it comes to the floor, it is going to pass. It will go to the House, and I assure you it will pass.

So let's start that process. If we are going to be here next week and a lot of plans are going to be disrupted, we are willing to do that. But let's make it worthwhile by passing significant legislation, such as ensuring that our military is paid on time if for any reason we are looking at a government shutdown.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THANKING SENATOR HUTCHISON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, while the Senator from Texas is still on the floor, I just want to say how, personally, this Senator is going to miss her after the calendar year 2012, since she is retiring from the Senate. I say that with the utmost respect and affection for the Senator from Texas because what a great partner she has been in setting policy for this Nation's space program.

Had it not been for the Senator from Texas, we would not have that policy etched into law in the NASA bill that we passed last year and which now is the skeletal structure that we hang all the appropriations on going forward, giving a clear path, a clear direction, a clear roadmap for our Nation's space program. So I just wanted to thank the Senator from Texas in front of the Senate.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I appreciate so much the words of the Senator from Florida because, of course, he is not mentioning the great leadership he has portrayed.

He is today the only Member of the Senate who has actually gone into space as an astronaut, and his love for and zeal for our space exploration is unsurpassed, and I appreciated working with him.

It was our joint bill that passed last year that assures a way forward for NASA; that assures that there will be manned space exploration; that we will use the space station, in which we have invested hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, for not only health benefits for our country but also learning about dark energy. The dark energy and antimatter research that is being done right now, I witnessed myself last week when I visited the NASA facility at the Johnson Space Center in Houston, TX. We are now getting information on the cosmic rays that are coming into the spectrometer that has just been put on the space station by CDR Mark Kelly and his crew during the most recent shuttle mission, and we are going to possibly learn the genesis of the universe by this facility that was put aboard the space station and the research that is going to be done on dark matter and what happens when it meets matter. It is really exciting, and I believe that the way forward that Senator NELSON and I have put NASA on, I believe, is going to assure that we have private sector involvement; that there will eventually be a transition to the private sector, but in an orderly way so that we don't lose the expertise in which we have invested so much.

I hope later, before I leave, we will get a chance to talk about that. I am looking forward to going to the last launch of the space shuttle that America will put up. The systems that we have had will end after this last space launch that will happen in early July, and then we will be in the process of building the new vehicle which we have put in place in the law to begin to shorten the gap between the time that we can put Americans in space with our own vehicle. We are going to try to make that a shorter timeframe by the law that we passed.

So, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida and look forward to having more opportunities to talk about the importance of space exploration and America's preeminence in that field.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator again. We stood shoulder to shoulder and we were able to get these two additional flights, which the Senator from Texas just chronicled, that no sooner had Mark Kelly and his crew put the alpha magnetic spectrometer up on the space station that it started collecting these cosmic rays.

These are subatomic particles that are flying around in space that we try to duplicate down here on Earth by smacking atoms together in accelerators to understand subatomic particles, and we have them out there being collected right now on the space station in the AMS. It was on the station one day after they put it there. It is collecting this. It is going to help us learn all the way back to the origin of the universe.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If the Senator would yield.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Of course.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. When I was there last week, Dr. Samuel Ting, who is the Nobel laureate from MIT who built the spectrometer and talked about and convinced us of the importance of putting it on the space station, he was there with Mark Kelly and myself, and he said they had 1 billion hits now of those cosmic rays and he was on a cloud, literally, about what they are learning already. Mark Kelly said, in a press conference that we had, that it was the most significant achievement that he has ever made in his entire career as an astronaut. I believe he will be proven right, and I think Dr. Samuel Ting will be eligible for another Nobel Prize in physics if we can really find the genesis of matter and antimatter in space, which he said we would; that you cannot duplicate on Earth except by trying to put these atom smashers and electron smashers on Earth but at much bigger expense than being able to do it in space where it just happens. Billions already, he said.

So thank you. I leave the floor. I know we digress, but it is very exciting.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Well, Mr. President, as the Senator is leaving, I just want to say that she and I did have to stand shoulder to shoulder, and we had some fights. Of course, in the process we had some critics too. Now some of my critics wish that when I went into space it would have been a one-way ticket. But the fact is, it was a two-way, and we stood another day. The proof is in the pudding of what is happening up there.

I will have something later to say, Mr. President, about the winddown of the space shuttle program. But while the Senator from Texas was here, I just wanted her to know my profound gratitude for her collegiality, her friendship, her expertise, and working in the way this Senate ought to work, which is in a bipartisan way. I thank her profoundly for that example that she set for the Senate and for this country.

Mr. President, we are here about General Petraeus. I am a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. I have had a chance to visit with him on a number of occasions in his capacity as general, as well as now the nominee, soon to be the new CIA Director.

I would simply say that I don't think for our national security's sake we could have two better nominees now: the former CIA Director, who has been confirmed by this Senate as the new Secretary of Defense, taking over from an extremely good and competent Secretary of Defense, Secretary Gates—and, of course, that is Leon Panetta—and then for his shoes, as the leader of the CIA, to be filled by General Petraeus. And what is happening today is illustrated by the modus operandi of the takedown of bin Laden. It is a marriage between the intelligence community and the military community.

Of course, the takedown of bin Laden was exactly that: painstaking years of effort to get the intelligence, since bin Laden went dark after he slipped through our fingers in Tora Bora, and we knew he was communicating by a courier. So the question was, How did we find the courier? Once we identified who it was, where was he? Find him and follow him. That, of course, led us to the compound, and when married up with all of that intelligence on what was going on at that compound, then in came the U.S. military.

Although it was a CIA operation, as reported by the newspapers, led by Leon Panetta, in fact, it was a three-star admiral, a Navy SEAL, who conducted the actual raid from his headquarters. Of course, the SEALs took care of business and did it in such a proficient, effective, and magnificent way, and sequestered all of those women and children, save for the one woman, as reported in the newspaper, who got caught in the crossfire when the SEALs were fired at.

So it was an absolutely 100 percent operation, and it is illustrative of why this appointment of General Petraeus is so important and why the appointment of Leon Panetta as Secretary of Defense was so important. These two are going to be just like that, as we are protecting the national security for years to come.

That is what I want to say about General Petraeus.

Mr. President, I would like to speak on another subject—the budget—so I ask consent that I speak as in morning business.

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

THE BUDGET

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, the negotiation over this deficit

reduction and the debt ceiling package has hit the critical stage. It is beginning to come into the consciousness of the country and most of the people around here. Those people have in some cases wanted to push it off, in other cases have said: Oh, the debt ceiling? That is not such a big deal.

It is baffling that people would say that. The economic chaos that would reign in this country and the world financial markets if the Federal Government was not able to pay all of its bills would be catastrophic. How can any person in a responsible position say that?

But it is also baffling that there are so many people—and you know who they are—who have decided to draw a line in the sand on any deficit reduction and say: It is going to be my way or no way. That is part of the problem of what is going on in this country right now. This is a big, broad, diverse, complicated country. The very principle of a body such as this is that you respect the other fellow's point of view. When you have differences of opinion, you try, as the Good Book says, to say, ''Come, let us reason together'' and to hammer out a workable solution. Yet you hear the rhetoric—it is going to be their way or no way, so no matter whether you talk about closing corporate tax loopholes—no. That has to do with tax revenue. It sure does, but certain people are not paying their taxes due to loopholes.

Two weeks ago, we acted on one of those tax loopholes overwhelmingly. This Senate voted to get rid of one of those tax loopholes. It was for corn ethanol, the big subsidy. It was multibillions of dollars per year that was a tax credit—in other words, lost tax revenue. The Senate finally realized that was not worthwhile.

Why are we saying we should not put that in as a part of the package on deficit reduction? A dollar of deficit reduction is a dollar of deficit reduction regardless of where it comes from, whether it comes from actually whacking Federal spending or whether it is cutting some of the special tax breaks for some of this country's most profitable multinational corporations. The objective is to bring down the deficit.

What is a deficit? You have income coming in the form of tax revenue, you have outflow going out in the form of expenditures, and when the two are equal, that is a balanced budget. When I came into the Senate 11 years ago, we had 4 years of this. Tax revenue was above annual expenditures, and for 4 years, we had a surplus. But this is what has happened: The expenditures are up here and the tax revenue is down here.

If you are going to get the budget eventually in balance over the course of a decade, you have to do this. That doesn't mean just tax increases. It can be done by eliminating tax expenditures. Over the next 10 years, tax expenditures in the existing Tax Code are $14 trillion. You don't have to get rid of all of them. Some of them we don't want to get rid of because they are good tax policy, they are good public policy. But you can sure get rid of some of them.

But we have the other side over there who will not even talk about some of these tax loopholes we ought to be cutting. They say that is increasing taxes. Now, the truth be known, it is because most of them, whether they like it or not, on that side of the aisle have taken a pledge to a fellow named Grover Norquist and said they will not vote for any new taxes, and it is being interpreted that tax expenditures—in other words, tax deductions, tax credits, or tax exclusions—that if you close those tax loopholes, that is going to be new taxes. Well, that is tax revenue that is not coming into the U.S. Treasury because some special interest is getting preferential treatment that we ought to question. A good example of this is what we just voted on in the removal of the tax subsidy for corn ethanol.

At the end of the day, for Americans, this debate is going to matter hugely. If we have to do something by just cutting expenditures and not remove the tax loopholes, then in order to address the deficit—remember, this is the deficit, this is expenditures, and this is tax revenue, and if we have to bring that into balance by only moving down the expenditures, we are going to have to take it out of the hide of retirees, out of the hide of hospitals, schools, what Senator HUTCHISON and I were just talking about, the space program, the coastal preservation programs, our national parks, and the Federal prisons. Are we going to put an end to the narrow tax breaks for the well-connected or are we just going to whack all of those programs?

The view of this Senator is that if you really want to get a package that is going to be serious and that is real money, that is not smoke and mirrors and budgetary sleight-of-hand, then you are going to have to get a package of about $4 trillion in 10 years of deficit reduction.

There is no reason, if you are going to be serious about budget reduction, that special benefits for oil companies, for pharmaceutical companies, hedge funds, and other special interests should be a sacred cow and not to be touched. What message does it send to the everyday American about their government and whom that government represents if we just take it out of the hides of people such as those I just mentioned, like retirees?

Basically, I suggest you take a page from one of our illustrious former President, President Reagan. In 1984, the Federal Government was confronted by deficits as far as the eye could see. I was a young Congressman at the time. President Reagan understood that it was appropriate to close those tax loopholes as part of the deficit reduction process, and the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 included more than 60 provisions aimed at shutting down tax shelters and ending abusive special interest tax breaks. That 1984 bill targeted foreign investors who sought to use the offshore havens to dodge U.S. taxes, and it targeted Wall Street's use of financial derivatives to evade U.S. income tax, and it included a provision targeting the windfall profits for oil companies.

That brings me to an example I want to discuss in some detail. For decades, oil companies have been enjoying the generous tax subsidies of the American taxpayer by using their ample resources to get tax benefits very generously given from the Federal Government. Oil and gas companies are experts at figuring out the narrow tax break, and it benefits their interest, and it does so particularly with regard to offshore drillers.

The largest of all the dedicated oil and gas tax breaks is the ability of the oil companies to immediately expense intangible drilling costs. These costs include drilling and development work completed before a well begins production. Oil companies are able to deduct—in other words, to write off as an expense—those costs and do so immediately.

The tax break for intangible drilling expenses is going to cost the American taxpayer $12.4 billion over the next decade if it is not repealed. The President has proposed its repeal. Several of us in the Senate have proposed the repeal and have filed a bill to do it. The repeal of this tax break on intangible costs for oil companies ought to be included in a deficit reduction package. Remember, it is a choice: Are we going to cut people like retirees and the space program and educational expenses and the environment and the Federal prisons or are we going to get tax revenue from special tax breaks like these?

For several years, oil companies working offshore have been devoting significant resources toward complex tax schemes to avoid paying taxes to Uncle Sam. Let's take a closer look.

Transocean, that is a name that ought to ring familiar. They were the ones, remember, who operated the defective blowout preventer, the one that did not work, that was supposed to jam the two cylinders together and cut off the oil flow when there was an explosion on the Deepwater Horizon oil rig.

Let's look at the record. In 1999, Transocean moved its place of incorporation from Delaware to the Cayman Islands. In 2008, it moved from the Cayman Islands to Switzerland. This tax-avoidance operation, referred to as ''corporate inversion,'' had no real effect on where Transocean does business. Even after it moved to the Cayman Islands, it continued to be, in fact, managed and controlled from Houston, TX. It continues to have substantial drilling activities in American waters. And by changing its legal domicile from Delaware to a tax haven in the Caribbean, Transocean was able to cut its tax bill nearly in half. Martin Sullivan, a former economist at the Joint

Commission on Taxation, estimates that Transocean's offshore tax scheme saved the company $1.9 billion from 2002 to 2009. That is an example of one of these tax subsidies that ought to be eliminated. Congress shut down those corporate inversions in 2004 but only on a going-forward basis. Until Congress gets serious about taxing U.S.-managed companies that deceptively claim to be foreign corporations, Transocean and others will continue to benefit. Transocean is not alone. We know of at least five oil companies involved in offshore drilling that moved their legal domicile to a tax haven in the Caribbean in order to avoid paying U.S. income tax.

I will conclude by saying, unlike Transocean, BP has never been an American corporation. But it has no problem in reaping the benefits of our porous Tax Code. We learned soon after the $20 billion claims facility was announced that BP would be writing off the entire expense for tax purposes, writing off all of that expense for the oil that was spilled that hurt so many of our residents in Florida and all up and down the gulf coast. They are going to write that off as a tax deduction, and, therefore, pay less taxes. We estimate this will reduce the tax burden by nearly $9 billion for BP. Several of us have introduced legislation to shut down this abusive tax break as well, and it is another that we ought to put in this deficit reduction package.

I conclude by saying these corporate tax loopholes for oil companies should be part of any deficit reduction package, and this Senator is going to continue to stand up and fight to ensure they are a part of that deficit reduction package.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Petraeus nomination. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. In a few minutes we will be casting, I am sure, a 100–0 vote to confirm General David Petraeus as the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and obviously his nomination is supported by all Members of the Senate, and I am sure all Americans, especially those, such as the Senator from South Carolina and myself, who have had the great privilege and honor of knowing General Petraeus for many years and watching him lead the men and women serving in our military in a fashion that I have never seen surpassed. The Senator from South Carolina has had the unique privilege and responsibility to serve under General Petraeus in uniform, because, as most of our colleagues know, the Senator from South Carolina also serves as a colonel in the South Carolina National Guard and in the legal corps as a JAG officer.

The Senator from South Carolina has worked with General Petraeus both in Iraq and Afghanistan on many of the important issues concerning detainees as well as other issues. Before I ask the Senator from South Carolina for his comments, I wish to repeat what I said before. I don't believe that in my life, which has been blessed to know many outstanding military leaders of all branches of the service, I have ever quite encountered a military leader or civilian leader, for that matter, with the combination of charisma and intellect General Petraeus possesses. The Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, and I had the unique opportunity, among many visits we made to Iraq and Afghanistan, one Fourth of July in 2007 to be present at a reenlistment ceremony that took place in the palace in Baghdad. There were a couple of thousand spectators and there were well over 200 young men and women who had agreed to reenlist, to continue to serve in Iraq when they could have fulfilled their commitment they made to serve in the military and gone home to their families and a grateful nation. Instead, they chose to reenlist, to stay, and continue the fight. Part of that ceremony was to administer the oath of citizenship to over 75 people who were not born in the United States of America, who were not citizens, who were green card holders, who were legally in the United States as green card holders but had joined the military in order to serve and to achieve an accelerated path to citizenship.

What struck me at that ceremony was that in the front row there were three empty seats with boots on them of individuals who were green card holders who were scheduled to take the oath of citizenship and who had been killed in the previous few days in action, serving their country in Iraq.

I was privileged to speak. The Senator from South Carolina spoke. The Senator from Connecticut spoke. But when General David Petraeus spoke to those assembled men and women who are serving their country, it was very obvious of the not only respect but admiration every one of those young Americans felt for the inspirational leadership General Petraeus had provided them. I might point out it was a time when most experts and many politicians and Members of this body predicted the surge would fail. Well, I think what they didn't take into account was the incredible leadership and implementation of a strategy that was embodied by GEN David Petraeus and the young men and women who are serving.

So I am confident as we continue the fight against al-Qaida and the radical Islamic extremists who want to attack and destroy our country, that now General Petraeus, soon to be Director of the CIA, will provide our Nation with the very best strategy, tactics, thought, and action to keep our Nation safe.

I don't very often come and talk about nominees and spend the Senate's time, but I know I express the appreciation and affection of all those men and women, both serving now and in the past, who had the great honor and privilege of serving under General Petraeus and to wish him a well done and smooth sailing and following winds as he assumes his new responsibilities which will continue to keep America safe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think our American military will be studying the Petraeus tactics and strategy that he implemented in Iraq and Afghanistan for generations to come. In January of 2007 when the surge was announced, I had had the pleasure of being over in Iraq in April, but I remember a letter issued by General Petraeus to all those under his command and it was basically entitled ''Hard is not Hopeless.'' He explained in great detail in the letter how we would move forward as a nation, that it would be difficult, it would be hard, but not hopeless. I have seen the inspiration he provides to our men and women in uniform, and I cannot tell you how much this country owes General Petraeus and his family. He has been deployed almost continuously since 2001, but what he was able to accomplish in Iraq with the help of those under his command, he will be the first to say, they deserve the credit.

And now Afghanistan. He came into Afghanistan under very difficult circumstances, losing a commander in the field. The progress in the last year has been stunning. The Taliban in the south has been knocked down hard. There is a 90,000 increase in the Afghan national security forces. We have a new training program to train Afghan security forces, and I think it will pay great dividends.

To the President, you have chosen wisely in picking David Petraeus to be the Director of the CIA.

I am confident Director Petraeus will do as good a job for the country as General Petraeus, and that is saying a lot. Following Leon Panetta, who did a great job, we are in good hands as a nation. I don't believe any single person understands the threats America faces better than General Petraeus. At the CIA he will have a chance to take the fight to the enemy in a different way. We will not have available forever 100,000 troops to be used in theaters of battle.

We are going to bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. I hope we do it smartly based on conditions. But this fight is morphing into other countries, Yemen, Somalia, the Horn of Africa, and the Nation is playing a more crucial role in our Nation's defense than at any time in the history of the CIA. We will be blessed to have

David Petraeus to be Director of the CIA. He understands the threats. I think he will be able to marshal the resources of the CIA to keep the enemies on their heels and to reinforce to our allies that we are a reliable partner and to our enemies there is no place you can hide. There is no passage of time that will keep you safe from American justice.

I hope the Congress—I know Senator CHAMBLISS will, the Senate in particular—will listen to General Petraeus, who will soon be Director Petraeus, about how to make sure the CIA is equipped and funded to take on the enemy. In this war on terror, we are fighting an idea. There is no capital to conquer, there is no air force to down, there is no navy to sink. We are battling an idea. And the way we ultimately become safe is to empower those who have the will to fight the terrorists in their backyard to provide them with the capacity to let the terrorists organizations know we will follow you to the gates of hell, that we will never relent. The CIA and the brave men and women who serve in that organization are becoming the tip of the spear in this battle. What happened in Somalia yesterday, what is going to happen in the future in Yemen and Somalia is a direct result of good intelligence and national will.

To Senator MCCAIN and those who have gotten to know General Petraeus, I can assure you that President Obama chose wisely. This is the perfect job for David Petraeus to take up for the Nation. He has the understanding of the threats we face and the CIA is the platform we will be using against the enemy more effectively than any other platform I know.

With that, I look forward to casting my vote for Director of the CIA David Petraeus, and I hope everybody in this body will provide a vote of confidence to General Petraeus. He has earned this. America is in good hands with David Petraeus being the CIA Director.

I yield. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, the question is on the Petraeus nomination.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David H. Petraeus, of New Hampshire, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) would each vote ''yea.''

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Alexander	Graham	Murray
Ayotte	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Harkin	Paul
Begich	Hatch	Portman
Bennet	Heller	Pryor
Bingaman	Hoeven	Reed
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reid
Blunt	Inouye	Risch
Boozman	Isakson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kerry	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Chambliss	Kohl	Shelby
Coats	Kyl	Snowe
Coburn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Lautenberg	Tester
Collins	Lee	Thune
Conrad	Levin	Toomey
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (CO)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Inhofe	Moran
Burr	Leahy	Udall (NM)

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was absent for the rollcall vote on the nomination of GEN David Petraeus to be the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''●

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today, I was unavoidably absent for vote No. 104. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on the nomination of GEN David H. Petraeus to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.●

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislation session.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be authorized to meet today at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, July 5, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res 20, a joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the U.S. Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a very important issue. I understand a number of my colleagues have worked very hard to bring this issue to the floor.

But the fact is, it simply does not address the fact that we are bankrupting this Nation. I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have conferred with my friend, the Republican leader. There will be no more votes today or tomorrow. Our first vote will be next Tuesday.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 6 p.m. tonight, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

BIG OIL SUBSIDIES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I regret that our colleagues have objected to a consent request to go to some of the most critical issues the country is facing—to have the Finance Committee meet on trade agreements that could expand markets and ultimately create jobs in America, and that is what we need in America—to create jobs. On the question of whether there

should be a limited use of force, the Congress, and particularly the Senate, should speak, and not being able to do that is pretty amazing to me. So I hear a lot about wanting to get the people's work done, but then I hear objections to trying to move to get it done. It is pretty outrageous.

I came originally to the floor after this vote to thank President Obama for, yesterday, calling and echoing my call to end subsidies for Big Oil. It is a call that received a bipartisan vote in the Senate, a bipartisan majority vote in the Senate, but, of course, it did not pass because of our colleagues' insistence on a filibuster or a supermajority amount. But it is time that our friends on the other side of the aisle put the interests of taxpayers ahead of Big Oil and allow these wasteful subsidies to finally end.

As the President said, we have strategies to reduce the deficit, such as my legislation to cut oil subsidies, that are already introduced and ready to go. All we have to do is pass it. A vote to allow that to happen is a simple choice for everyone in this Chamber: Are you on the side of working-class families and seniors or are you on the side of Big Oil?

There are lots of ways to cut the deficit, but saving taxpayer subsidies for Big Oil while ending Medicare as we know it and cutting student loans is not, in my mind, a solution. It makes no sense to give a taxpayer-funded subsidy to the big five oil companies, which are earning $12 billion in profits a month—they are going to earn about $144 billion in profits this year alone—and say to families: Oh, no, you have to sacrifice even more.

Those on the other side of the aisle would tell a middle-class student whose family earns a median family income of about a little over $50,000 that, no, you cannot go to college, you cannot get a Pell grant from the Federal Government, but ExxonMobil, a company that will earn $42.6 billion in profits this year, needs government assistance. And they will continue to come to the floor and look Americans in the eye and say that somehow is commonsense deficit reduction. There simply is no commonsense explanation for balancing the budget on the backs of working families and letting multibillion-dollar oil companies keep billions in taxpayer dollars.

We have this debate about the deficit and how we deal with the debt ceiling, but we don't seem to want to have the shared sacrifice of having the special interests in this country, whether it is Big Oil or ethanol, which had a huge bipartisan vote here in the Senate—that they should not face any consequences but that, in fact, middle-class working families should.

We all know oil companies are among the largest, most profitable companies in the world, but it is hard to understand the scale of their wealth. This chart shows it clearly. This is the median income for families in this country, and this is Big Oil's profit.

Whose side are you on?

This is about closing loopholes and, given the current budget climate, you would think we would all be for closing those loopholes.

Let me give an example of what one of those loopholes is. Under the law as it exists today, we allow the big five oil companies to go to other countries in the world and say to them: You know, tax us in a way that we can ultimately reduce our obligations in the United States.

U.S. taxpayers are taxed on their income worldwide but are entitled to a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for any income they pay to a foreign government, which makes sense because we don't want to tax our companies twice. But U.S. oil and gas companies have very smart lawyers and accountants. They figured out that if they go to a foreign government, such as Indonesia, and say: Don't charge me a license fee or a royalty, which is what we do in the United States to permit these companies to explore on Federal lands and waters for oil and gas—no, they say to Indonesia and other countries: Charge me a tax. Why? Because then I can take all of that tax—which really is a license fee but is now paid as a tax—and I can deduct it back here in the United States. What does that mean? That means American taxpayers are subsidizing foreign oil production. That is not in the national interest of the United States, it is not in the interest of taxpayers in the United States, and it is not about shared sacrifice when we are talking about how to deal with the deficit and debt in this country. Just closing that loophole would mean $6.5 trillion to the Treasury that could be applied directly to deficit reduction.

As a matter of fact, I am only talking about closing two loopholes for the big five oil companies, which are going to make $144 billion in profit. Just closing those two loopholes would save the U.S. taxpayer $21 billion over the next 10 years.

Now, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say: Oh, if you do that to those poor oil companies, they are just going to raise the price of gasoline. That is simply not true. First of all, we are talking about $21 billion over 10 years or roughly $2 billion a year. So those poor oil companies, if they would only make $142 billion in profits this year instead of $144 billion in profits this year, would not have to raise gas prices. They are making $142 billion a year, so they certainly don't need to raise gas prices. And we certainly don't need to incentivize their exploration because they are making record profits in this country and in the world. They don't need us to incentivize them when they are making $144 billion in profits. So let's save the taxpayers that $21 billion and put it directly to deficit reduction.

Only in Washington would my Republican friends suggest that stopping those subsidies to Big Oil is somehow going to be a tax increase. Only in Washington could ending $21 billion in subsidies to the big five oil companies—we are not even talking about the independents—that are going to make $144 billion in profits this year—somehow be a tax increase. Yet we can take away Pell grants or cut seniors under Medicare or the poor under Medicaid, and that is OK. Well, something is wrong with that vision of America.

To back up my point that the argument is simply fallacious, you need to look no further than the definitive report by the CRS that explains that my proposal to end oil subsidies will not lower the production of oil and will not raise gasoline prices.

So, Mr. President, you drive up to the pump, you pay nearly $4 a gallon already, which has a real impact on your family and on your income, and it has a real impact on your choices and has a real impact on food prices and has a real impact in so many areas, and yet we are still supposed to give the oil companies another $21 billion in tax breaks from the American taxpayers.

It is time to stand for the people's interests, not the special interests. It is time to end these tax breaks. It is time to put it as a revenue source into our challenges in terms of meeting our debt and dealing with our deficit, and our proposal would do exactly that.

I don't know how you can look the American people in the eye and say: We are going to cut so many things that are going to affect your life, but on this issue we are going to keep Big Oil whole. We will not touch a penny from their pockets. That is fundamentally wrong, and the American people know it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleagues for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. First of all, I am happy to hear that our Democratic colleagues agree to allow us to come back next week and not go on a recess. It is important that we start work on the single greatest issue, the single most important issue facing this Nation—our debt and deficit issue.

A couple of minutes ago, I objected to what the leadership wanted to move to, which was an important debate on Libya, but it is not addressing what we need to address. The fact is that in the Senate this year—we have been here 6 months, and we have not passed a budget. As a matter of fact, we have not passed a budget in the Senate for over 2 years. We have missed all of the budget deadlines. We should have passed a budget by April 15. Appropriations bills should have been completed by June 10. We are simply not addressing the single greatest issue facing this country—that we are bankrupting America. Only six bills have been

passed in the Senate that have actually become law. Three of those were cleaning up last year's business. They were continuing resolutions funding the government, when what should have happened a year ago is those bills should have already been passed. President Obama's budget that he sent over here in January was so unserious that actually it lost 0 to 97 in the Senate. Not a single Democratic Senator voted for that budget.

We have an awful lot of work to do. Our budget deficit this year—the highest estimate I have heard is about $1.65 trillion. We have incurred over $4 trillion in just the last 3 years. If anybody in America wants to understand why our economy is in a coma, it is exactly that. People look to Washington and they see how reckless and out of control our spending is.

As a former manufacturer, as somebody who made investments and created jobs, I realize that when the Federal Government is spending so much money that it doesn't have, eventually the Federal Government is going to take in the form of higher taxes, possibly in the form of higher inflation.

The other thing that is overhanging the economy that is preventing job creation is overregulation. I cannot tell you how many Wisconsin businesspeople come into our office and talk about that regulation or this regulation that one of the agencies is trying to impose on them.

One thing that is interesting about many of these regulations is they are not being implemented. Just like the health care law; over 3 million waivers have been granted. Why is that? I believe it is because this administration actually understands that if they implement the health care law and these regulations—they understand exactly the harmful effect that will have on our economy and on job creation.

The fact is, what this administration has done—they came into office with a tough situation, no doubt about it, but their actions—passing the health care law, the 1,600-page Dodd-Frank financial bill—have made job creation far harder. They have made the situation far worse.

I think Senator RAND PAUL has a few things to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I agree with Senator JOHNSON. I come to the floor in support of this movement, which is that we should be talking about what America says we should be talking about—the debt.

Yesterday, the President went on national television and chastised Congress. He said to Congress that Members of Congress need to cancel things. Do you know what. I agree. I am here today, though, Mr. President. Where are you?

My understanding is that the President is campaigning and has a fundraiser in Philadelphia tonight. I don't believe he is here tackling the Nation's problems today. He could send us the Vice President, but I don't think he is here either. I think he is in Las Vegas campaigning tonight.

This is a two-way street. If he is going to go on television and chastise us for not doing work—we are saying we want to be working on the Nation's problems; we are here saying the Nation's debt is a problem; his administration has said the No. 1 national security threat we face is the debt—where is the President? Campaigning.

We are here, Mr. President. We will have an offer. We don't want to raise the debt ceiling. We don't want more debt. Do you know what. As Republicans, for the good of the country, we are willing to raise the debt but only—and I repeat ''only''—if we have significant budgetary reform.

We have to balance the budget by law. Force Congress to do it by changing the Constitution. It is the only way it will ever change. There is a pathology here. The pathology is that we do not have a spine. We are spineless and cannot do what it takes to cut the spending, and we will only get there if we change the Constitution.

So, Mr. President, we are here. We are here, and we welcome you to come back to town in between fundraisers and talk about how we would fix this. But we would fix this by saying: Yes, we will raise the debt ceiling, contingent upon a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Seventy-five percent of the public is in favor of saying we have to balance our budget. Let's come back and discuss what the American people want.

I commend Senator JOHNSON for leading this fight, and I think this is just the beginning. But I don't plan on saying we should go to any other subject until we have addressed the debt ceiling.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I totally agree with my colleague from Kentucky, and I believe Senator RUBIO has a few words to add to that.

Mr. RUBIO. I thank Senator JOHNSON, and I too yesterday watched the President's lecture on television. I watched it again this morning just to make sure I was well informed before I came here.

My reaction is twofold. One, I am disappointed, and the other is I was alarmed. First, I am disappointed because America does not have a tradition of class warfare. It has never been a part of our Nation. In fact, one of the things that distinguishes us from the world is Americans have never believed that somehow we have to take money away from somebody else in order to be better off. On the contrary, we have always looked to advance the cause of everyone in the belief we can all be prosperous and in the hopes of growing our economy that way. That is the American tradition, and that has served our Nation well.

Unfortunately, you wouldn't know that from the speech yesterday—the rhetoric that, quite frankly, was deeply disappointing. The idea that if we raise taxes, as the President said yesterday, on millionaires and billionaires, raise taxes on oil companies, raise taxes on owners of private jets, that will somehow make a difference in America's debt in terms of having a real impact, is not only misleading, it is, quite frankly, disappointing. It is class warfare and the kind of language you would expect from the leader of a Third World country, not the President of the United States.

I am also alarmed and worried about the speech because I think from it you can take only two things. Either the President doesn't truly understand the nature of the problem we face or he has decided this is a political issue and not a policy one. I say perhaps he doesn't understand the nature of the case because, for example, he mentioned the corporate jet tax six different times. Yet the impact that would have is so insignificant, the White House, to this moment, cannot give an estimate of what that means in terms of a dollar figure. Going further, by the way, it is important to note that exact tax provision was part of the President's now infamous stimulus plan that passed in February of 2009.

The bigger problem, though, is maybe the President fundamentally doesn't understand how jobs are created. Politicians don't create jobs. U.S. Senators don't create jobs. Senator JOHNSON pointed out that jobs are created by everyday people from all walks of life who start a business or expand an existing one. Our job in government is to make it easier for them to do that, not harder. Threatening to raise taxes, threatening to wage class warfare does not accomplish that purpose.

Here is what I would suggest to the President. I would suggest we have done this before as a people in America—things such as a simpler Tax Code; people around here are in favor of tax reform; simpler tax reform; a manageable and sane regulatory environment and, of course, a government that doesn't spend money it doesn't have. These things have worked before and they will work again, and I urge the President to lead us in that direction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the Senator from Florida for those comments, and I want to pick up on one point the Senator just made about class warfare.

Certainly, as a job creator myself of 31, 32 years, I know an awful lot about entrepreneurs, and I have to point out how incredibly dispiriting it is to have leaders in Washington attack you day in and day out, demonize you, when all you are trying to do is make a good life for yourself, your family, and provide solid employment for other good Americans.

So, again, I need to point out class warfare does not work. It does nothing—it does nothing—to help improve our economy.

Senator LEE.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

There is no issue that is more important or more pressing for the American people than this one right now, where we have reached a point where our debt-to-GDP ratio is about 95 percent. Our economy can't long endure that kind of borrowing. It has an effect that will result in an estimated loss of about 1 million jobs a year for each year we remain above the 90-percent, debt-to-GDP ratio. We simply can't endure that, and the American people can't endure that.

We need to increase revenues. The only way to increase revenues is to allow the economy to recover. That won't happen as long as we keep borrowing more and more money while doing nothing to control the underlying problem—the systemic problem that requires a structural reform.

The American people understandably, justifiably, and very correctly are demanding that before we raise the Nation's debt limit yet again, before we extend yet another credit card for the United States of America, we commit to some kinds of cuts. Future borrowing requires us to make future cuts. The problem with that is the moment that debt is actually used up, the moment it is incurred, the American people are under an obligation. But if we make a promise today that we are going to cut, let's say, $2 trillion or $3 trillion or $4 trillion over the next 10 or 12 or 14 or 15 years, that is a promise we can't make. That is a promise we can't really commit to because this Congress, the one that sits right now, will not be the same Congress that convenes in January of 2013 or January of 2015 or in future years.

We have to make changes right now. The only way we can commit to future cuts, to future structural reforms—the only way we can bind future Congresses—is by amending the U.S. Constitution to change the way we spend money, to limit spending as a percentage of GDP, and to require a supermajority to spend more than we have or to raise taxes.

That is what we are demanding. We are willing to work and to come to the table on the debt limit, but we demand some kind of solution that will put us on course toward sanity. That is why we are here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the Senator.

Senator AYOTTE.

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank my colleagues. I think those who are watching this will see we are new Senators back here in the back corner of the Senate. As a new Member of this Chamber, I am deeply disappointed by the lack of work that we have been doing in the Senate. The majority leader has put us in a position where we haven't been focusing on the fiscal crisis that is facing our Nation right now, when we look at the fact it has been 792 days since we have had a budget.

I was so excited as a new member of the Budget Committee to roll up my sleeves and get together and put out a responsible blueprint for this country. Unfortunately, we were told by the majority leader that would be foolish—to put together a responsible blueprint for this country and to do the work of the Budget Committee.

One of the reasons I came to the Senate is I am tired of business as usual. I know my freshman colleagues back here share that. I am the mother of two children—I know the President mentioned his children yesterday—but if we care about our children and the future of this country, we owe it to our children to not continue to kick the can down the road. We should be in the Senate today and next week talking about how we are going to put together a blueprint that makes sure that we do not continue to borrow from countries such as China; that we do not continue to enslave our children with the debt this country is accumulating.

We know if we do not address this, the greatest country in the world will go bankrupt. I, for one, want to follow through on the American promise that we have always made to the next generation, which is that we will leave them with a better country. That is so threatened right now with what is happening in Washington.

I share with my colleague, Senator JOHNSON, the belief we should be addressing nothing next week but spending and debt. We have the debt ceiling vote coming up, so why aren't we rolling up our sleeves right now, working on a solution with real spending reforms and putting those handcuffs on Congress that we know we need, such as a balanced budget amendment, spending caps, and a budget for our country that reduces spending so we don't have to have this continuing resolution situation.

We do not have a tax problem in this country, we have a spending problem. We need to create a positive climate for our private sector and do the hard work in Washington—the same way our families do—and live within our means. So I think next week we should be doing the work that needs to be done.

Mr. President, you called on us yesterday to work. We are here working. The only financial and fiscal blueprint that you have offered—your budget for 2012—did not even get one vote from a member of your party in this Chamber. This budget blueprint would have added another $14 trillion to our debt.

So I say to our President: We are willing to roll up our sleeves and get to work with you to avert this looming fiscal crisis, but where is your plan that will reduce spending and get us on a responsible fiscal path to preserving the greatest country in the world?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank Senator AYOTTE.

Senator VITTER.

Mr. VITTER. I thank Senator JOHNSON, and I am honored to join him and all our colleagues here to echo the same important message. Everyone knows—everyone paying attention across the country knows—our greatest challenge is out-of-control spending and debt. Everyone knows we face a mounting crisis and an important deadline in terms of the debt limit. So when are we going to face these crucial issues, the top challenges we face as a country? When are we going to face them squarely, directly, constructively on the floor of the Senate? It is just that simple. Let's get to the important matter at hand. Let's debate in a constructive way and let's vote on proposals to curb spending and debt.

Yesterday, we stood together, under Senator JOHNSON's leadership, and said just that. We said we are going to block any effort to go into a recess or a pro forma session next week—the July 4 recess. We have done that. We have successfully blocked that recess, and we did that because we need to roll up our sleeves. We need to go to work, not go on vacation, and deal with this crucial challenge of spending and debt.

Interestingly, President Obama, in many ways, said the same thing yesterday. He chastised Congress and said: You need to go to work, not go on vacation, and address this crucial issue. Well, great. We have succeeded in canceling that recess. That is a first important step. But why are we continuing to try to move to every other issue under the Sun except the biggest challenge our country faces? Why don't we face this issue, debate it in a constructive way?

Senator REID, why don't you put measures on the floor that directly address this issue?

With that in mind, those of us who joined together yesterday to block our July 4 recess have written Senator REID a letter today, and I think it summarizes our point and our position very clearly, so I will read it. It is not long.

Dear Leader Reid:

Yesterday we came together to make it clear that we believe the Senate should not go on vacation while our country goes bankrupt. We vowed to block any recess or pro forma session next week.

We're glad you have accepted that reality. But let's not be in session just to try to fool the American people into thinking the Senate is working on the Nation's fiscal crisis. Let's actually begin a constructive debate on the biggest challenge our country faces—spending and debt.

With that goal, we write to ask a few simple fundamental questions: When will you put serious bills on the floor to directly address spending and debt?

The Budget Act of 1974 requires the Senate Budget Committee to mark up a budget by April 15th, and tomorrow will mark the 793rd day since the Democratic-led Senate has passed a budget and the 11th week since missing that deadline this year. When will the Budget Committee meet to mark up a budget proposal, and when will you put such a proposal on the floor?

The American people want us to enact meaningful, effective spending caps. When will you put a spending cap bill on the floor?

We clearly need the enforced discipline of a balanced budget constitutional amendment. This measure failed by a single vote last time it was debated on the floor of the Senate. When will you put a balanced budget amendment on the floor?

We await your response and your leadership.

So, again, Mr. President, to summarize, we banded together yesterday and said: As the country goes bankrupt, we shouldn't go on vacation. We are going to block any recess, any pro forma session next week. And we did. But we did it to turn to this challenge: to debate spending and debt in a constructive way, to have votes on that, not to continue to avoid the issue and turn to every other issue under the Sun.

So through the Chair, I would again ask Senator REID, why don't we turn to this most important challenge of our country. Please put serious bills on the Senate floor that directly address spending and debt. Let's get on with the people's work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank Senator VITTER.

Senator SESSIONS.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator JOHNSON for his leadership on this issue.

As the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, I share my colleagues' disappointment that we have not functioned. It is good to see Senator AYOTTE and Senator JOHNSON, who are members of that committee. We worked hard to get prepared some weeks ago on the assumption that the Senate would meet its statutorily required duty; that is, to produce a budget.

I am holding up title 2, section 632 of the United States Code, and it is the Budget Act. It requires that the Congress annually produce a budget. We have now gone 792 days without a budget.

The first line of the act is: On or before April 15 of each year, Congress shall complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year beginning October 1 for the next fiscal year.

We haven't done that. It also says we should meet by April 1.

Senator CONRAD, our Budget chairman, Democratic chairman and able, experienced chairman, was prepared to go forward. It is pretty clear to me that the majority leader decided we shouldn't have a budget process.

Last year, the Budget Committee produced a budget out of committee, but the majority leader failed to bring it up for vote on the floor. As the leader, he has the power generally to control that fact and was able to do so. This year, he said it would be foolish to have a budget; and, basically, we would not even meet in committee to have a budget.

So we are facing the most serious systemic debt crisis in our Nation's history. The numbers are so serious and our path is so unacceptable that it is clearly the No. 1 issue of our time.

The Chairman of President Obama's debt commission gave a written statement to the Budget Committee that said this Nation has never faced a more predictable economic crisis. When asked, Erskine Bowles, President Clinton's Chief of Staff, said it could be 2 years, a little before, a little after.

What I am saying is, these individuals, particularly the ones who just finished a campaign, traveled all over their State, talked to hundreds of thousands, millions of people in their State, got a feel for it. They are bringing new vitality and new insight into what is happening, and what is happening is nothing. Six months have gone by, and we have not had any hearings, we have not had any votes on the floor. We haven't seen any legislation. So I think this is an unacceptable method. I think it undermines the classic constitutional duty of Congress to appropriate money and deal with taxes.

It is our responsibility. But have you observed mayors who say: I am not going to present a budget to city council. I am going to let them decide. Do you see Governors not presenting budgets to the State legislatures and then fight for what they believe in? Look what is happening with Governor Christie, Governor Cuomo in New York, Governor Brown in California, Governor Bentley in Alabama.

It helps to have that one single person elected to represent everybody, to provide some impetus, and it is astounding to me that we haven't seen that from the majority leader in the Senate or from the President. He submitted a budget but then backed away from it and it was voted down 97 to 0 on the floor just a few weeks ago, but it was never seriously considered.

So what are we looking to do? We are heading to a time where we may be asked in a few hours to vote on a monumental multitrillion-dollar deal to raise the debt limit of the United States. What will be in it? Will we be changing the trajectory of our Nation or will it be business as usual? We are not going to have time to review it. That should be on the floor now. People should be standing and casting votes right now. How much do you want to increase taxes? Do you? Which ones? How much do you want to cut? Where?

Let's have the vote down here. That is what we should be doing. I think it will help the American people understand how serious our problem is, and what it will take to get out of it. It is much more serious and our problem is greater than most people realize.

I thank my colleagues for their good comments and the enthusiasm they have brought and the passion they have brought to this critical issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank Senator SESSIONS. I will point out that business as usual here in Washington is bankrupting America.

Senator VITTER.

Mr. VITTER. I thank Senator JOHNSON.

I am glad our Republican freshmen did not get the memo that they were supposed to be seen but not heard. It is exciting for this old dusty establishment when the people who just walked in the door are the ones who are leading it. So I thank all the freshmen who are sitting here.

Washington is addicted to spending, and the ''addict in chief'' is President Obama. He has promised many times to quit, to quit spending, to live within our means, but he keeps falling off the wagon. Now, for the fourth time since he has been President, he is asking Congress to refill the bottle so he can keep spending and keep borrowing and keep increasing America's debt.

Members of the Senate often brag about the fact that we have the power of the purse. Part of that power is to pass laws to limit how much the administration can borrow. It has been a tradition. But both parties over the years have consistently blown through that legal debt limit and increased it whenever we wanted another drink.

The debt limit is supposed to be a stop sign, to stop the administration from spending more than we can afford as a nation. Instead, they have turned it into a green light, where we can just speed through and continue to pour more and more debt onto our children.

But now we have gone from it being just a wink and a nod, where we brag about how much bacon we take home to we are at the point where we could seriously lose our Nation. I think Americans sense that everywhere.

Congressmen and politicians constantly exaggerate and cry wolf, but I think there is a sense all across America that goes beyond partisanship to real worry. That is what I hear everywhere I go.

People somehow intuitively know that if we have debt almost the size of our economy and projecting to even double that over the next 10 years, what they see on TV in Greece and around the world of countries literally coming unglued could very well happen much quicker than we think in the United States.

We have over $14 trillion in debt. We know the President is not serious about quitting this spending binge because the budget he sent us practically doubles that. As we have gone through these last few months of talking about raising the debt limit once again, we have not gotten one proposal from the President to deal with this issue. He has played dozens of rounds of golf and had many fundraisers around the country, but he has been AWOL on this issue.

So not only has he added over $3 trillion of debt since he became President, he has been missing in action when it comes to actually dealing with it. His condescending speech yesterday that told Congress to solve the problem ignored the fact that he was elected as President to lead. Yet he is not even following when it comes to this issue.

We do have a spending addiction, and the only way we are going to stop it and keep our country from going over the cliff is if we have a constitutional requirement that we have to stop spending more than we are borrowing.

Outside Washington that doesn't sound as if it is an extraordinary thing to say. But here last week, one of the

Democratic Senators called me extreme for suggesting we needed to balance our budget. American families have to do it, businesses have to do it, 49 States have to do it, and sometimes it is painful. But we don't have to do it here. The reason we have an unlimited government is that we have unlimited spending in Congress.

We are at a point where we have to make a decision. We have obligated ourselves to borrow more money. We don't have a good choice at this point. But if we are going to give the President more money to spend to meet obligations he has already made, we have to make sure this is the end of this spending addiction. The only way for that to happen is if we in Congress give the people of the United States, and the 50 States, the opportunity to decide for themselves if they want their Federal Government to have a balanced budget.

That is what our condition is. We will help the President deal with this debt ceiling, but he is going to have to agree with us, and so will the Democratic Party, that we are going to send to the States a balanced budget amendment that the States can ratify. Five years after they ratify it, this Federal Government must be in balance.

If we can't do that, if we can't make that commitment to the American people that we are going to stop this addiction, stop bankrupting our country, then we are going to have to go through the pain we have caused ourselves, along with this President, when we don't raise that debt limit.

We need the help of Americans today because the people in Congress do not have the willpower to do what I just said. We need millions of Americans to call us and e-mail us and tell the President and tell Members of Congress that this debt limit should not be raised again, ever, unless we permanently solve this problem for the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). The Senator has used the 30 minutes of the colloquy.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, 2 minutes is granted.

Mr. VITTER. This is very little to ask this Congress to do—to agree, within 6 or 8 years, to do the hard work to balance our budget in return for giving the President more authority to borrow more money.

We owe it to the American people to let them decide for themselves and let the States ratify it. This is a huge decision. All we are asking our Democratic colleagues to do is to let America decide if we should have a balanced budget. Let America decide if it is a radical, extreme idea that we live within our means and stop spending more than we are bringing in. I know how America is going to answer that question, and that is why I want to give them the chance to answer it.

Mr. President, you have the money you need to meet our obligations, but once and for all we need to mean what we say and stop spending this country into bankruptcy.

I thank the Chair. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank Senator VITTER for his leadership on this issue. It is the most important issue facing this Nation.

I wish to thank my colleagues for joining me and for the leadership they have shown as well.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here today with the senior Senator from Colorado to talk about these important issues. The first thing I want to talk about is the debt ceiling itself. People at home are asking me constantly: MICHAEL, what in the world is going on back there? We are dealing with our budget at the local level, we are dealing with our budget at the State level, we are making choices that are not popular and are not easy to make but we are moving ahead and making decisions in our businesses and making decisions at home. We are moving ahead. What is wrong with Washington, DC?

Part of the problem in this place is that people are not just entitled, it seems, to their own opinions, they are also entitled to their own set of facts. I think when you are getting paid by the taxpayer you have an obligation to actually not play with your own set of facts but to come out here and say what the facts are.

What the facts are on the debt ceiling, the debt ceiling and the vote, is that this is not a case of deciding as you are sitting at the kitchen table and you are spending too much and so you are going to cut up your credit card. I would be for that. That is not what we are talking about here. This is about bills that have already been incurred by the United States. These are debts already owed by the United States. What this is about is not cutting up your credit card, it is about sitting at home and saying: You know what, I didn't budget very well last month, I didn't budget very well last year, so even though I watched cable happily all year long, I am not going to pay my cable bill this month. I am not going to do it. Even though I lived in this house all year, I am not going to make my mortgage payment this month. I am not going to do it.

That is not fiscally responsible for a family to do and it is not fiscally responsible for the Federal Government to do.

At home, if you do that what you discover is that your mortgage rate goes through the roof because the bank says to you: MICHAEL BENNET, you did not pay your mortgage last month and I am not going to lend you money on the same terms that I lent you money before because you are a lousy risk. That is exactly what this is about. It is not about new money. It is important for everybody to understand that because if we do not raise the debt limit and we say to the creditors of the United States you are not getting paid—not to mention our veterans and our seniors and the men and women who are fighting in Afghanistan—but to our bondholders, you are not going to get paid, they are going to raise our interest rates, and every percentage point increase in our interest rate is going to drive us 1.3 trillion more dollars into debt. There are people coming out here saying it is the fiscally responsible thing to do, not to raise the debt ceiling when, if we do not, we are going to have $1.3 trillion more of debt to pay and the interest on that debt and nothing to show for it.

It is not surprising to me that, Washington being Washington, there are people who see this as an opportunity to create leverage over things, to have a negotiation about the direction of this country. I understand that. I believed for a very long time that we have to get hold of our deficit and our debt. We have a $1.5 trillion deficit. We have almost $15 trillion of debt on our balance sheet. I think we have a moral obligation not to constrain the choices of our kids and grandchildren.

I have 3 kids of my own who are 11, 10 and 6. One of them heard me say that during a townhall meeting and she followed me out to the sidewalk and she said: Daddy?

This is Caroline, the oldest, and I said: What?

She said: Just to be clear—

She was making fun of me because I use that expression sometimes.

She said: Just to be clear, I am not paying that back.

That is the right attitude for her to have. We need to be advocates for Caroline Bennet and all the kids living across this country, not just to be fiscally responsible, which we need to be, not just asking what we are going to cut, which we need to do, but also prioritizing what we are spending to make sure we are maintaining the American dream, to make sure we are honoring the legacy of our parents and grandparents and their parents and grandparents and honoring our national creed.

It is our job, not as Senators but as Americans, to provide more opportunity, not less, to the people who are coming after us, and the debt and deficit is a huge piece of that. But, you know what, it is not the only thing. I lie awake at night worrying about the fact that if you are poor in this country it is hard for you to get a decent education. If you are born into a ZIP Code that is defined by poverty in the United States, your chances of graduating with a college degree in the 21st century in the greatest country in the world are 9 in 100. That means 91 of you are consigned to a future where you cannot participate meaningfully in the democracy, you can't participate meaningfully in this economy. We need to deal with that.

The fact is we have an economy that is not generating jobs, where median

family income for the first time in our history is falling, not rising. People are coming to my townhall meetings and saying: I have done everything I can do over the last decade, but I am earning less at the end than I was at the beginning. They are saying to me: MICHAEL, we sent our first kid to the fancy school, but we are not going to be able to send our second kid there, or we cannot send our kid to the best college they got into.

We need to be working on that.

We have an energy policy in this country right now—maybe it is better to say a lack of an energy policy in this country right now—that forces us to ship billions of dollars a week of our treasury to the Persian Gulf to buy oil. That doesn't make any sense.

I was on a call last week with farmers from my State, saying to me they are being driven out of business by the broken immigration policy we have.

I think the people at home are sick and tired of the screaming match. I think people at home are sick and tired of the partisanship. I believe that people do not think it is going to address these issues and I think they look at this deficit and debt situation and they say to themselves: This is such a reflection of incompetence that we are fearful to have a conversation about all the other things we have to do for our kids and for our grandkids. Their standard of what they want us to do is extremely clear to me.

The senior Senator and I are from the most beautiful State in this country, but we are also proud of the fact that it is a third Democratic, a third Republican, and a third Independent. What I have taken out of the townhall meetings I have had is this: They want us to materially address this problem. They do not believe we are going to fix it all at once—unfortunately, they are right about that—but they want us to materially address it. They want to know we are all in it together, that everybody has some role to play in helping preserve choice and options for the next generation of Americans and to make sure business understands that we are going to make good on the accounts we have.

That is not Washington speak, though; that is Colorado speak. It is tougher around here. And they want it to be bipartisan because they do not believe in either party's go-it-alone approach on this question.

I would add a corollary to all of that, which is that the capital markets need to be assured that their paper is going to be worth what they paid for it.

We need a comprehensive approach. It is an approach that is going to require us to cut discretionary spending. It is an approach that is going to require us to reform our entitlement system. It is an approach that is going to require us to do real tax reform in this place. We are not great here at walking and chewing gum at the same time but that is what we need to start doing. These are comprehensive and complicated questions.

No one would rather vote on something than I would that did not raise any taxes, but the math doesn't work. It is clear at the end of the day for us to move ahead we are going to have to have an agreement that has all of those aspects in it: discretionary spending cuts, entitlement reform, tax reform.

That is why Senator JOHANNS and I, a Republican here, circulated a letter to the President that had those three elements in it. Thirty-two Democrats and thirty-two Republicans signed the letter—the Presiding Officer of the Senate signed the letter—agreeing that all these elements were going to be part of a final product here.

What I want to do this afternoon is simply implore all of us to do our jobs, to get this behind us, to begin the building of America again in the 21st century, to make sure we are not the first generation of Americans to leave less opportunity to our kids and our grandkids. There is a lot more agreement behind closed doors in this place than there is out on the floor. We need to bring some of that agreement out here, because if we fail to reach some conclusion before this debt limit vote and we unintentionally or intentionally end up in a place where we have turned our back on the debts we owe, we are not going to be able to solve this problem. The choices are going to make these look like easy choices.

We are going home for a few days this weekend, the senior Senator and I, to celebrate the Fourth of July, Independence Day, to spend some time with our families and friends and our neighbors. Then we are coming back next week. My hope is that everybody comes back—everybody, on both sides—with more of a seriousness of purpose than we have had, with an ability to see not just political benefit but the benefit to the country of coming to agreement.

If I can go home and say to people that we have reached a deal that meets the terms I mentioned earlier, my view is that will be perfectly fine in Democratic parts of the State and in Republican parts of the State. That is what we should strive to do.

I hope the American people will hold the people in this Chamber accountable in the way they hold people at the local level and the State level accountable. No mayor would ever say I am going to willingly or wantonly jeopardize the credit rating of my city—the Presiding Officer was a mayor—and live to fight another day, and we should not do that either.

I hope we move past the rhetoric of this debt ceiling discussion and actually get into a conversation that will solve the fundamental problems and challenges that are facing our country, because if we do not do that, we are not going to do the even more important work than that, which is to support the aspirations all of us have for this country and for our children in a world that is becoming more complex and uncertain every single day.

I thank the senior Senator from Colorado for his incredible leadership on these issues. I believe if we continue to try to reach out and continue to try to work together, ultimately we are going to find a path.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge the leadership of my colleague from Colorado, particularly underlining the salient points he made during his remarks. I think most important to note about Colorado is it is a third Republican, a third Democratic, and a third Independent in our political and electoral makeup. I think it drives us to find bipartisan solutions and bipartisan ground. That is why we came to the floor this afternoon. It was in the hope that our colleagues from both sides of the aisle would join us in the discussion about how we move forward, not just on lifting the debt ceiling, for the reasons Senator BENNET outlined, but for the reasons that we think are as follows:

We will lay a new foundation for our 21st century economy, we will send a message to the markets and the business community that we are serious about dealing with our annual deficits and our long-term debt. In effect, in doing such we will inject a healthy dose of confidence into our country, into our markets, and into our business community. Taking those steps will be a way of moving forward, as the Senator said.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleague Senator BENNET.

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

Mr. BENNET. One of the things Senator UDALL said reminded me of a conversation I had a number of months ago with somebody who is in the capital markets and who watches everything going on down here pretty closely, but quizzically. He cannot figure out what in the world we are doing. I saw him, I think maybe it was in February, sometime in that timeframe. I asked him, as I always do: What are you doing? He is one of the smartest investors I know.

He said: I am buying gold.

I said: Why are you buying gold?

He said: I don't have any confidence that you guys are going to be able to work this out and get our deficit and debt under control.

First, think how unproductive that is. I am not telling anybody to buy or sell gold, but it doesn't create jobs in this economy. We want people investing in companies so they can grow and hire people and create jobs.

Anyway, I saw him again about 6 weeks ago. We started talking about the debt ceiling conversation.

He said: It is beyond the realm of my comprehension that you guys would fail to lift the debt ceiling.

Here is a guy cynical enough about the way this place works who is saying

he is buying gold, but it is even beyond his comprehensive that we could fail to lift the debt ceiling. The reason is, he actually understands what the facts are around this.

I think we will lift the debt ceiling. I certainly hope we will. But the more important point is what the Senator has been working on for all these many months, which is coming to a comprehensive plan that actually addresses the underlying problem of our debt and deficit.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. My colleague and I hosted the Colorado Capital Conference a few weeks ago. We had Coloradans from all sections of the State, all walks of life. We had the three main political points of view represented: Democrats, Independents, Republicans. They remarked to Senator BENNET and to me, as well as hearing from a broad range of our colleagues who were gracious enough to take time to speak to our constituents and answer questions, that we all had identified the problem and we all had identified the solution, which was a comprehensive plan that we implemented together. We are here again on the floor this afternoon to call on all of our colleagues to join us in working together, finding that common ground, because there is a lot at stake but there is enormous opportunity. My colleague was a successful businessman in one of his previous lives, but he may want to comment on the capital conference as well.

Mr. BENNET. It is clear to me, if this decision were left up to 100 Coloradans, we would scratch our head and we would probably argue out some things. But I think it would probably take about a day for us to come to a set of solutions that would solve the problem or at least move us down the road, and we would feel pretty patriotic about what we had done; that we had done something useful for our kids at the end of this process, if we are able to deliver something like that. I think that is how we ought to feel. There are too many days around this place where I feel like we have lost sight of all that. In that conversation the Senator talked about—Al Simpson was such a big part of, Gary Hart was there, Alice Rivlin, and a number of people—it was abundantly clear, blindingly obvious to the people in that room that we couldn't approach this problem by drawing bright lines and saying: No, we cannot touch this or, no, we cannot touch that.

They knew everybody was going to have to give a little bit in order to make this work. Unfortunately, some of that line drawing is what we are seeing around here that we have to find a way to get past.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If the Senator would yield, I would comment on two elements my colleague just alluded to. Let's talk about Social Security. There are those in our party who have said keep your hands off Social Security. I know what a strong and important program Social Security has been. It has allowed me and my wife to raise our children. My parents were treated with dignity in their latter years. They also had the assurances of Medicare. If we think because Social Security on paper is solvent, we ought to think again because there is $3 trillion owed to the Social Security trust fund by the Federal Government, and, yes, Social Security isn't responsible for that shortfall because we have taken those dollars and put them in the general fund, but that $3 trillion is going to have to come from somewhere. There are some commonsense fixes we can put in place that will protect and serve and strengthen Social Security.

On the other hand, we hear in the Chamber tax revenues, I should say more appropriately, are off the table. Every economist and every observer points out we cannot get there from here, there being a balanced Federal budget, without additional revenues. Why can't we start, as the Bowles-Simpson commission proposed, eliminating many of the subsidies and loopholes and special deals in our Tax Code that total something over $1 trillion. That is a great place to start. If we follow that with tax reforms, lowering rates for corporations and businesses, that is an even bigger step we can take. There is a broad agreement in the Chamber—certainly in our conversations with people across the country who represent their States here—those are commonsense steps forward.

Mr. BENNET. I completely agree, and why wouldn't we want to look at our Tax Code and our regulatory code. I hear about that from the other side, and I share their view. I have been in government. Listen, I was a school superintendent for almost 4 years. If one thinks I don't understand what it is like to be on the receiving end of well-intentioned legislation from Washington, DC, that by the time it gets to a school or classroom, makes no sense at all, believe me, I lived it every single day. So why wouldn't we look at our Tax Code and our regulatory code and ask ourselves: Are these things more or less likely to drive innovation in the United States? Are these aspects more or less likely to grow our economy and to create jobs? It is clear we have the highest corporate tax rate in the world now. It used to be second, but Japan either changed theirs or is about to change theirs. That is sending a very uncompetitive message to the world.

On the other hand, we have so many loopholes, so many special interest loopholes that underlie the Tax Code, we are not actually getting the revenue we would be suggesting as high rates. So in a way, this isn't a partisan issue, but it is the worst of all possible worlds because we are sending out an anti-competitive message to the world that says we are closed for business, and we have a whole bunch of loopholes that may or may not—and I suspect in many cases do not—drive innovation in this country.

In fact, most of them are looking backward into the 20th century. They may have made sense in the middle of the 20th century, but they don't necessarily make sense to build new industries here, to develop things such as a new energy economy that is so important to our State which, by the way, would help lead us toward energy independence from the Persian Gulf. There is no reason to think all these things that have been written down are written in stone, and, frankly, our job is to make sure it is working better for people. So I think the debt and deficit commission made some excellent recommendations on that side.

The other side is on personal income tax. What they said there was, we can actually lower rates and raise more revenue. Why? Because there are so many deductions that are part of the code, and only 30 percent of the people in this country itemize, get the benefit of those deductions. We can imagine a world where everybody gets the benefit of a lower rate but we are able to have revenue to drive us forward. We can get there. The thing on the debt and deficit commission is, TOM COBURN, who is one of the most conservative Members of this body—I don't think he would mind my saying that—and DICK DURBIN, one of the most liberal Members of this body, both voted for that deficit and debt commission report. That is almost good enough for me.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I was proud of the Senate when five of the six Senators on the Commission voted for the Bowles-Simpson recommendations, not without some concerns, not without an interest in working to fill in and flesh out the plan, but five of the six Senators from across the political spectrum said this is a very good starting point.

Mr. BENNET. I see we are joined by Senator COONS from Delaware, and I am going to stop, but along that line, just to give people who are here in the Chamber or might be watching some optimism, just 2 weeks ago we took a vote on one subsidy, an ethanol subsidy, and I think it was Senator COBURN and Senator FEINSTEIN who put it on the floor, a Democrat and Republican, and it had like 73 votes. I get in trouble with my kids. It wasn't ''like'' 73 votes, it was 73 votes to end that subsidy.

By the way, there were around 40 Democrats and 30-some Republicans who supported that. We need more of that around here. I think it would—if we keep working at it and keep chipping away at it, in the end, we will be able to see common sense will prevail over politics.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, Senator COONS would like to share his thoughts.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, the two Senators from Colorado have inspired me to come to the floor and join them in a colloquy about the challenges facing our country. I say to the Senators

from Colorado, I am pleased and impressed with their leadership and have greatly enjoyed serving with them to date.

I agree that the vote on one of our tax expenditures on the ethanol subsidy was an encouraging and inspiring moment because we saw both Democrats and Republicans from all over the country casting a vote to end a tax expenditure or subsidy that, many would argue, has outlived its usefulness in the current marketplace.

In my home State, we recently saw the bankruptcy of our second largest poultry company, and they have communicated to me their grave concern about the ethanol subsidy. There are lots of folks on both sides of that particular debate. I think the larger point that is important for us to get to is certainty in the markets. I spent a number of years in the private sector in business before running for and being elected to office, and I know the mantra Senator BENNET is well familiar with, Senator UDALL is well familiar with, both parties are well familiar with, is certainty is what the markets look for. Certainty is also what our people look for. We have alarmed them, concerned them by not being able to reach a broad, bipartisan, responsible plan that lays out a framework for how it is we are going to address both the Nation's record deficits and record debt. Our debt today, as we know, is roughly $14 trillion. Our deficit has hit an alltime record, and we are working on borrowed time. I have heard some suggest we need to better understand the situation we are in. The situation we are in, I believe, is that we are about to risk defaulting on America's mortgage. We have made commitments as a nation. We have expended ourselves at home and abroad in a lot of different ways, and I am worried we are on the verge of failing to meet our commitments. Just as America's households hesitate before ever defaulting on their mortgage, I think we, as a nation, as a people, have to hesitate, have to think deeply about the consequences of it.

I asked the folks who work with me on economic policy to quantify it. They looked at a number of different studies around the country and gave me chilling numbers. Should we fail to meet the August 2 deadline that Secretary Geithner has repeatedly, since January, in writing and testimony, suggested to us is the absolute last date by which we can reach a bipartisan compromise and a path forward, we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs. One study said 640,000 jobs. The markets may lose as much as 10 percent of their value, which would mean a loss of almost $1 trillion of market equity value. That means pension funds, personal savings, 401(k)s would take an enormous hit. The average homeowner would see an increase in costs, whether it is their credit cards or mortgages or car loans. It is easy to think this is an abstract argument. But in reality, I think the problem we are causing, the lack of confidence in the markets, could have a sudden, sharp, grinding effect on our economic world, and that is because investors act more like animals than they do like machines. When spooked, they act the way herds do and they run off in a certain direction. My concern is, as a country, we are so used to having a AAA bond rating, to being the world's reserve currency, to being the gold standard in security. I am gravely concerned that intransigence, an unwillingness to come to a reasonable compromise is putting us at real risk of spooking the markets, of harming the average American homeowner, and putting our rating at risk as a country.

At the end of the day, so far in my short 6 months here, I have observed some things about how Washington works that worry me. If I could offer a metaphor, it seems to me there are a lot of sacred cows here. It seems to me the trillions of dollars we spend in our Tax Code through tax loopholes and special tax provisions and the trillions we spend through direct spending are broken up into these sacred cows, and I feel as if I have gone into dairy. I feel as if I am surrounded by a whole herd of sacred cows, and what we need is a deliberate and clear bipartisan effort to thin the herd, to make some tough choices.

As I know Senator BENNET said previously, I wish to commend the hard work of the Gang of 6, the so-called Gang of 6, the bipartisan group who came up with processes and a path forward. The Bowles-Simpson commission presented to those of us on the Budget Committee, presented to this body in writing, a proposal. There are paths forward. There are ways to make these tough choices. I hope before the time runs out, this body will embrace these proposals, make the tough choices and the sacrifices we need to come to the center and lay out a path. I, frankly, don't think we have until August 2. If we are going to put at risk the markets by injecting uncertainty, frankly, the timeline may be more like the middle of July. It is my hope the Senators from Colorado will be joined by Senators from both sides of this body and both sides of this Capitol in crafting a responsible bipartisan solution.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator, in effect, is saying that rather than this being a problem, although it is, this is an enormous opportunity for the country to chart a new course. If we agree to do it first and foremost as Americans——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators have spoken collectively for 30 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. We thank the Chair for that notification. We look forward to next week continuing this conversation.

I wish to thank my colleague for joining me and Senator BENNET in this discussion this afternoon.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to express my gratitude to the Senators from Colorado to allow me to join them and look forward to continuing this conversation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to listen to my colleagues from across the aisle and while my purpose is to address another subject, I do want to respond to what we have just heard from three Democratic Senators and a number of Republicans regarding the need to address the serious issue of debt and deficit and how we are going to proceed before we run into a situation of national default with consequences we cannot begin to imagine, I think it is appropriate to say there is bipartisan support for serious debate and discussion. I was disappointed, obviously—in fact, I was more than disappointed. I was very frustrated yesterday with the President's press conference, the President essentially said the Congress is not doing its job and compared what was being done here to undisciplined children, who couldn't do their homework. He was targeting the opposition, which sounded like a lot of campaign rhetoric. This is very disappointing. At a time when we face a serious fiscal crisis, he shouldn't even be thinking about the election of 2012 and focusing on any campaign rhetoric—we ought to be thinking about and working to address the crisis before us that is going to have implications for every American now. If we don't come to an agreement on how to proceed before August 2, we are going to see how the financial markets react to what we have not been able to do. But to suggest we haven't been doing anything and that the Congress needs to take the lead, I think, goes even against the President's own thoughts when he was a Member of this body.

I wish to quote from a statement he made when President Obama was Senator Obama. That quote is as follows:

> The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. . . . Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Yes, Americans do deserve better. But, obviously, that famous sign that used to be on the desk of Harry Truman when he was President, ''The Buck Stops Here,'' has been taken off that Presidential desk and shifted over to the responsibility of the Congress. We do have a responsibility, but it is fair to say and accurate to say that without Presidential leadership, no matter what we do here will not become law. The President needs to be engaged in supporting what we do. Otherwise, it will not become law.

I think most of the American public thinks, based on the inferences made yesterday by the President in his press conference, Republicans are on one

side, the Democrats are on the other side, and they don't see the problem the same way. I think what we just heard—eloquent speeches and important speeches from both Republicans and just now Democrats—indicates there are adults here, not just children. We have been working hard ever since day one of this session to try to address the train wreck we see coming. First, it was estimated to come on May 16, and now August 2. We bought a little bit of time, I guess. But the clock is ticking and we see a train wreck coming and we are trying to do something about it.

There are serious people making serious efforts to have serious dialogue and debate as to how we best go forward in the interests of our country and not in the interests of the 2012 election; in the interests of our grandchildren and children, not in the interests of our political careers.

I came back to the Senate for one reason and one reason only, and that is that I was not going to stand idly by and watch our country sink deeper into debt. I was not going to watch my generation be the first generation to hand our children a country in worse shape than the one we inherited and a hole they could never dig out of. They will not be able to enjoy all the benefits my generation has had of peace and prosperity.

It is clear—and I am not here to go through all the statistics. I have made several speeches on this topic and we hear this on the floor every day. There are so many facts in support of the need to take serious action to address this serious problem. There is so much handwriting on the wall, and the wall is about to collapse. Economists from the conservative side to the liberal side and everybody in between—analysts, financial markets, and so forth—are taking action and saying we need to take action here. We see Democratic and Republican Governors across this country in various States taking action.

I am proud of what we have done in the State of Indiana in the last 6 years under the leadership of Governor Daniels. We have balanced our budget. We have dug out of a deep deficit left by his predecessor. We have a AAA credit rating. We have made some tough choices. We have had to cut and slash government jobs. There was a lot of bloat and a lot of excess there. We made tough choices, and we paid a financial price for it, but we are in better shape today than we have been in a long time as a result of taking these actions.

We see countries around the world having to belly up to the reality of the facts. They have overspent and have promised more than they can deliver. Yet the United States of America should be the leader of this effort in terms of getting its economy in shape. It is a place where the dollar was sound. It is the place to invest your money and know it was the safest place. All of that now has come into question.

I have been a part of these talks across the aisle. The two Senators from Colorado who just spoke, the Senator from Delaware who just spoke, and others, are taking this seriously. They are not putting their political fortunes ahead of the necessity to deal with these issues. They are saying that what transcends politicians, what transcends reelection is the fact that we have a serious crisis that has to be dealt with now and tough choices have to be made. We are talking in earnest behind closed doors, working in open sessions and closed sessions, trying to fashion an appropriate response. But without the President's leadership, no matter what we do, no matter what package we put together, we cannot succeed.

So it appears the President has decided to engage in the politics of the 2012 elections, and it is very disappointing. I hope that is not the case. I hope this shift we have seen from needing to get involved to ''what is wrong with you men and women?'' is just a temporary lapse. When we get frustrated, it is easy to say childish things, and that is why I waited overnight so I wouldn't come down here to be characterized as someone who says childish things. The problems we face are too serious for us not to take seriously.

I too believe we can fashion a plan that is in the best interests of the American people and the future of America, but we can't do it by pointing fingers at each other. We can't do it without Presidential leadership. Right now, the one missing element is Presidential leadership. As has been said before, the President was invited to come and meet with us today and to talk to us about the seriousness of this issue. We are willing to demonstrate to him that our doors are open and we are willing to go there, but it takes a commitment on both sides in order to accomplish that. Instead, I guess a couple of fundraisers were scheduled—one in Philadelphia, one in Las Vegas—and, apparently, that takes precedence. So I think the President's words are pretty hollow.

IRAN

I came here to talk about another issue, and I wish to do that now. Our necessary focus on the economic situation and what we need to do and the impending debt crisis we are facing should take precedence, but we can't overlook the fact we have serious issues on an international level that will have an impact on our country in the future. Those of us here have a responsibility to deal with not only domestic issues but with international security and foreign policy issues. Tomorrow is the first anniversary of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act that was passed by an overwhelming majority—bipartisan majority—in the last Congress. In fact, the vote in the Senate was 99 to 0.

This act expanded sanctions on the Iranian regime as it continues its quest for nuclear weapons capability. Clearly, more needs to be done. I am here to talk about it and the implications, but I needed to say something about what has happened in the previous 24 hours that has been so disconcerting to not only me but to the American people and both Republicans and Democrats who are trying to make a serious effort at solving the problems we face.

Put on the back burner because of all these discussions is this question about Iran and where it is going and what the consequences of the future with a nuclear-armed Iran would be. This month my colleagues and I, because we believe these sanctions have not yet accomplished the goal we have intended and that we need even tougher sanctions against Iran, have introduced a bill entitled ''The Iran, North Korea, and Syria Sanctions Consolidations Act of 2011'' that further tightens the noose on the Iranian regime. We need strong support from this body and collective efforts to prevent a nuclear Iran.

I will take a few minutes now to explain why I believe this work is of such dramatic and growing importance to our Nation.

The enormous changes being wrought by the Arab spring and the potential consequences—both positive and negative—of that movement have captured our attention. Those of us who care passionately about the future of the Middle East and understand the consequences to our national security as a consequence of that, whether it is economic security because of energy resources we get from the Middle East or whether it is diplomatic security or just national security in terms of conflict that potentially draws us into that effort, all of this is at stake. We are hoping, of course, that the democratic instincts of the Arab spring will develop, but we look at this with a mixture of both hope and concern.

The democratic impulse in the region has not yet brought meaningful change to the Iranian people who continue to suffer under an autocratic, savage, and ruthless regime. As that regime continues to crush every plea for greater democratic liberties, it also pursues its vision of nuclear weapons capability. Welcome signs of democratic progress elsewhere in the region must not deflect our attention from the growing danger in Iran.

Three American Presidents, including this current President, have declared that a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is unacceptable. To give meaning to that repeated commitment to do whatever is necessary to prevent Iran from gaining that dangerous capability remains an urgent and highly significant matter facing the United States and international security. The consequences of a nuclear weapons-capable Iran are not tolerable, not acceptable, and must motivate the most powerful and effective efforts possible to prevent that from happening.

A nuclear-armed Iran would threaten the entire region and its enormous energy resources. It would motivate broad nuclear proliferation throughout the Middle East. It would further destabilize the region already in turmoil. It would encourage radicalism and terrorism, and it would threaten the destruction of the State of Israel.

This last danger alone—the potential destruction, the declared destruction of the nation of Israel—that alone potentially raises the danger to which Israel is the last resort, but almost certainly we have to respond to it to ensure its survival. That alone compels us to be clear-eyed and determined to find a solution before we have to face that potential decision.

I have been working in recent years with the Bipartisan Policy Center to press for a robust, comprehensive three-track effort to raise the stakes on the Iranian regime and to compel it to live up to its commitments and halt its weapons program. The first track we proposed was enhanced diplomatic efforts. People say, Why diplomatic efforts? That is just going nowhere.

We felt we needed to enhance those efforts to at least give that a chance, so that those who would say sanctions should not be imposed until we have tried diplomatic efforts—we said: OK, let's continue to give that a shot, but let's do that in parallel with some of these other approaches.

But this enhanced diplomatic effort, where we create and invigorate and motivate an international coalition devoted to the same objective to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, has been tried, and it has not succeeded.

Now, this effort does not mean simply repeated outreaches to the Iranian regime to engage them in dialog. The Obama administration came into office promising such discussions, but this has gone nowhere. International talks in Geneva last year accomplished nothing. Talks in Turkey earlier this year broke down in the afternoon of the very first day. Clearly, lack of any flexibility and goodwill on behalf of the Iranian regime has dissuaded any further attempt to renew dialog efforts. Dialog with the Iranians is in a deep freeze.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I was not aware I had asked for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is for 10 minutes.

Mr. COATS. That is news to me.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I will just try to see how I can wrap this up.

I might ask, Mr. President, is there an order in place that I am not aware of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is that the Senate is in morning business with 10 minutes to be consumed by each Senator.

Mr. COATS. All right. I apologize. I did not know that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Although consent has been given for larger blocks of time, and the Senator has just been given consent.

Mr. COATS. All right. Thank you, Mr. President.

The second track for solutions are sanctions. We currently have the Sanctions Act in place. We want to impose an additional sanctions track. That is why I have sponsored and cosponsored this new act. The impact of this, I think, could potentially be significant. But, so far, we have not seen success as a result of sanctions.

Since the international community first began to face this challenge—in the form of IAEA inspections and reports, various U.N. Security Council sanctions resolutions, and protracted negotiations to construct an effective coalition strong enough to have meaning—none of these actions have seriously thwarted the Iranian regime's nuclear ambitions.

That takes us to the third track of a comprehensive approach. Those of us in the Bipartisan Policy Center, working with experts on all sides of this issue, came to the conclusion that certain military options can be put in place that deserve serious and open discussion. Since diplomacy and sanctions have proven to be too weak, we need an extra kick to this process in order to achieve the desired result.

I am suggesting discussion and debate and dialogue. No one should suppose that including a military option in this package means anything other than preparing the ground for the logical, necessary access to measures of last resort, should they be needed.

Through the Bipartisan Policy Center, we participated in an exhaustive analysis of all the means and consequences of potential military action against Iran's nuclear weapons program. There were no war advocates in that room—none of us. Nevertheless, if it is true that a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is ''unacceptable,'' then our Nation and the international community as a whole must see with vivid clarity what measures remain, should the first two tracks fail.

The Iranian regime must be especially clear-eyed and nondelusional about those potential consequences should it not change its behavior. Indeed, to give the diplomatic and sanctions tracks the essential credibility they require, the military option must be entirely believable.

Military options themselves include a multipronged, comprehensive strategy, not all of which are ''kinetic'' or mean an actual attack with our Armed Forces. Such a strategy would include constructing the alliances needed to station U.S. forces in position to confront Iran and then a series of steps designed to demonstrate to Iran that the United States and its coalition partners are capable of decisive military action, if necessary, to stop its nuclear program.

At the end of the day, we have to decide whether we will tolerate an Iran with nuclear weapons. If other States, including, importantly, China and Russia, become convinced of this core reality, they will make different calculations about their own self-interests in this matter. If they come to believe that we so desperately need them to accept modest sanctions on Iran, then they can compel us to take off the table the sanctions proposals with real teeth. We have become hostage to their views on this vital issue and also to their related economic interests.

So if these and other States come to realize that when we say ''unacceptable,'' we mean it, they will come to different conclusions about how their own interests can be best served.

In conclusion, a nuclear weapons-capable Iran that we believe can be contained is not one that we are therefore prepared to tolerate. If we think we can solve this problem through diplomatic efforts and sanctions, we have not been able to do so, and the likelihood of doing so diminishes as every day goes by. The nuclear clock keeps ticking in Iran. This is an illusion and one that makes our task much harder. If others, however—especially Iran, but also including our allies and other coalition partners—come to believe that we would consider tolerating a nuclear Iran because it can somehow be contained, then none of this will work. The result then will not be a contained and tolerated nuclear Iran; it will be the military action we all hope to avoid, whether it is ours or another's.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

THE BUDGET

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to lend my voice to the others who have been here—my colleagues—to talk about the need to come to the table and come up with an agreement around how we are going to deal with raising the debt limit by the August 2 deadline and include some sort of package to address our debt and our deficits.

I listened carefully to my colleague and friend from Indiana, and I think we agree on a lot of what he said. I certainly agree that both sides of the aisle have been working hard to look at ways we can address this issue. I agree we need Presidential leadership to address this challenge we are facing. That is why I was so pleased to see the President come out yesterday and say, very strongly, that in order to address this, we are going to have to put revenues on the table, make sure they are in the mix, because we cannot get there without looking at revenues, with just looking at cuts to the budget.

So I think there is a lot of agreement. But every negotiation I have

been part of means that every side has to give a little. So drawing a line in the sand and saying: We are not going to look at revenues at the same time we are looking at spending cuts is not the way for us to solve this challenge.

Now, we all know that negotiations are ongoing between the President and leadership in both the House and the Senate. They are looking at all kinds of measures to reduce the deficit and raise the legal debt limit. There is no doubt we have to address the long-term debt and deficits. I repeatedly called for a bipartisan package that includes reforms to everything that is deficit related. So that means domestic, defense, and mandatory spending, as well as looking at revenues. I support including deficit-reduction measures in the vote to raise the debt limit. I believe that reducing the deficit is important to strengthening the long-term health of our economy.

But that being said, failure to increase the debt limit would do exactly the opposite. It would devastate the economy. To be clear, raising the debt limit does not mean spending more. It means meeting our existing obligations—obligations made by both parties over many years. Failure to raise the debt limit means default. It means, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, we would not pay our creditors, and that disruption would cause the worldwide economy to have devastating consequences—consequences that would be incredibly expensive to American taxpayers.

I think Warren Buffett said it very well when he said: If Congress did that, it would be the ''most asinine act ever.''

Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke said it would cause severe disruptions in the financial markets, it would slow our economic recovery, and make the deficit problem worse.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce said it absolutely must be done, the debt limit must be raised.

Economist and former Reagan adviser Larry Kudlow said default would be ''catastrophic.''

All these experts have pointed out that the disruption to world financial markets would plunge us into another financial crisis, and America would lose the trust of world investors, which would result in higher borrowing costs for the government, and that would ultimately be borne by taxpayers.

It would also mean higher interest rates for consumers, making it more expensive to buy a house, pay for college, or even pay your credit card bill.

In a recent report, the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimated that if we do not raise the debt limit, the Federal Government would have to eliminate all spending on discretionary programs, cut nearly 70 percent of spending for programs such as Social Security and Medicare, or increase taxes by more than 60 percent. That is not just speculation. That is what will happen if we fail to raise the debt limit.

We should not be playing politics with this issue. We all have a stake in making sure this gets done. That is why it makes no sense to me that the leadership on the other side of the aisle is refusing to entertain any discussion about eliminating any tax loopholes.

I think it is important to highlight some of those tax loopholes, and there are two I want to talk about that have been mentioned on the floor in the last couple of days. I would think we could all agree that these are the kinds of tax loopholes we ought to be closing.

First, we have a special deduction for yacht owners. If the yacht is big enough, like the yacht shown in this picture I have in the Chamber—so if it has beds and a bathroom and a kitchen—then yacht owners can claim it as a second home, and they can get the same mortgage interest deduction on their taxes that we give to middle-class homeowners.

I think this is a clear abuse of the Tax Code. The mortgage deduction provision is meant to increase home ownership, not yacht ownership. There are as many as a half million yachts in the United States that qualify for this exemption, and the yacht industry actually includes this tax loophole in their marketing.

Now, the second loophole that, again, has been mentioned before on the Senate floor is a tax break for racehorse owners. The current Tax Code allows racehorse owners to depreciate the cost of their horses at an accelerated rate.

Yachts and racehorses, these are tax breaks that just do not make sense. We all know we are grappling with a truly historic long-term deficit. To continue to ignore the revenue side of that deficit is irresponsible. Our Tax Code is riddled with hundreds of arbitrary tax breaks just like the one for racehorses and the one for yachts. In fact, we give away more in tax breaks in a year than we take in through individual and corporate income taxes. These tax breaks are, too often, granted based on who has the most clout in Congress rather than based on what is best for the economy or what is fair for people in this country.

So the result is that some businesses are paying nearly the full corporate tax rate while others are paying almost nothing. We need a fairer system. We need a tax system that drives innovation and keeps our economy competitive on the global stage.

Do we really want to continue supporting tax breaks for yachts and racehorses? If we want to eliminate waste in government, isn't this exactly the kind of spending we should be targeting?

Lastly, we must consider the price of refusing to deal with these tax breaks, of refusing to say we are going to look at these kinds of tax breaks because we know that meaningful deficit reform will mean trillions of dollars in changes. In avoiding revenues, Republicans have, instead, proposed steep cuts that are dangerous both to the health of the American people and to the strength of our economy.

Eliminating funding for basic women's health care, ending Medicare as we know it, dangerous cuts to nursing home care, slashing Pell grants that will help train the next generation of engineers, stopping the development of new energy technologies, and halting efforts to retool the economy to compete in the 21st century—these are the alternatives that Republicans are proposing to save tax breaks for yachts and racehorses.

We know we need to continue these kinds of basic services and investments in the economy. The President's bipartisan commission has said it, the business community has said it, and Americans know it. We also know that finding a compromise on the debt limit is critical if we want to avoid plunging our economy back into chaos. We know that many of these tax breaks just do not make sense.

So I urge my colleagues, let's look at the facts. Let's work together for what we all know needs to happen—reduce the deficit, raise the debt limit, and keep America working.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator JACK REED from Rhode Island be the next speaker on our side.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the bills from a decade of ineffective tax cuts and unpaid wars and a recession fueled by lax regulation have come due. I did not support the policies that generated these bills, but pretending these bills do not have to be paid is not an option. Indeed, playing chicken, literally, with the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government is a recipe for disaster. If the U.S. defaults on its debt, every single expert tells us, it will have a huge and immediate impact on the lives of every American all across this country, from the poorest to the most well off. And particularly for those who are struggling, it will be devastating at a time when they can least afford it. Not only could it cause a stoppage of Social Security and veterans' benefits checks, but, more systemically, it would undermine our Nation's opportunity to build a more lasting and more prosperous recovery.

We have seen some progress, but it is not enough. This step, if we default, would seriously undermine our ability to function as an economy and would seriously, perhaps decisively affect our ability to mount and continue to mount a reasonably recovery. We are still recovering from the worst depression since the 1930s. Much of it is based on the policies I mentioned previously: two unfunded wars, the expansion of an

entitlement program that was unpaid for, deep tax cuts that were unpaid for—all of it put on the tab, and the tab is coming due. But now to suggest that we walk away from our obligation to provide at least the legal means to pay our debt is irresponsible.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about taking a scalpel to wasteful spending and about the primacy of severely curtailing investments in our society. They continue to talk about an economic philosophy that I think has been disproven by the last several years, particularly from 2000, when President Bush and the Republican Congress inherited a projected multitrillion-dollar surplus and turned it into a huge deficit under the premise that these types of cuts in taxes, these types of policies would stimulate jobs.

In fact, there has been talk that we are now focusing on cutting spending on Medicare and Medicaid, which is so central to all Americans. It is difficult also to imagine that they are asking for these cuts at a time when so many families throughout this country are struggling—struggling to stay in their homes, struggling simply to pay their bills each week, struggling to ensure their children can continue on with their education. All of this needs a government that supports these Americans, not reneging on commitments we have made, particularly commitments we have made financially to essentially pay for the obligations that have been run up, particularly beginning in 2000 and continuing through the Bush administration.

We all understand we have to reach a principled compromise, but in that compromise, as so many of my colleagues have suggested, an exclusive focus on cutting expenditures will not get us there, I think, simply based on the arithmetic, but more than that, it will impose huge burdens on families who are struggling, and it will continue to reward the most prosperous in this Nation. I do not think that is the right way to do it or the fair way to do it.

The priorities I have heard expressed on the other side are to continue to talk about very deep tax cuts, at a time when we have the lowest revenues we have had in decades, and then talk about cutting expenditures—education, health care, and, indeed, under their proposed budget, Medicare and Medicaid, which is so central to so many people.

We know we have to focus on not just expenditures but also revenue, and we also have to begin the very difficult and arduous task of entitlement reform. We began that in the last Congress. In fact, I think it is ironic, as I recall the debate on the affordable care act, that most of the amendments my colleagues on the other side were offering were to send back to committee proposed changes in Medicare that would have reduced costs and, I would argue, would actually have improved quality. That was their focus. Now their focus has suddenly shifted to how we must cut Medicare and Medicaid.

What we have to do is provide the same kind of reasonable, balanced approach that took place in the 1990s. Again, without any Republican support in 1993 and 1994 but with a Democratic President and Democratic votes, we were able to begin to balance the budget. It was a multiyear process. It required difficult choices. But we have to continue to pursue that path of a balanced, reasonable response to this problem.

As I said before, one of the issues that is so central to this country is not directly related just to the issue of the deficit, it is also related to jobs. They are obviously closely interrelated. The more jobs we have, the more people who are participating in the economy, the better our fiscal position is in Washington.

Sadly, what we saw, particularly at the tail end of the Bush administration, was a collapse in our jobs market. The U.S. economy lost 8.7 million private sector jobs in 2008 and 2009. We experienced—under the Bush administration principally—25 consecutive months of job losses. That, again, has contributed to these huge deficits. If people do not work, they do not contribute to the taxes. If people do not work, they are likely to get unemployment benefits. People who lose part of their wages may qualify for other programs.

Since the President has come to office, we have seen a rebound. We have not seen the full, robust recovery we need, but we have seen a rebound. We gained 2.081 million jobs, a little over 2 million jobs in 2010 and 2011. We have experienced 15 consecutive months of private sector job creation—not enough, but we have reversed the collapse and 25 months of job decline by creating jobs and continuing on a sustained basis as a result of difficult decisions that were made by President Obama and the Democratic Congress in the Recovery Act.

My home State of Rhode Island has been particularly hard hit by the policies we saw in the first part of this decade. We have the third highest unemployment rate at 10.9 percent. We have seen a significant foreclosure problem. We have seen very crippling impacts on the working families of Rhode Island.

Now we hear that the only solution we have and the best way to correct jobs is to continue to do what was done under the Bush administration: Let's just cut taxes, particularly for the wealthiest Americans. The evidence suggests that does not produce the kinds of jobs—not even the kinds of jobs we have seen in the last 15 months. The economy did not add a single new job during the 3 years under the Bush tax cuts. The economy had 132 million jobs in June 2001 when we passed—against my opposition—the Bush tax cuts. That was the month it was first signed into law. Three years later, in June 2004, there were just 131.4 million jobs. We actually lost some jobs.

If you take a step back and look at the course of the entire Bush Presidency, from January 2001 through January 2009, there was a decline in the number of private sector jobs of approximately 650,000. That is over the course of the whole administration. In fact, the only net job creation that occurred was in the public sector. Nearly 1.75 million government jobs were created over the course of the Bush Presidency.

Revenue as a percentage of our economy, as a percentage of GDP, was 14.9 percent in 2010. It is the lowest level since 1950 when it dropped to 14.4 percent. By comparison, government revenue was averaging about 18 percent over the previous 30 years. So you see, under the Bush policies, which essentially my colleagues want to emulate, reconstitute, no job growth and a significant decline in revenue.

At a time when revenue as a percentage of GDP is the lowest it has been in 60 years, now we are talking about further tax cuts in the Republican budget, but we are certainly talking—my colleagues are talking about maintaining the current taxes. Frankly, there are so many tax expenditures that my colleagues talked about that are not worthy of retention, that are loopholes that we can, in fact, eliminate, and we should. Some examples: tax break for people who breed alpacas; deductions for film and TV production; favorable tax depreciation for racehorse owners, horse breeders tax credit; an exemption for wooden practice arrows used by children; NASCAR motorsport racing facility tax credit; withholding tax breaks on horse and dog track winnings. The list can go on and on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his deference.

We understand we have to make tough choices. They have to include expenditure cuts. We have already started with the continuing resolution of the last year where we reduced spending significantly. But we have to have revenue on the table. As Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke said:

> [. . .] a sharp fiscal consolidation focused on the very near term could be self-defeating if it were to undercut the still-fragile economy.

We need to create jobs. We need to balance deficit reduction with job creation. We need to put everything on the table, and we need to recognize that the consequences of default on our debt will be staggering, felt by every American. One figure that continues to be impressed upon me is the fact that for every 1 percent increase in the interest rate over the 10-year period, we increase our deficit by over $1 trillion.

I think the first response to a default would be a rise in the interest rates we have to pay for our debt.

I would urge progress on the efforts to have a comprehensive solution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business. The Senator is recognized.

LINCOLN LEGACY INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, beyond the debt limit extension, which has rightly consumed the attention of this body, we face another challenge—the funding for our roads, airports, and railroads.

Our best estimate is that current needs would total $225 billion annually, but revenue from the main source of funding for these programs, the gasoline tax, only totaled $90 billion.

The law requires balance in the transportation trust fund. So how would we respond? There are basically three major options.

Option 1: Let funding fall. This would be a catastrophe, especially for the construction industry, where already in Illinois upwards of 30 percent of construction workers are without work.

Option 2: Increase the gas tax. But that is one of the most regressive taxes that hits the working poor harder than almost any other citizen in our country. The slowdown in our economy as a result of a gas tax increase would probably cause unemployment to go up and could jeopardize our extremely fragile recovery.

There is a third option, but before I describe that, let me ask a question. Arguably, what is the third biggest thing that the Lincoln administration was known for? First would be the emancipation proclamation. Second would be the victory in the Civil War. What is No. 3? I argue that it was the 1862 Transcontinental Railway Act—an act that, in 1862, when the Lincoln administration was borrowing as much money as it could from as many creditors as possible to fund the expansion of the Union Army, with credit already stretching to the limit—and does this sound familiar—the Lincoln administration launched the largest infrastructure development program in the history of the United States. We built a 2,000-mile railroad in only 6 years, and created 7,000 American towns. We did it with only $50 million in appropriations.

How did we fund the rest? The answer is that this was the ultimate public-private partnership. I am particularly worried that in this Congress—especially as it considers a transportation bill next year—we have forgotten our own economic legacy, especially from the time that we built one of the largest infrastructure development projects in history.

To recall, the Federal Government granted 20 square miles in alternating sections on either side of the railroad for every mile of track they laid for those railroads. The railroads were also granted timber, stone, and mineral rights on this land. In addition, for every mile of track they laid, the railroads were authorized to issue a set amount of bonds—loans they received—which interest payments were backed by the Federal Government. This guarantee allowed 30-year bonds to be issued at a low rate of 6 percent. This was one of the largest development projects in the history of the United States. That is why it is an example for how we respond to our transportation needs today.

When we look at our own economic legacy and look at the funding shortfall for new roads, airports, and rail, I think we should recover that legacy to respond to the challenge for next year. That is why I have introduced the Lincoln Legacy Infrastructure Development Act.

This legislation removes a number of Federal restrictions on public-private partnerships, providing States greater flexibility to generate transportation revenues and enhanced access to private capital for road, rail, aviation, transit, and port infrastructure. Under the Lincoln Legacy Infrastructure Development Act, we could mobilize over $100 billion for new infrastructure investment.

Specifically, this legislation lifts caps on cost recovery programs for highways; it incentivizes partnerships in transit; it removes barriers to airport privatization; it increases resources for the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, sometimes called TIFIA; and it makes improvements to the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program, which are backed by the U.S. High Speed Rail Association and the American High Speed Rail Association.

The legislation also stands on the premise that the taxpayer should be protected in these types of arrangements. Indiana showed us what a properly structured deal should look like. Governor Mitch Daniels reaped a windfall from the 2006 lease of the Indiana toll road that netted his State $3.8 billion for new transportation upgrades. Most of the money has now been reinvested in highway projects throughout his State, but leaders shrewdly placed $500 million in an interest-bearing account to fund future road projects. This is one of the many reasons why the Indiana economy has grown at twice the rate of the Illinois economy.

We have seen public-private partnerships take off not only in our own country, where they were invented, but in other countries, especially British Columbia and Australia, where they have authorized $30 billion for transportation infrastructure—almost 20 percent of their total, using this innovative financing means.

In these times of deficit and debt, we could let America grind to a halt, we could raise taxes and sock it to the working poor, we could slow down our economy with a new government burden, or we could recall our own economic legacy, written by Abraham Lincoln's administration itself, to use public-private partnerships as a way of growing jobs and incomes in the United States, without increasing taxes.

I urge this body to review this legislation as we come up with a new transportation bill, and to see it as a way to improve jobs, income, and our infrastructure—which is so critical to the crossroads of the Nation, Illinois—and do it in a way that doesn't hurt our economy or the working poor.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we must raise the debt ceiling, period. This is not an opinion, it is a fact. The consequences of failing to act are simply too catastrophic to consider any other course. Negotiations are underway now to seek an agreement to raise the debt ceiling as part of a larger agreement on deficit reduction. But there is a major obstacle to agreement: a refusal on the part of the Republican leadership to compromise, a refusal to understand that sacrifice must be shared.

The sacrifice, they say, must come from middle America—those struggling to pay for a college education or for health care for their kids or for long-term care for their parents. The Republican leader demands that this sacrifice be made by the middle class in order to protect the Bush tax cuts and other tax breaks for the wealthiest among us—despite the huge and growing gap in the distribution of income in our country between the wealthy and the middle class.

One example of the kind of tax breaks and tax loopholes that we Democrats seek to change is the unconscionable tax break given to hedge fund managers. Hedge fund managers generally make their money by charging their clients two fees. First, the manager receives a management fee, typically equal to 2 percent of the assets invested. Second, the manager typically receives 20 percent of the income from those investments above a certain level. This 20-percent share of the investment returns from hedge funds is known as ''carried interest.'' Under current law, most hedge fund managers claim that this carried interest qualifies as a long-term capital gain, currently subject to a maximum tax rate of 15 percent, rather than being taxed as ordinary income, currently subject to a maximum tax rate of 35 percent.

But a moment's analysis shows that this money is ordinary income by any fair definition and should be treated that way. The 20-percent fee is not capital gains, because it applies not to capital that the hedge fund manager

has invested, but to the payment he receives for investing capital that other people provide. Pretending that the 20-percent fee is capital gains when, in fact, it is payment for a service is an ''Alice in Wonderland'' argument that elevates fiction over fact.

We Democrats seek to end this fiction. We are ready to call carried interest what it is—ordinary taxable income. Recognizing carried interest for what it is would increase tax fairness for working Americans who pay their fair share of taxes. They have the right to expect that the wealthy do the same. It would reduce the deficit—if we did this—by an estimated $21 billion over the next 10 years.

Republicans seek to protect this loophole. They say the income of investment managers is at risk from year to year and, therefore, deserving of a lower tax rate. Well, ask the factory worker, who just saw his or her job move overseas; ask the store clerk, who saw his employer close because of the damage from the financial crisis; ask the part-time worker, whose hours and earnings go up and down from week to week—ask all of them just how much risk working Americans face right now.

Republicans say taxing this income as ordinary income would discourage investment in job creation, and that is absurd. The people who are actually risking their capital—investors in these funds—will continue to see their profits taxed at the lower capital gains rate. The issue in this case is income that these managers receive for serving their clients. If you are a hedge fund manager, your job is to manage a hedge fund. The income you receive for that job is no different than the income a waitress receives for waiting tables, or a janitor receives for scrubbing floors. The idea that the income of millionaire fund managers should be taxed at a lower rate than that of their staff or other workers is an absurdity.

This nonsensical loophole is deeply unfair at a time when working families are struggling, while the wealthiest among us continue to prosper greatly. Recent decades have seen a massive and growing prosperity gap between ordinary Americans and the wealthy. How wide has that gap become? In 1980, the top 1 percent of American earners took home about 10 percent of our Nation's total income. A few decades later, that figure had increased to 24 percent of our Nation's total income. That is just the wealthiest 1 percent that now have over 20 percent of our total income. It is hard to argue that properly taxing their income will impose great hardship on investment fund managers, who have done awfully well in recent years.

How well have those investment fund managers done? According to a survey by a magazine covering the hedge fund industry, the top 25 hedge fund managers earned $22.7 billion last year. The two managers who topped the list earned $80 billion each—that is billion with a ''B.'' The typical American household earned perhaps $60,000 or $62,000 in 2008. Those hedge fund managers earned in about 4 minutes what it took a typical working family a year to earn. Yet they paid drastically lower rates on those massive incomes than the low-wage worker who cleaned their office. The Republicans would protect these unconscionable tax breaks while, at the same time, wanting to cut programs that provide an education for our kids and provide health care for our seniors.

It gets worse. Adding insult to injury, Republicans are protecting another tax loophole—one that many of these hedge fund managers, by the way, use to avoid taxes entirely. This loophole allows corporations and wealthy individuals to take income earned here in the United States and shift it to overseas tax havens, dodging U.S. taxes that they rightly owe.

I have long sought to end this abuse, because these offshore tax havens increase the tax burden on those who pay the taxes they owe. In the last Congress, I introduced the Stop Tax Haven Abuse Act, which would seek to recover tax revenue now lost to offshore tax dodging.

Ending this loophole is significant if we seek to properly tax the income of hedge fund managers. At one hearing of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair, three well-known hedge funds that claim to be based in the Cayman Islands admitted under questioning that they did not have a single employee in the Cayman Islands. Closing the offshore loophole would make our effort to equitably tax carried interest all the more effective, by shutting off a major avenue that hedge funds and other investment funds use to dodge taxes.

Democrats have rightly proposed addressing the carried interest loophole and offshore tax havens and other unfair tax loopholes as part of a balanced deficit reduction strategy. We believe it is grossly unfair to cut programs that help young Americans get a college education or help train working Americans for new jobs in order to protect tax loopholes that benefit the wealthiest Americans.

The Republican response? To walk out of negotiations and say they will not accept any deficit reduction package if it includes revenue measures.

Mr. President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. If there is no other Senator waiting, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to continue for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

What the Republicans have done is to walk out of negotiations and say they will not accept any deficit reduction package if it includes revenue measures. So let's call this what it is. If Republicans refuse to consider compromise solutions, they are threatening all of us, the whole country, with economic catastrophe in order to protect the sky-high income of millionaire hedge fund managers and offshore tax avoiders. Those are two of the loopholes—two of many loopholes—we have identified that should be closed that Republicans refuse to consider closing. So what they are doing—and we should make no mistake about this—is holding the well-being of all Americans hostage to the tax breaks of a wealthy few.

We all agree we must act to reduce the deficit. We have acknowledged, as Democrats, the need for spending cuts, even painful cuts to programs we support. That is why I am so troubled by the utter refusal of the Republicans to consider even modest compromises in the direction of new revenue.

There is an overwhelming consensus among budget experts that we cannot achieve serious deficit reduction with spending cuts alone. There is an overwhelming consensus among economists that drastic cuts in Federal outlays will threaten our economic recovery—just as such cuts have throttled recovery in other nations. And despite the fantasies of some in Congress, it is abundantly clear a failure to raise the debt ceiling would do incalculable harm to the recovery and to our standing in the world. Drawing lines in the sand, as the Republicans have done, and refusing to compromise by walking out, has no place in the situation we face.

I urge the Republican leadership to abandon their uncompromising positions, to embrace solutions to the deficit and recognize that we all must sacrifice to address the deficit problem. The well-being of all of us, of all Americans, should not be held captive in the service of the most fortunate few.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if people have been following the debate on the Senate floor this afternoon, they understand it is focused almost exclusively on the Federal budget deficit and what we are going to do about it. It is a legitimate and timely question, because we are now in negotiations at the highest levels—between the President and the leaders in the House and Senate—to try to find some way through our impasse.

The challenge is to find a way to reduce America's deficit and, at the end of the day, to extend our debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has a deadline of August 2. We have never in our history

failed to extend our debt ceiling. To fail to do so would be the equivalent of defaulting on a mortgage payment. And, of course, we all know the consequences to any homeowner or family if that occurs. You understand your credit rating is not going to be the best after you have defaulted. The same thing would be true with America. You also may find the next time you need a mortgage that particular bank may not want to lend to you again. The same thing is true with America. It has a negative impact on your lifestyle. All of a sudden you are in a suspect class and it isn't as easy to borrow money to buy a car or to make some other purchase.

That is the risk we are running at the highest possible level when it comes to this debt ceiling vote on August 2. We have never—underline the word never—defaulted on a debt ceiling extension in the history of the United States of America. That is the reason why the securities and bonds and stocks that are sold in this country enjoy a financial reputation better than most of the world. The United States is powerful, big, and trustworthy. We are going to lose that last word—trustworthy—if we default on the debt ceiling. That is what we face on August 2.

There is a group in town here called the Bipartisan Policy Center, and they have kind of spelled out in specific terms what it would mean if we end up in default, and it is pretty grim. I have some charts here that talk about what we would face if we defaulted on the debt ceiling extension on August 2.

The revenues for the month of August if we default will be $12 billion in the United States, and the bills due on August 3 will be $32 billion. The first day we will be $20 billion in the red, which means choices will have to be made if we fail to extend the debt ceiling. And they are hard choices. Let's take a look at some of those choices we would have to face if we didn't have enough money to pay our bills.

Which of these don't get paid if Congress doesn't raise the debt ceiling? Social Security? Medicare/Medicaid? Veterans' benefits? Those firms that are supporting our war in Iraq and Afghanistan? IRS refunds to individuals and businesses? All of these would have to be brought into question, because we cannot pay them all if we fail to extend the debt ceiling.

This bipartisan policy center said, Let's consider one of the options. Let's protect the biggest programs. Let's pay interest on America's debt so we don't have any further default. Let's of course pay Social Security; elderly folks, many of them, have no other source of income. We had better pay Medicare and Medicaid, because hospitals and doctors across America are taking care of sick people who are elderly and poor. We had better pay those defense firms, because if they withdraw their services it can endanger our troops. And we had better pay unemployment compensation, because for these families there is no other source of income. So if we pay those, the ones I just listed, we would be unable to pay the salaries of those in active military service. We would be unable to pay veterans' benefits. We would be unable to keep the courts open or pay the FBI. We couldn't provide the money for education—that would be Pell grants, college student loans—and virtually everything else in government. What would everything else include? Air traffic controllers, the guards at Federal prisons.

If you think what I am describing here is just a scare tactic, it is not. It is the reality of what happens when you default, and it is a reality that is being ignored by many on the other side of the aisle.

In fact, a fringe publication called the Washington Examiner, which is a very conservative Republican publication, today said: Don't worry about it. Default on the debt ceiling. We can figure out a way through this.

Well, I am sorry, but the reality of the choices facing us is that if we choose not to extend the debt ceiling, then we are going to have nothing but terrible choices.

Here is another scenario, if you thought the first one was stark. Let's assume that we want to protect the most vulnerable in America where, in the month of August, we have $170 billion in income and $300 billion in bills. So we pay interest on the debt, Social Security, Medicare/Medicaid, veterans, food stamps, housing for people who are poor, unemployment benefits, and education for the kids. Unpaid would be the defense firms again, those men and women serving in our military, even those in combat, the FBI, the courts, and everything else in government. The options are grim and real.

I have heard my colleagues on the Republican side come to the floor today, and they are upset. They are upset at a speech given by the President yesterday. Well, the President understands the gravity of the decision that is before us. The President has urged Members of Congress to get busy and help to solve the problem. I think he has a right to be upset, to some extent, and impatient.

It was 2 weeks ago that we had a negotiation underway with Vice President BIDEN, a bipartisan negotiation, Democrats and Republicans from the House and Senate. It fell apart when Congressman CANTOR, ERIC CANTOR, the House Republican leader, walked out and announced publicly, I am no longer part of this conversation. I think we have to stop this negotiation, this bipartisan negotiation. I am handing it over to the Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER. He can talk to the President.

That, to me, was the height of irresponsibility. If you are given a responsibility to sit in those sessions to try to spare the United States from this terrible outcome, picking up your marbles and going home is not a good option, even if you hand it over to your boss, the Speaker of the House. What it did was to break down those bipartisan negotiations. What we thought might lead to a solution has fallen apart when the House Republican leader walked out. Now the President is trying to pick up the pieces and put it back together and move us toward a solution, and if he was impatient about it yesterday, he has a right to be.

One of the very serious problems we face is if we want to deal with this deficit in real terms, make a real impact on it, we have got to have more bipartisan cooperation. That is a cliche around here, but it is a fact.

I was on the President's Deficit Commission, the Bowles-Simpson Commission. I sat there for almost 10 months, and I listened to everything. I tried to learn as best I could what we were facing, and at the end of the day I voted for the Commission report. Eleven out of 18 of us did, a bipartisan report. It was tough and it wasn't easy, and there were parts of it that I hated as a Democrat. Yet I knew that if we were going to solve this problem, there was no other way to do it. We had to say to those on the Republican side of the aisle, you have to step up with us and find ways to bring revenue to our government.

Today we are bringing in 14 percent of our gross domestic product in Federal revenue, Federal tax receipts. Gross domestic product is the sum total of our economy, all the production of goods and services; 14 percent of it comes in in Federal revenue, 24 percent goes out in Federal payments, spending. That 10-percent difference equals the annual deficit.

Ten years ago, we were in balance. When President William Jefferson Clinton left office, the Federal budget was balanced, 10 years ago. At that moment in time, the net national debt of the United States of America, from George Washington through William Jefferson Clinton's 8 years, was $5 trillion.

Eight years later, when President George W. Bush left office, the national debt had grown from $5 trillion to $11 trillion, more than doubled in an 8-year period of time. You ask yourself, how could that happen in 8 years that we would fall so deeply into debt? There are three basic reasons it happened:

We fought two wars and we didn't pay for them. So the expense of those wars was added directly to our national debt. The President's economic theory was: The best way to move the economy was for us to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, and he did it in the midst of a war, something no President had ever done, which directly added to the debt, and he signed into law programs that weren't paid for, expensive programs. So we ended up with an $11 trillion debt facing the new President, then President Obama, being sworn in and a failed economic policy with hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work

and losing jobs by the day. That is what the President inherited.

He has tried to right the ship and move us forward, and it has been hard and it has been slow and it has been frustrating. I think he has done his best, and I think he has done a good job at it.

First, he put in a stimulus package of about $800 billion. As the Presiding Officer here knows, 40 percent of that was tax cuts, tax cuts to the families across America to help them out of the recession. Another 25 percent of it went to building roads and bridges and highways and high-speed rail, infrastructure that will serve America for generations. The remainder of that went into helping State and local governments get through difficult times. We sent extra money to States because we knew a lot of people were out of work. They would need unemployment checks, they would need help to pay their hospital bills. We put that money into a stimulus package to stop what was a hemorrhaging in this economy, and I think it worked to slow down the decline. It did not turn it around as quickly as we liked.

Then last December the President said, on a bipartisan basis I will agree with the Republicans to extend all tax cuts for everybody, highest income to lowest income, and extend unemployment benefit payments. We passed that as well.

The President has tried, and we are coming forward out of the recession ever so slowly. Now we run the very risk of not extending the debt ceiling and plunging ourselves back into a recession even worse than where we started. So is the President impatient? You bet he is. Impatient to the point where he invited Congress to maybe come to work next week.

Many of us had felt we could spend a few days back home. I was going to spend the time after the 4th of July traveling around my State. It is a big State; but I guess it is clear now that my job is to be here, and I will be, along with other Members.

The House will be in session. We are in a strange period of time here where the House of Representatives comes and goes even when the Senate is in session, so we kind of see each other in passing. Well, we will both be together next week, and I hope we will stay here and get this job done. The House is scheduled to go into another recess July 17 to 23, and I certainly hope they don't do that. They had better stay in town. Let's get this done before August 2.

We have a serious problem facing us with job creation in this country. There is no question about it. I think we can move forward as long as we understand some basics.

The key to creating jobs in America is an expanding positive economy. It is a feeling by people in this country and around the world that we are moving forward. And, sadly, people are not going to get that feeling unless we get our act together in Washington. It means Democrats and Republicans working together.

I have tried for about 5 or 6 months now with a bipartisan group of Senators to come up with a way to do this; and, unfortunately, one of the Republican Senators from Oklahoma walked away from that conversation as well. But we still have a job ahead of us, and it is one that we ought to face.

I sincerely believe that the Bowles-Simpson Commission is the right paradigm, the right direction for us in terms of where our Nation and our budget should go. It calls for some changes many Democrats will find painful and changes Republicans will have to struggle to accept as well, but those are the changes that will be needed.

If we fail to include revenue in this discussion about reducing the debt, if it is just spending cuts, it can only go so far. If we include revenue, we can talk about a much bigger package of deficit reduction, much more credible, with a more positive impact.

During the course of the last 2 days, we have tried to identify on the floor some parts of the Tax Code that can be changed to save money for our economy. Each year, our Tax Code, that body of laws relating to taxes in America, provides deductions and credits and exclusions and special treatment that spares individuals and companies from paying $1.1 trillion in taxes each year. It includes such things as the employers exclusion of health insurance premiums, mortgage interest deductions, charitable deductions, State and local tax payments. All of these things and many others are included in that Tax Code. It is rare that we open that Tax Code and ask the question, Is this needed?

In the last few days we have come to the floor and talked to the tax subsidies and tax breaks that aren't needed that, frankly, have to be sacrificed in order to get this economy back on its feet. We talked about one that is incredible. In the first quarter of this year, ExxonMobil declared profits of $10 billion, one of the most profitable quarters in the history of American business, and we as taxpayers continue to subsidize ExxonMobil. Why? They are doing quite well. And remember the last time you filled your tank with gas? It doesn't look as though they are sparing us when it comes to raising the price of a gallon of gas. So I think that subsidy should go. Subsidies to the oil and gas companies at this moment in history are unacceptable. We have a thriving profitable industry that does not need a Federal tax crutch.

Take a look at some of the others we have talked about as well. Do you know we provide tax subsidies for American businesses that want to ship their jobs overseas? We call it deferral of income. It is one of the most expensive parts of the Tax Code. It says if you want to move your business overseas and produce overseas and generate a profit, you can hang on to that money. You don't have to pay taxes on it. We defer the payment of taxes. There is a tax break for a company that has decided to pick up and leave America and go someplace else. Why? Why would we create a tax incentive to do that? If a company decides that is the way to make a profit, so be it. I am sorry they would be leaving America, but for goodness sake, they shouldn't expect us and we shouldn't volunteer to subsidize that decision that costs good-paying jobs in our country.

There are a variety of other smaller tax subsidies, those we have to raise questions about. That is for sure. Tax subsidies for people who are lucky enough to own a yacht? We want to give them a tax subsidy? Or people who are lucky enough to own a jet plane? People who are lucky enough to have thoroughbred horses? Most of the winners who stand at the winner's circle of these race don't look like regular working stiffs. They look like folks who are doing pretty well in life. Why is the Tax Code subsidizing that particular industry? I think it is a valuable and important question.

Why don't we put these things on the table? Why don't we ask ourselves whether, at a time of deficit, when we need to not only reduce spending but come up with revenue, that there are some things we can no longer afford under our Tax Code?

Bowles-Simpson went a step further and said, If you start making substantial changes and reducing the tax expenditures, deductions, and credits, you can actually reduce marginal income tax rates for individuals and businesses. I think that is a valuable thing to look at. We don't have to eliminate everything in the Tax Code, but making substantial changes could result in a fairer, more comprehensive tax system.

Let me say one other thing that I think is guiding me in this debate and I think you as well. I think about an America, a nation of values that has always said we have got to care for the most vulnerable people in our country. Some of these people, through no fault of their own, were born with physical and mental shortcomings and limitations. Some of them are dealing with illnesses that we wouldn't wish on anyone. Many come from an impoverished background and are struggling to make do with the basics in life. I feel, at the end of the day, we can make this economy move forward, and we can do it in a sensible and humane way. We can protect the basic safety net. One of the elements in that safety net is Medicaid.

Yesterday, I had a meeting with some people I respect very much. They came in to see me. They represented the heads of children's hospitals from all over the United States, even from your State. My family has relied on those children's hospitals in Washington, DC, and in Chicago and other places, and thank goodness they are

there. I do not know of a more caring, competent profession in America.

More than most hospitals, children's hospitals bring in patients on Medicaid. These are patients who are not from families who are wealthy, they are not from families who have private health insurance policies—no, by and large, they are the poorest families.

One-third of the children in America are covered by Medicaid. That is where they get their health care. If we talk about cutting back on Medicaid, this program for low-income and disabled people, those children will be unfortunate victims in that budget discussion. Also, a large part of Medicaid goes for elderly people who have spent their life savings and are living their last years in nursing homes and convalescent centers. Medicaid pays that. Cutbacks in Medicaid run the real risk of pushing those people out of quality care into lower quality care or the streets.

Is that what America is all about? Would we preserve a tax break for a person who owns thoroughbred horses and then say that unfortunately that elderly lady has to leave the nursing home she has been in? Would we preserve a tax break for someone who owns a yacht and say that unfortunately we will not be able to cover the cost of a needed surgery for a poor child at a children's hospital in Chicago.

If that sounds like an exaggeration, it is not. That is what this debate comes to—whether we want to defend tax breaks for the well-off people in America at the expense of the most vulnerable. We are better than that, and most well-off people whom I know—and I have friends who are doing very well in life—would not be afraid to pay a little bit more in taxes to make sure America continues to move forward. They feel blessed to be part of this country and blessed to be successful in this country, and they do not resent the suggestion that they need to pay a little more when times are difficult. They are certainly prepared to sacrifice.

Some come to the floor here and think it is an outrage to ask oil companies not to take a subsidy in their most profitable year. They think it is an outrage to ask the most wealthy people in America to give up a tax break on a jet they happen to own and use for personal purposes or business purposes. I don't think that is what America is about, and I don't think that is what we should be about.

Let's come together in a bipartisan fashion and make the spending cuts which need to be made, both on the defense side and the nondefense side, and then deal with revenue sources, either making certain that those in the highest income categories are paying their fair share of taxes or at least do not receive the current tax subsidies that are going their way, and let's deal with the reality of this budget deficit.

Time is a-wasting. If we wait until August 1 to get this done, it may be too late. At some point, if we are not careful, 30 bond dealers somewhere in the United States or some other country may start this ball rolling before we do. If they do, questioning the credit reputation of the United States of America, interest rates will start moving up and we will not be able to move fast enough to stop it. That is why the President was impatient yesterday. That is why we should be in session this next week. And that is why we need to start rolling up our sleeves and stop walking out of meetings on budget negotiations and stay in the room until we get the job done.

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

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to be sure where we are now. Are we in morning business at this point in time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask that only so I have some recognition of what the time availability is. I do not plan to take too long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 10-minute grants.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I wonder what the American public thinks about when they see an empty Chamber, hear mutterings about class warfare. What puzzles me is, which class is making war against which class and where are the casualties? As we look around, I ask the question, Are we picking on the poor rich folk, those with abundant wealth, those who earn over $1 million a year, those who have been fortunate enough to have been able to bring their talent, their ability, to the world's most important stage? Are they immune from taking a bit part on the stage of human concerns once in a while because they are being asked to make an extra contribution to the well-being of our country? I don't think so. I don't think so. I am one of those who are fortunate and feel lucky enough to succeed because of a government action. Few of us—certainly not me—who served in the military achieved the status of a hero like our friend, DAN INOUYE, who sacrificed so greatly for his country and has the highest medal awarded for bravery America can give. But because I did my duty, I was serious about it, and I served overseas, I was rewarded with the GI bill to pay my college education and even given a little stipend with that. It turned my life around. It enabled me to be one of three founders of a company called ADP, a company employing 45,000 people.

Our parents were poor. We worried about meals on the table. We couldn't afford the right kind of clothing. We couldn't afford a bicycle that my mother bought me for my birthday. My father argued about whether it had to be taken back because it was $1 a week and we couldn't afford it.

Mr. President, 45,000 people. ADP is one of America's most successful companies. I don't want to dwell on this, but it's one of the companies with the longest growth record in profits, 10 percent each and every year, for 42 years in a row—42 years in a row. A kid from the back of the candy store.

So I look at our country, and I look at what it is we are trying to do, and it is hard to figure out. What happened? Why are we looking at these drastic cuts in programs that can help people? Why are we not engaged in ways to help people, to continue to provide help and assistance to help them get along in life and to be prepared to take over the leadership of the future.

Are our friends on the Republican side willing to end Medicare as we know it, decimating one of the most successful programs in the history of our country? They are willing to unravel the very fabric of our Nation and critical services that helped families struggling to give their kids a decent education, good health, a future, a job opportunity? What is it they want to take away with these cuts?

I can tell you, as a businessman for a long time—30 years before I got here—I am accustomed to looking at business sheets and financial statements. And one doesn't have to be an accountant or executive to understand that on a financial statement there are two parts, two significant parts: one is expenses, costs; the other is revenues. Revenues is the income you have to get in order to be able to afford to pay the expenses. If all you want to do is just cut expenses, then you are cutting the sinew and the flesh and there is not much left.

Here is what ought to happen—we should be saying to those who are the wealthiest: living with wealth is a pleasure, but that doesn't mean you don't have an obligation to the country and to have to do something a little different. Instead, they are making the wealthy wealthier, the most privileged more privileged than they have been, and that is true.

When you look at the big oil companies pocketing $4 billion a year each and every year, those are tax breaks that are unconscionable. But when you look at this—and I think about a period of time when I was growing up, and I look at a time during the war, World War II, and we had a program called the Excess Profits Tax. We said those companies are making so much money, they have to do their share and be helpful to the country at large and to make certain they pay some share of what the country is going through.

I just checked because I wanted to be sure. To date we have lost 4,400 Americans to the war in Iraq. We have lost over 1,600 to the war in Afghanistan. Those are homes that are without a son, a daughter, a brother, a father at

home. Where is the sacrifice on the part of the others here? No, no. We have to take care of the rich. We have to make sure they are more comfortable than they are. Whether it is a bigger yacht or a bigger airplane or a bigger house, we have to protect those people. They don't need any protection. What they need to do is share in the pain America is going through, and this is a reminder for me.

Make no mistake, greed is the fuel that drives Big Oil, and it is time we end their free ride on the taxpayers' dime. The big five oil companies have made almost $1 trillion in profit in the past decade. That is quite a reward for these folks. BP, $7.1 billion in the first 3 months of 2011 as they ground out the environment in the Gulf of Mexico. Imagine, $7.1 billion. ExxonMobil, $10 billion in a quarter. Shell, $8 billion. These are rounding numbers in a quarter. They don't need help. What they need is to help their country work its way through the crisis that we are in now.

But then we see what is being asked by those on the other side: They want us to have sympathy, have sensitivity toward the wealthiest among us because they cannot afford extra money. They cannot afford it—no, they cannot afford it because the other people are doing the sacrificial work and they don't want to help those kids get an education. They don't want to help those families to be able to provide a future for their children. They don't want to be able to help the families who need health care for the job market. That is not what they are about. So why should we use some of the money to invest in America, take down our debt, prepare young people for responsibilities for the future.

Big Oil's greed is helping to inflate our deficit and every day Americans are footing the bill, going up to the gas station. When somebody has to spend $40 to $50 to fill up a tank of gas, very often it is at a sacrifice for other things in their lives. It is terrible. And you see this all over.

We have a Republican Governor in the State of New Jersey right now, who is doing major cutting, and the result is that a family who makes $24,000 a year now, family income, will have to spend over $1,000 a year more for their health services. Mr. President, $1,000 to a family making $24,000 gross. A family who earns $60,000 will have to spend over $3,000 to pay for their health care.

Why wouldn't my colleagues on the other side—there are a lot of intelligent people, and I am sure they are sympathetic people—want to put a stop to this madness? Why wouldn't they say: Time to run up the flag, and we are all proud to be Americans, and we are grateful for what has happened to us? Instead they are saying: You have to have more. If you make $10 million a year, you have to have more. If you make $20 million or more—whatever it is—you need more. It is an outrage.

Big Oil is doing everything in its power to protect its subsidies, and the Republicans are doing everything in their power to help them. Last month 45 Republican Senators voted against ending these wasteful subsidies and using the money to reduce the deficit. Last week they chose to walk out on deficit-reduction negotiations rather than even considering putting a stop to Big Oil giveaways.

Making oil companies pay their fair share in taxes is not going to hurt the industry. It just means Big Oil executives might have to do with a smaller swimming pool or wait a little while longer to buy a bigger yacht. It is clearly offensive, and they are not helping. They are not helping lift the spirit of America. People are discouraged. They are worried about losing their homes. They are worried about their kids not be being able to get an education that they are emotionally, intellectually qualified for because they don't have the money because it is not available to them.

When we look at what has happened here—and you have to be fair. When this poor guy, the CEO of Exxon, is earning only $29 million a year, come on. Give him a break. He has to have a chance to preserve more of that income. Why should he pay to help this country weather the storm, weather the wars, weather the recession?

ConocoPhillips, he is not doing as good as the first guy. He only made $18 million in 2010. The third one, Chevron, their CEO only made $16 million. You know how the money gets to them? Through nickels, dimes, quarters, and dollars at the gasoline pump. That is how the money gets to them. How else can this CEO pay be afforded except from those who pull up to the gas station and say they have to buy 10 gallons of gas. Mr. President, 10 gallons of gas around here is about $45. It is a lot of money.

But instead of being fiscally responsible by ending the Big Oil big windfall, Republicans have another idea. They want to cut the deficit by ending Medicare as we know it, the most successful program in American history, perhaps, next to Social Security.

Seniors are struggling, Big Oil certainly is not. I don't think these fellows are struggling. I don't think they are doing without anything. I wish the other side would listen a little more closely to what the American people want. Almost three-quarters of the Americans want us to stop giving billions of tax breaks to big oil companies each year. The American people know these subsidies are unnecessary, ineffective, and basically immoral.

We should take the $4 billion we give away to Big Oil each year and use that money to pay down our deficit. That is a good idea. If we can do that, then it starts to make things a lot easier to continue to provide the services that are critical, essential to the average family.

We cannot restore fiscal sanity here until we start paying more attention to the revenue column in our ledger. As I said before, I was a CEO for many years, 30 years before I got here, and I know you cannot run a company or a country without a good, strong revenue flow. So I call on my colleagues, please, listen to what your country needs. See what you can do to make the country stronger. If our middle class, our modest-income class starts to fail along the way, we will not be able to conduct business as usual. It is for your own protection. Get with it. Make sure they understand that you cannot just get more of what is coming out; that you have to give something back to this great country of ours.

I call on my colleagues: Get Big Oil off the Federal welfare roll. Let's invest in our country's future and not have larger windfalls for oil industry lobbyists and lawyers. We have to make sure our children and our grandchildren inherit a country that is fiscally sound, morally responsible, able to provide health care, able to provide an education, able to guarantee that a child can prepare to be a leader in the future. We have to make sure that everybody sees a chance for themselves to succeed, to not be dependent on government programs, but at least be able to have those programs to get them started in life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER KENNETH R. WHITE

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today we honor the life and heroic sacrifice of CWO Kenneth R. White of Fort Collins, CO. He died on June 5, 2011, in Khost Province, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when his helicopter crashed during combat. He was 35 years old.

Chief Warrant Officer White's family remembers him as a wonderful man of God, an extraordinary husband, and a loving father to his three children. He was a respectful and courageous friend, who demonstrated those attributes in abundance as a successful officer.

After joining the Army in 1994, Chief Warrant Officer White grew in his career and attended warrant officer flight training in 2002. He fought bravely during two tours in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. Most recently, he served in support of Operation Enduring Freedom as a member of the 1st Battalion, 10th Aviation Regiment, 10th Aviation Combat Brigade, 10th Mountain Division based at Fort Drum, NY.

His bravery and outstanding service quickly won the recognition of his commanders. Chief Warrant Officer White earned, among other distinctions, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, the National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, and two Global War on Terrorism Service Medals.

Mark Twain once said, ''The fear of death follows from the fear of life. A

man who lives fully is prepared to die at any time.'' Chief Warrant Officer White's service was in keeping with this sentiment—by selflessly putting country first, he lived life to the fullest. He lived with a sense of the highest honorable purpose.

I stand with people in Colorado and nationwide in profound gratitude for Chief Warrant Officer White's tremendous sacrifice. At substantial personal risk, he fought in Afghanistan with unwavering courage to protect America's citizens and the freedoms we hold dear. For his service and the lives he touched, Chief Warrant Officer White will forever be remembered as one of our country's bravest.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Chief Warrant Officer White's parents, John and Linda, his wife Sarah, their three children, and his entire family, who carry on his memory and will forever remind us of his sacrifice.

FOURTH OF JULY MESSAGE FOR THE TROOPS

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, 235 years ago this weekend, John Adams proclaimed that July 2 would mark the most memorable epoch in the history of America. It was on that day the Continental Congress declared the 13 colonies free and independent of Great Britain's Crown. It was 2 days after that when Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence was adopted.

And when did Americans first celebrate their independence?

Philadelphia threw a big party on July 8, 1776, including a parade and the firing of guns. George Washington, then camped near New York City, heard the news on July 9 and celebrated then. But in 1781, Massachusetts became the first State to recognize July 4 as a State celebration. Ten years later, the young Nation's celebration was dubbed Independence Day.

This Independence Day I hope every American will stop and think for just a minute about our freedoms—and just how much we owe those who came here long before us and mutually pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. And let us also remember the young men and women who have died in defense of those freedoms.

We traditionally observe the Fourth with fireworks and fanfare, pomp and parade. But today we remain engaged in far-away struggles to promote and protect the rights of others who, like us, value freedom and independence. Many of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and coastguardsmen are spending their Fourth in Iraq and Afghanistan and other parts of world.

I recently was reminded of the commitment and selfless sacrifice demonstrated by one of America's World War II veterans, who lives in my State of Florida.

U.S. Army SSG Robert Rickel, of Boca Raton, served as a waist gunner on a B–17 Flying Fortress. Sergeant Rickel survived the daring bombing campaign of Schweinfurt, Germany, in October 1943, and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his heroism or extraordinary achievement.

Sergeant Rickel and all the military members and all their families knew the risks and sacrifices they were making were worth it. As President Reagan once said, ''Some things are worth dying for . . . democracy is worth dying for, because it's the most deeply honorable form of government ever devised by man.''

Indeed, our democracy is something to celebrate. Mr. President, I wish everyone a Happy Fourth of July.

WOMEN WORKING IN NON TRADITIONAL (WIN) JOBS ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I strongly support the Women Working in Non Traditional Jobs Act, introduced by Senators GILLIBRAND and myself late last week. This legislation would encourage local and State workforce systems to think differently about how they train and prepare women for jobs in which they are not well-represented. Women currently represent half of our Nation's workforce, but two-thirds of these women are concentrated in 21 of 500 occupational jobs. Nontraditional jobs, in which women make up 25 percent or less of employees, pay 20–30 percent more than traditionally female jobs. Because of this discrepancy, it is important to establish a program that will aid women in moving away from occupations they have traditionally held, which are by and large lower paying than occupations where men are concentrated. I have always been a strong advocate for equal opportunity in the workforce. This bill would create a new Federal grant program designed to help women find these high-wage nontraditional jobs.

Currently, there is only one Federal grant program designed to train women for nontraditional jobs: the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations, WANTO, but this program is under-resourced and overly narrow in scope. WANTO is 17 years old, has been funded at only $1 million for years, and is specifically designed to increase women's participation in the construction industry. The Women WIN Jobs Act would expand the work of WANTO by authorizing up to $100 million for recruiting, training, placing, and retaining women in nontraditional occupations that are high-demand, and high-growth.

Women have difficulty entering nontraditional fields because they lack sufficient information about career opportunities and pathways. Without sufficient training, preparation, or information, women will not be able to fully participate in the Nation's workforce and will continue to be underrepresented in high-earning and in-demand fields. This bill would address that problem by encouraging workforce systems to give women the support and preparation they need to compete for nontraditional jobs. Preparing women for work in nontraditional fields is crucial to success in the workforce and general economic success for our country.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GLENN M. ENGELMANN

• Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a respected member of Delaware's business community and a valued leader in our community, Glenn M. Engelmann, as he embarks upon his retirement following a long and distinguished career.

A native of Brooklyn, NY, Glenn earned a bachelor of arts degree in political science from the State University of New York at Binghamton and later went on to receive his juris doctor from the prestigious University of Chicago Law School.

In 1986, Glenn joined the law department of ICI Americas Inc, later known as Zeneca Group PLC. In that role, he provided legal advice principally for ICI Americas' pharmaceuticals business. Glenn then served as counsel to the advanced materials business and, in 1991, was appointed as group counsel for ICI Pharmaceuticals. A few years later, in 1993, Glenn was appointed vice president, general counsel and secretary for Zeneca. He remained as the leader of Zeneca's, and later AstraZeneca U.S.'s, legal affairs and promotional regulatory review until today. This month, Glenn will leave his post as vice president and general counsel for AstraZeneca U.S. and commence his retirement.

Outside of AstraZeneca U.S., Glenn is no stranger to his community. In addition to helping to lead one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies, Glenn is the president of the board of directors for the Jewish Federation of Delaware and honorary board member of Children & Families First, an organization that provides services, training and support to thousands of people across the State of Delaware each year. He has also served on the board of Jewish Family Services of Delaware, where he was president from 2000 to 2002.

When he is not working or serving our community, one could probably find Glenn at Citizens Bank Park watching the Philadelphia Phillies or at the Wells Fargo Center cheering for the Philadelphia 76ers. Or perhaps he might be reliving his ''glory days,'' listening to The Boss Bruce Springsteen—the Rolling Stones or the Beatles. And while I have heard nothing but jokes regarding Glenn's golf game, I assume he is trying to get better. Maybe he can improve during retirement.

A devoted family man, Glenn and his wife Michelle have three children: Harris, Jason and Rachel, as well as a dog

named Cleo. He has no doubt had a profound influence on his children's academic and career paths. Harris is going to be a junior at Washington University in St. Louis this fall. Jason is embarking on his second year at Duke Law, and Rachel recently earned a master's in Public Health from the University of Michigan and now works for Abbott Pharmaceutical. Upon his retirement, Glenn will leave behind a legacy of commitment to his work and public service both for his children and for the generations that will follow them.

I join Glenn's family and colleagues in congratulating him—a leader in his field and in our community—as he celebrates the completion of a successful career and begins a new chapter in his life. I wish him and his family only the very best in all that lies ahead for each of them.●

REMEMBERING PAULINO ''PAUL'' ZATICA

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President today I wish to honor the life of Paul Zatica, a husband, father, community leader, businessman and exemplary Idahoan.

At the core of Paul Zatica's accomplishments were his dedication to family, strong sense of community and his ability to connect with his customers. After serving in the U.S. Navy from 1946 to 1948, graduating from Boise Jr. College and the University of Denver and marrying his wife of nearly 63 years, Erma Jean, Paul Zatica opened Paul's market in Homedale, ID, in December of 1955. He grew the business into eight stores throughout southwestern Idaho. Paul's Market has been credited with providing jobs and scholarships to numerous students. Paul also devoted decades of service on the Homedale City Council, the Homedale School Board and Owyhee County Rodeo Board and helped form the Homedale Development Company. Paul has been recognized for his commendable skills through honors, such as his selection as Idaho Retailer of the Year in 1988 and grand marshal for the 2006 Owyhee County Fair and Rodeo Parade.

I join Paul's wife; four children, Stan, Paulette, Bryan and Steve; eight grandchildren; three great-grandchildren; other family members; many friends; the Homedale community; and the numerous people he inspired in mourning his loss and expressing gratitude for his contribution. Paul Zatica will be missed, and his legacy of devotion to his family and community will not be forgotten.●

KAPPA ALPHA PSI FRATERNITY, INCORPORATED

● Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this year we are celebrating the 100th birthday of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity Incorporated. Next week, thousands of members and guests from all over the world are coming to Indianapolis, IN, to participate in a week-long program of forums and seminars with a focus on leadership, brotherhood, and service, known as the 80th Grand Chapter Meeting and Centennial Celebration.

Kappa Alpha Psi was founded on January 5, 1911, on the campus of Indiana University in Bloomington, IN. Led by the vision of Elder Watson Diggs, it was founded by 10 God-fearing, serious-minded young men who possessed the imagination, ambition, courage, and determination to defy custom in pursuit of college educations and careers during an oppressive time in American history for African Americans.

Now, the membership has grown to more than 360 undergraduate chapters and 347 alumni chapters located throughout the United States and five foreign countries including 35 chapters in Louisiana. Today, the fraternity boasts a membership of more than 150,000 college-trained young men.

Kappa Alpha Psi has been an instrumental group in raising the profile of African-American men and has worked tirelessly to knock down barriers to advancement in our society. The brotherhood has consistently encouraged achievement in every field of human endeavor.

I also would like to take this opportunity to commend attorney Dwayne Murray. Professionally, Dwayne not only founded and continues to manage his own law firm but he became the first African American appointed to the District 7 Panel of Trustees for the U.S. Middle District Bankruptcy Court. He was recognized by the Louisiana Legislature as an ''Honorary State Representative'' and the Governor's Office as an ''Outstanding Citizen'' for his community service and efforts to bring lay and professional people into the political process. Today Dwayne currently serves as the 31st Grand Polemarch of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Incorporated, and is a resident of the great State of Louisiana. Under his extraordinary leadership, the organization has initiated several community service projects, including ''Sunday of Hope.'' Through this effort, Kappa Alpha Psi has raised well over $500,000 for St. Jude Children's Research Hospital during the past 2 years. Dwayne has also spearheaded the ''Greeks Learning to Avoid Debt'' or GLAD Program. This program will ensure that college students receive the necessary training to use credit wisely and remain financially stable through college and beyond. A final noteworthy accomplishment, Dwayne founded Kappa Kamp, a rigorous leadership institute for elementary and middle school aged young men. The Baton Rouge Alumni Chapter continues to raise money to support Dwayne's project through the annual Walter Banks Golf Classic.

In the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005, Kappas from all over the country came to the aid of hurricane survivors along the gulf coast and helped with our recovery effort.

Thus, it is with great pride that we not only congratulate all members of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. on the occasion of their centennial celebration, but I would also like to recognize my constituent and friend, Dwayne Murray, as he approaches the end of his tenure as Grand Polemarch of this great organization.●

PROFESSIONAL VOWS OF SISTER MARY OF THE SAVIOR

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on Saturday, August 6, Sister Mary of the Savior, O.P., will reaffirm her professional religious vows on the 25th anniversary of her vows. My dear friend Bishop Moses Anderson, S.S.E., will preside.

I have known Sister Mary as long as I can remember. She was Cathleen Going, and she and her dear sister Patricia grew up near the Leahy family in Vermont. Her parents and my parents were the closest of friends, and when I look at the picture taken 25 years ago at her professional vows I see my mother, Alba Leahy, in the front row.

Sister Mary of the Savior has given her life to help others, both through her deeds and her prayers. In a world when too little of that is done, my wife Marcelle and I so appreciate people like her.

I knew first of this from our friend, Moses Anderson, who has also given of his life and the two of us have talked about Cathleen and what she has done.

It is wonderful to have people like that in one's life, and I want the Senate to know about this remarkable woman.●

REMEMBERING HENRY G. MARSH

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to Henry G. Marsh, a tireless and dedicated community leader in Saginaw, MI, who passed away on May 11, 2011. Mr. Marsh was an important figure in the civil rights community in Saginaw, as well as in politics, for many years. He accomplished much throughout his professional life and has forged an impressive legacy that will surely inspire many for years to come.

Henry G. Marsh was born on October 11, 1921, to Thomas and Saidye Marsh. Upon graduating from Greenwood High School, Mr. Marsh joined the Army. After his military service, Mr. Marsh earned a degree from Knoxville College in Knoxville, TN, and later a law degree from Wayne State University.

In 1954, Mr. Marsh moved to Saginaw and quickly became actively involved in community affairs in the city. He would soon accept a position as legal counsel for the NAACP, and would eventually become chairman of the Human Relations Commission. Henry Marsh was committed to serving the needs of the Saginaw community and served in various positions and as chairman of many committees and boards throughout his adult life in Saginaw, MI.

In 1961, Mr. Marsh became the first African American to be elected to the Saginaw City Council, and in 1967, became Saginaw's first Black mayor. Shortly after becoming mayor, he formed a 220-member Committee on Civil Rights, made up of homemakers, factory workers, ministers, business owners and members of civil rights organizations, that sought to bring the city together to solve the many issues the city faced at the time. Reflecting on his stint as mayor, he was quoted in the Saginaw News in a 2000 interview as saying that the commission was ''the most important thing I ever did. We discussed the legitimate concerns of this city.''

Henry Marsh was a devoted husband and family man. He was married to his wife Ruth for 63 years, and they were blessed with three children, Michael, Walter and Teresa.

This is, indeed, a great loss to the many people who knew Henry Marsh and to the many more that have benefited from his life's work. I know my colleagues join me in paying tribute to the life and work of Henry G. Marsh. I am sure his family takes comfort in knowing that his accomplishments will be honored and remembered for years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT E. DURBIN

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional officer in the U.S. Army. LTG Robert E. Durbin will retire on August 1 after more than 36 years of distinguished service to the Army and the Nation.

Throughout his career, General Durbin has personified the Army values of duty, integrity, and selfless service across the many missions to which he has contributed.

General Durbin, a resident of Pennsylvania, graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1975 and then went on to receive a master's degree in mechanical engineering from Pennsylvania State University.

He has served in a variety of command and staff assignments, leading men and women during times of peace and war. Over the course of almost four decades of service, he has commanded at the platoon, company, battalion, and brigade levels.

Furthermore, he served as the commanding general of the Combined Security Transition Command—Afghanistan, the command that plays such a critical role in training the Afghan National Security Forces. He subsequently became the commanding general of the 1st Infantry Division and Fort Riley.

General Durbin has spent the last 3 years serving as the director of the Army's Office of Business Transformation, where he was responsible for leading the Army's efforts to operate more cost-consciously while still providing the best trained and equipped force. During one of the most challenging economic periods in our history, General Durbin has helped foster and institutionalize better business practices among our Army's senior leaders. His personal efforts were instrumental in leading the Army through significant changes in the way it grows, resets, modernizes, and transforms. He made these processes more relevant to current operational requirements and significantly increased the Army's capability to support combatant commanders.

In all of his assignments, General Durbin has provided outstanding leadership, integrity, and sound advice on numerous issues of importance to the Army and our nation.

I would like to thank General Durbin, his wife Diana, and his entire family for their commitment, sacrifices, and service to our nation. Congratulations and best wishes.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CALLOVI

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize John Callovi, a summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

John is a graduate of Wellington High School in Wellington, FL. Currently, he is a rising senior pursuing a major in economics at the University of Florida. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to John for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN CASSCELLS-HAMBY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Stephen Casscells-Hamby, a summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Stephen is a graduate of Trinity Preparatory School in Winter Park, FL. Currently, he is a rising junior pursuing a double major in business and economics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Stephen for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSHUA FORDIN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Joshua Fordin, a summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Joshua is a graduate of Pine Crest School in Fort Lauderdale, FL. Currently, he is a rising senior pursuing a major in international relations at Johns Hopkins University. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Joshua for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CRISTINA HACKLEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Cristina Hackley, a summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Cristina is a graduate of Groton School in Groton, MA. Currently, she is a rising sophomore at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Cristina for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES KLUG

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Charles Klug, a summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Charles is a graduate of Berkeley Preparatory School in Tampa, FL. Currently, he is a rising senior pursuing a double major in political science and religion at Wake Forest University. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Charles for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MAGGIE MARTINEZ

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Maggie Martinez, a summer intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Maggie is a graduate of Lake Highland Preparatory School in Orlando, FL. Currently, she is a rising senior double majoring in art history and English at Vanderbilt University. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Christina for all the fine work she has done and

wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY SOTO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Anthony Soto, a summer law intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Anthony is a graduate of Florida International University in Miami, FL, where he majored in political science. Currently, he is entering his last year at Florida State University Law School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Anthony for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING NORTHERN MAINE DISTILLING COMPANY

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, my home State of Maine is home to countless young entrepreneurs who are working to ensure that our State and Nation have a vibrant, growing economy for years to come. Two of these remarkable individuals reside in northern Maine, where they have begun a booming business based on a college project. Today I recognize the founders of the Northern Maine Distilling Company for their tremendous accomplishments in such a short period of time.

Scott Galbiati and Jessica Jewell were students at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute when they worked on a class project together to design a business plan. They chose to create a distillery. And after getting married in 2006, they took their venture to the next level, deciding that this would not remain an abstract plan developed in a classroom, but that they would see this business to its fruition. Most exciting of all, they decided they would create their company in Maine.

After many trial runs and much hard work, Scott and Jessica based their company in Houlton, a small community on the State's eastern border with Canada. By utilizing the town's high quality water supply, the locally made and distilled Twenty 2 Vodka, the distillery's flagship product, has quickly become recognized as a truly unique product of Maine.

Northern Maine Distilling uses only American made products in their production process, resulting is the creation of 50 gallons of vodka per batch. Additionally, by using their Web site and other social media sites in a smart and effective manner, Scott and Jessica have been able to reach out to communities across the country, sharing recipes and ideas with people nationwide.

Twenty 2 Vodka has won several awards over the course of its short existence on the shelves. It received the bronze medal at the New York International Spirits Competition and the 2010 World Beverage Competition, and last year bested all competitors at both the Consumer Judged SIP Awards and San Francisco World Spirits Competition, taking home the gold at both. The vodka has quickly won wide acclaim, and can be found in a variety of locations across the State.

But perhaps the biggest achievement for Scott and Jessica thus far was being named the 2011 Entrepreneurs of the Year by the Leaders Encouraging Aroostook Development, or LEAD, and Momentum Aroostook. These two organizations are dedicated to fostering economic growth and development in Maine's northernmost county, and by recognizing Jessica and Scott with this prestigious award, they have identified two of Maine's rising stars in the business world.

Starting and growing a business is not any easy task, as any entrepreneur will tell you. But successful business owners demonstrate critical characteristics, like perseverance, commitment, and pragmatism. The Northern Maine Distilling Company was born out of these traits, which clearly shine through in Jessica Jewell and Scott Galbiati. I thank everyone at the Northern Maine Distilling Company for their hard work, and wish them much success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1317. A bill to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefit.

S. 1323. A bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2342. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Criteria Used to Order Administrative Detention of Food for Human or Animal Consumption'' (RIN0910–AG67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2343. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adjustment of Civil Money Penalty Amount for Inflation'' (RIN2501–AD52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2344. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Libyan Sanctions Regulations'' (31 CFR Part 570) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2345. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Alphabetical Listings: Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons; Blocked Vessels; Persons Determined to be the Government of Iran'' (31 CFR Chapter V) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2346. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the competitiveness of the export financing services for the period from January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2347. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2010 Management Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–2348. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Alaska Plaice in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XA483) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2349. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2011 and 2012 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish; Correction'' (RIN0648–XZ90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2350. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area'' (RIN0648–XA376) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2351. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska'' (RIN0648–XA394) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2352. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2011 Management Measures; Correction'' (RIN0648–XA184) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2353. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2011 Specifications for the Spiny Dogfish Fishery'' (RIN0648–XA163) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2354. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Management Measures'' (RIN0648–BA70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2355. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Operation and Maintenance of the Neptune Liquefied Natural Gas Facility Off Massachusetts'' (RIN0648–AX09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2356. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications'' (RIN0648–XA109) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2357. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish; Amendment 5'' (RIN0648–AX70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 30, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2358. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act Regulations-Definition of 'Indian tribe' '' (RIN1024-AD98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2359. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the decision to procure additional services on a noncompetitive basis under an existing contract for environmental clean-up work at the Idaho National Laboratory; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2360. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for fiscal year 2010 relative to the Medicaid Integrity Program, the Center for Program Integrity, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2361. A communication from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Supplemental Security Income (SSI) non-medical redeterminations; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–2362. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2363. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the 1974 Trade Act's freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2364. A communication from the Deputy Director for Policy, Legislative and Regulatory Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2365. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program. . . .'' (CFDA Nos. 84.133A–6, 84.133A–7, and 84.133A–8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2366. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the financial aspects of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–2367. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Performance of Functions; Claims for Compensation Under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; Compensation for Disability and Death of Noncitizen Federal Employees Outside the United States'' (RIN1240–AA03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 29, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2368. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011 and the Attorney General's Semi-Annual Management Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–2369. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the applications for the interception of wire and other communications during fiscal year 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2055. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–29).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1305. A bill to establish and clarify that Congress does not authorize persons convicted of dangerous crimes in foreign courts to freely possess firearms in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HAGAN (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1306. A bill to provide for secondary school reform; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1307. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey real property, including improvements, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in Ketchikan, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1308. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to child pornography and child exploitation offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1309. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1310. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal

Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplement products with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BENNET, and Mrs. HAGAN):

S. 1311. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding 21st century community learning centers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts:

S. 1312. A bill to strengthen and improve monitoring in the fisheries across the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1313. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1314. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Labor to establish minimum funding levels for States for the support of disabled veterans' outreach program specialists and local veterans' employment representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1315. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend public safety officers' death benefits to fire police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 1316. A bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1317. A bill to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefit; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

S. 1318. A bill to enhance pre- and post-adoptive support services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1319. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a system of background checks for employers and employees of the electronic life safety and security system installation and monitoring industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1320. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to offer to enter into temporary used fuel storage facility agreements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1321. A bill to establish energy policies to make measurable gains in reducing dependence on foreign oil, saving Americans money, increasing United States competitiveness, improving energy security, improving environmental stewardship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. LEE):

S. 1322. A bill to permit commercial vehicles at weights up to 129,000 pounds to use certain highways on the Interstate System in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1323. A bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; placed on the calendar.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. Res. 223. A resolution designating July 1, 2011, as ''National Caretakers Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 224. A resolution congratulating the Soil Science Society of America on its 75th anniversary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. DEMINT):

S. Res. 225. A resolution congratulating the University of South Carolina baseball team for its gritty and record-breaking pursuit of back-to-back National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Baseball National Championships; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 164

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to repeal the imposition of withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities.

S. 211

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and performance of the Federal Government.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to require that the Government give priority to payment of all obligations on the debt held by the public and payment of social security benefits in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 382

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture regarding additional recreational uses of National Forest System land that is subject to ski area permits, and for other permits.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 414, a bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to establish pilot projects under the Medicare program to provide incentives for home health agencies to utilize home monitoring and communications technologies.

S. 581

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 581, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require criminal background checks for child care providers.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to remove unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats from seniors' personal health decisions by repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 724

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 724, a bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a funding gap caused by the failure to enact interim or full-year appropriations for the Armed Forces occurs, which results in the furlough of non-emergency personnel and the curtailment of Government activities and services.

S. 898

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary to establish a comprehensive design standard program to prevent, control, and treat polluted stormwater runoff from federally funded highways and roads, and for other purposes.

S. 922

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 922, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide grants for Urban Jobs Programs, and for other purposes.

S. 949

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 949, a bill to amend the National Oilheat Research Alliance Act of 2000 to reauthorize and improve that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 968, a bill to prevent online threats to economic creativity and theft of intellectual property, and for other purposes.

S. 988

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 988, a bill to ensure that local educational agencies and units of local governments are compensated for tax revenues lost when the Federal Government takes land into trust for the benefit of a federally recognized Indian tribe or an individual Indian.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to prohibit theft of medical products, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1048, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to the Islamic Republic of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes.

S. 1059

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1059, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act.

S. 1096

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1096, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under the Medicare part B program by extending the minimum payment amount for bone mass measurement under such program through 2013.

S. 1176

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1176, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1219, a bill to require Federal agencies to assess the impact of Federal action on jobs and job opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1293

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1293, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a demonstration program to adapt the lessons of providing foreign aid to underdeveloped economies to the provision of Federal economic development assistance to certain similarly situated individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1297, a bill to preserve State and institutional authority relating to State authorization and the definition of credit hour.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

S. RES. 170

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 170, a resolution honoring Admiral Thad Allen of the United States Coast Guard (Ret.) for his lifetime of selfless commitment and exemplary service to the United States.

S. RES. 175

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 175, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to ongoing violations of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and the importance of a peaceful and just resolution to the conflict within Georgia's internationally recognized borders.

S. RES. 221

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. Res. 221, a resolution congratulating Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc., on reaching the historic milestone of 100 years of serving local and international communities, maintaining a commitment to the betterment of mankind, and enriching the lives of collegiate men throughout the United States.

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 221, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 1305. A bill to establish and clarify that Congress does not authorize persons convicted of dangerous crimes in foreign courts to freely possess firearms in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the No Firearms for Foreign Felons Act of 2011. This bill would close a loophole in current law, by ensuring that people convicted of foreign felonies and crimes involving domestic violence cannot possess firearms. We must close this gap in our laws before it is exploited by terrorists, drug gangs, and other dangerous criminals who threaten our communities.

Under current Federal law, people who are convicted in the United Sates of violent felonies like rape, murder and terrorism are prohibited from possessing firearms. But, shockingly, Federal law does not bar criminals convicted of these same violent crimes in foreign courts from possessing guns. This outrageous loophole for foreign convicts is the result of a 2005 U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of Small v. United States.

In that case, the Court analyzed the 1968 Gun Control Act, which states that anyone who has been convicted of a felony ''in any court'' cannot possess firearms. The Court concluded that the phrase only applied to American courts, despite the fact that the Gun Control Act had been applied to foreign felonies since 1968, the year it took effect.

At the time, the Supreme Court was very much aware that its ruling could have serious consequences. As Justice Clarence Thomas noted in his dissent, ''the majority's interpretation permits those convicted overseas of murder, rape, assault, kidnapping, terrorism and other dangerous crimes to possess firearms freely in the United States.'' But whatever one may think of the Court's ruling, it is now the law of the land.

We must make every effort to close this dangerous loophole and the bill I am introducing today would do just that.

Under this bill, section 921 of Title 18 would be amended to state that ''[t]he term 'any court' includes any Federal, State, or foreign court.'' Similar changes would be made in other sections of the Gun Control Act. Where there are references to ''state offenses'' or ''offenses under state law,'' the bill would expand these terms to include convictions of offenses under foreign law.

In other words, the bill would make it clear that if someone was convicted in a foreign court of an offense that would have disqualified him from possessing a gun in the U.S., then they

will be disqualified from gun possession under U.S. law. The only exception will be if there is reason to think the conviction entered by the foreign jurisdiction is somehow invalid.

Under the bill, a foreign conviction will not constitute a ''conviction'' under the Gun Control Act, if either: the foreign conviction resulted from a denial of fundamental fairness that would violate due process if committed in the United States, or the conduct on which the foreign conviction was based would be legal if committed in the United States.

I expect that these circumstances will be fairly rare, but the bill does take them into account and will provide a complete defense to anyone with an invalid foreign conviction. In any event, it is clear that we should not keep in place a dangerous policy which essentially treats every foreign conviction as invalid.

Particularly in these times, America cannot continue to give foreign-convicted murderers, rapists and even terrorists the right to buy firearms in the United States.

With each passing day, we run a risk that foreign felons are exploiting this loophole in our law. This is unacceptable.

Criminals convicted in foreign courts should not be able to have guns when U.S. law forbids those convicted of the same crimes on U.S. soil from possessing guns. We should not wait for lives to be lost before we act to close this loophole.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1305

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''No Firearms for Foreign Felons Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. NO FIREARMS FOR FOREIGN FELONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) COURTS.—Section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(36) The term 'any court' includes any Federal, State, or foreign court.''.

(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN FELONIES.—Section 921(a)(20) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''any Federal or State offenses'' and inserting ''any Federal, State, or foreign offenses'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''any State offense classified by the laws of the State'' and inserting ''any State or foreign offense classified by the laws of that jurisdiction''; and

(C) in the matter following subparagraph (B), in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: '', except that a foreign conviction shall not constitute a conviction of such a crime if the convicted person establishes that the foreign conviction resulted from a denial of fundamental fairness that would violate due process if committed in the United States or from conduct that would be legal if committed in the United States''.

(b) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CRIMES.—Section 921(a)(33) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''if the conviction has'' and inserting the following: ''if the conviction—

''(I) occurred in a foreign jurisdiction and the convicted person establishes that the foreign conviction resulted from a denial of fundamental fairness that would violate due process if committed in the United States or from conduct that would be legal if committed in the United States; or

''(II) has''.

(c) PENALTIES.—Section 924(e)(2)(A)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''an offense under State law'' and inserting ''an offense under State or foreign law''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', except that a foreign conviction shall not constitute a conviction of such a crime if the convicted person establishes that the foreign conviction resulted from a denial of fundamental fairness that would violate due process if committed in the United States or from conduct that would be legal if committed in the United States''.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1308. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to child pornography and child exploitation offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help protect children from Internet predators and pornographers. I am joined by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, with whom I serve on the Judiciary Committee and who is herself a former prosecutor. The same bill has been introduced in the House by Judiciary Committee Chairman Rep. LAMAR SMITH and Rep. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Technology can do so much for us today, but it also has a dark side. Students and Senators can use it, but so can predators and pornographers. Sadly, in some ways children are more at risk than ever and we must do whatever we can to protect them. This means equipping law enforcement with the tools they need to combat the sexual exploitation of children wherever it occurs.

This bill does several things. First, it makes it a crime to financially facilitate access to child pornography. Second, this bill requires companies such as Internet service providers to retain information such as subscriber network addresses for at least 18 months. Third, it expands existing authority to issue administrative subpoenas while investigating federal offenses involving the sexual exploitation or abuse of children. Fourth, it provides for protecting from intimidation or harassment child witnesses and victims in criminal investigations and prosecutions. Finally, it provides for enhancing criminal penalties or sentences for crimes such as the sex trafficking of children or child pornography.

Several of these provisions may look familiar. The provisions relating to subpoena authority, protection of child witnesses, child sex trafficking, and sentencing come directly from S. 2925, the Trafficking Deterrence and Victims Support Act of 2009, which Senator WYDEN introduced in the 111 Congress.

In preparing this bill for introduction today, Senator KLOBUCHAR and I met or spoke with law enforcement groups, financial institutions, communications companies, and child advocates. Many of them are stepping up their own voluntary efforts through coalitions such as the Financial Coalition Against Child Pornography and the Family Online Safety Institute. I have worked with many of these organizations and companies for years and look forward to doing so again on this important legislation.

This is a strong bill, a balanced bill, which will provide effective tools for addressing these threats to our children. I know that many divisions exist today, in the country and in the Congress, on many issues. But I trust that those divisions will disappear when it comes to protecting children from sexual exploitation. That must be an ongoing commitment and I hope that all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle and across the political spectrum, will join me and Senator KLOBUCHAR in supporting this legislation and helping us get it enacted into law.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 1310. A bill to improve the safety of dietary supplements by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers of dietary supplements to register dietary supplement products with the Food and Drug Administration and to amend labeling requirements with respect to dietary supplements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1310

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. REGULATION OF DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

(a) REGISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 415(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A facility engaged in manufacturing dietary supplements that is required to register under this section shall comply with the requirements of this paragraph, in addition to the other requirements of this section.

''(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—A facility described in subparagraph (A) shall submit a registration under paragraph (1) that includes, in addition to the information required under paragraph (2)—

''(i) a description of each dietary supplement product manufactured by such facility;

''(ii) a list of all ingredients in each such dietary supplement product; and

''(iii) a copy of the label and labeling for each such product.

''(C) REGISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO NEW, REFORMULATED, AND DISCONTINUED DIETARY SUPPLEMENT PRODUCTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date described in clause (ii), if a facility described in subparagraph (A)—

''(I) manufactures a dietary supplement product that the facility previously did not manufacture and for which the facility did not submit the information required under clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B);

''(II) reformulates a dietary supplement product for which the facility previously submitted the information required under clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B); or

''(III) no longer manufactures a dietary supplement for which the facility previously submitted the information required under clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B), such facility shall submit to the Secretary an updated registration describing the change described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) and, in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) or (II), containing the information required under clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (B).

''(ii) DATE DESCRIBED.—The date described in this clause is—

''(I) in the case of a facility described in subclause (I) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the dietary supplement product described in such subclause;

''(II) in the case of a facility described in subclause (II) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility first markets the reformulated dietary supplement product described in such subclause; or

''(III) in the case of a facility described in subclause (III) of clause (i), 30 days after the date on which such facility removes the dietary supplement product described in such subclause from the market.''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(z) If it is a dietary supplement for which a facility is required to submit the registration information required under section 415(a)(6) and such facility has not complied with the requirements of such section 415(a)(6) with respect to such dietary supplement.''.

(b) LABELING.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF LABELING REQUIREMENTS.—Chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 411 the following:

''SEC. 411A. DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS.

''(a) DIETARY SUPPLEMENT INGREDIENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2011, the Secretary shall compile a list of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients that the Secretary determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

''(b) IOM STUDY.—The Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine under which the Institute of Medicine shall evaluate dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients, including those on the list compiled by the Secretary under subsection (a), and scientific literature on dietary supplement ingredients and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Dietary Supplement Labeling Act of 2011, submit to the Secretary a report evaluating the safety of dietary supplement ingredients and proprietary blends of ingredients the Institute of Medicine determines could cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Institute of Medicine issues the report under subsection (b), the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment and taking into consideration such report, shall—

''(1) establish mandatory warning label requirements for dietary supplement ingredients that the Secretary determines to cause potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups; and

''(2) identify proprietary blends of ingredients for which, because of potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, the weight per serving of the ingredient in the proprietary blend shall be provided on the label.

''(d) UPDATES.—As appropriate, the Secretary, after providing for public notice and comment, shall update—

''(1) the list compiled under subsection (a);

''(2) the mandatory warning label requirements established under paragraph (1) of subsection (c); and

''(3) the requirements under paragraph (2) of subsection (c).''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(A) in subsection (q)(5)(F)(ii), by inserting '', and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(1)(B), the weight of such proprietary blend,'' after ''ingredients)''; and

(B) in subsection (s)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), by inserting '', and for each proprietary blend identified by the Secretary under section 411A(c)(1)(B), the weight of each such proprietary blend per serving'' before the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) the label or labeling does not include information with respect to potentially serious adverse events, drug interactions, contraindications, or potential risks to subgroups such as children and pregnant or breastfeeding women, as required under section 411A(c); or

''(G) the label does not include the batch number.''.

(c) CONVENTIONAL FOODS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and after providing for public notice and comment, shall establish a definition for the term ''conventional food'' for purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.). Such definition shall take into account conventional foods marketed as dietary supplements, including products marketed as dietary supplements that simulate conventional foods.

By Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts:

S. 1312. A bill to strengthen and improve monitoring in the fisheries across the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I rise to speak about overregulation—something that is really putting a wet blanket on many businesses throughout our country, and especially in Massachusetts. That is why I am introducing a bill to reform the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's—or NOAA's—asset forfeiture fund.

The fund, as you may know, is authorized by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation Act and allows NOAA to retain fines and penalties collected as a result of enforcement actions for legitimate enforcement purposes.

As the Department of Commerce inspector general's excellent work revealed, NOAA has mismanaged that fund for many years, wasting taxpayer funds on exorbitant foreign travel and unauthorized purchases of vehicles. As a matter of fact, they purchase more vehicles than they actually have employees. So that speaks for itself. They also purchased a $300,000 luxury boat with the funds collected in that forfeiture fund.

The reason I am standing on the floor of the Senate today is because the way the fund has been implemented has actually corrupted the relationship between the fishermen and the regulators. Fishermen have complained for years about the arbitrary fines, overzealous enforcement, and violations of their due process rights when it comes to dealing with NOAA. After decades of such complaints, mostly in the Northeast, the Department of Commerce appointed a distinguished retired judge to serve as a special master and investigate enforcement actions and abuses by NOAA.

In one case, a New Bedford, MA, fisherman lost his livelihood and a farm that had been in the family since the 1640s. He was forced to sell due to punitive NOAA penalties. Incredibly, the Commerce Department's own special master concluded that the perverse incentive to fill the asset forfeiture fund with funds was a motivating factor in how NOAA handled that case. Larry Yacubian got not only a check but an apology from Washington because of those abuses, but he will never get his home back.

That is why in my role as ranking member of the Federal Financial Management Subcommittee, I, along with my dear friend, Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware, held a field hearing in Boston on June 20 to identify a lot of these longstanding problems and identify the problems with the asset forfeiture fund itself.

Unfortunately, the hearing revealed that while NOAA has instituted some reforms to its management of the asset forfeiture fund, including auditing the funds for the first time in nearly four

decades, it still intends to utilize the seized assets of fishermen to pay for foreign travel, which is inappropriate.

The years of NOAA's mismanagement and abuse of the asset forfeiture fund have bred mistrust among fishermen and Federal officials, and it can only be broken by removing the fund from NOAA.

It is for these reasons that today I am introducing the Asset Forfeiture Responsibility Act of 2011, which will hopefully end this sad chapter in Federal financial management by this agency by replacing the existing funds with a new fisheries investment fund. Funds will be kept—like most every other fund—at the Treasury Department for the benefit of regional councils and NOAA, and the fund will be audited for the next 3 years to make sure they are getting their act together.

The fishing investment fund will direct monies from those fishermen who break the rules toward assisting fishermen with the ever-growing costs of regulatory compliance and to reimburse the legal fees incurred by fishermen whose fines were remitted by the recommendation of the Special Master.

Currently, appropriated funds assist fishermen with the costs of compliance, but in these difficult fiscal times this funding is actually at risk. This legislation would provide a more reliable source of funds to offset the increasing cost of compliance, while allowing the fishing councils the flexibility to address other priorities, such as preparing fishing impact statements and addressing other priorities to rebuild or maintain the fishery and the fishing stocks.

As I have always said, since I was elected and got involved in this issue, all the fishermen want is to have a level playing field and an assurance that those who break the rules will be caught and they will be fined appropriately. That is why I have maintained funding for NOAA's legitimate law enforcement responsibilities.

However, in the end, we should be focused, quite frankly, in this Chamber on bettering the economic security and ability of the American people to make an honest living. This bill will bring back jobs to the hard-working men and women of the American fishing industry while restoring their trust in government. It is the right thing to do.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 1320. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to offer to enter into temporary used fuel storage facility agreements; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to help address one of the glaring issues our domestic nuclear industry faces—what to do with the used nuclear fuel being stored at over 100 sites across the country. I am pleased to be joined by Senator MARY LANDRIEU in introducing this bill.

Typically, a nuclear power plant stores its used fuel in a spent fuel pool located within the reactor site's exclusion zone. When there is no more room in the pool, and the used fuel is sufficiently cooled, the fuel can be moved to dry cask storage nearby the plant in what are called independent spent fuel storage installations.

Although there are 104 nuclear reactors producing power across the United States, not all have been in operation long enough to fill their spent fuel pools and require dry cask storage. So at present, the are 63 independent spent fuel storage installations at 56 sites in 33 States. Of those, 7 sites are from decommissioned plants. Two decommissioned plant sites still have fuel in their spent fuel pool. That means there are 9 sites, from 10 decommissioned reactors, with 2,800 metric tons of used fuel that is being stored and guarded, whether in dry cask or fuel pools, but no operating power plant nearby. These are orphan sites, and but for the remaining spent fuel the land could be used for other purposes.

Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, the Federal Government is contractually obligated to take title to spent nuclear fuel from commercial nuclear power plants starting in 1998. Our Government has not fulfilled that requirement and as a result we face continuous lawsuits from the utilities operating those commercial power plants to cover the costs of storing the spent fuel on-site.

According to the Department of Justice, as of June 24, 2011, $1.12 billion has been paid out in settlement of these lawsuits, with an additional $220 million paid in judgments. Another $157 million is authorized, but has not yet been paid in settlement. And $937 million in outstanding judgments remains on appeal or remand. So, the total authorized payment level, so far, is roughly $1.5 billion, with close to another $1 billion dollars in payment going through the legal process. These are not lawsuits that go away once they are settled. Every year that the Government is in breach of its contractual obligation, the same company can bring a similar lawsuit as had been previously settled. As more nuclear power plants fill up their spent fuel pools and turn to dry cask storage, more lawsuits for breach of contract will be filed. The Department of Energy estimates that even if the Government starts to accept the spent fuel by 2021, the total cost of the lawsuits will be $13.1 billion.

While the Government anticipates a liability of $13.1 billion, utilities estimate the final tally could exceed $50 billion. But both the DOE and private sector estimates were developed before the Administration took steps to withdraw the Yucca Mountain application. More recent estimates suggest a cost of $100 billion.

I take special note of what our future liability could be. The Department of Energy expects the Federal Government's liability to increase by $500 million annually if waste is not accepted by 2021—10 years from now. It took us 30 years to get this far on Yucca Mountain. If we are to begin the search for a permanent repository anew, as it appears the Administration would like us to do, it seems increasingly likely the Government's liability costs will greatly exceed the earlier $50 billion estimate. At a time when we are already racking up trillions of dollars in debt for future generations, the administration has freely chosen to incur additional future taxpayer liability in terms of tens of billions of dollars by withdrawing the Yucca Mountain repository license application.

Fortunately for the administration, I have a solution. The Nuclear Fuel Storage Improvement Act of 2011 that I am introducing seeks to establish up to two interim used nuclear fuel storage facilities to centralize the used fuel spread across this nation, end the lawsuits against the Federal Government, and help the domestic nuclear industry, and the communities that host nuclear power plants, partially resolve the long-standing problem of what to do with the used nuclear fuel stored on-site.

The bill would provide financial incentives to a local unit of government, as well as the state in which that unit of government is located, to serve as a host of an interim used nuclear fuel storage facility. The facility itself would be privately owned and operated, and licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but the host entity would be entitled to financial payments from the Federal Government for its willingness to locate the storage facility within its jurisdiction. Up to two locations would be eligible for the financial agreement, funds for which would come from the Nuclear Waste Fund set up by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

Importantly for the Federal Government, under the legislation the Secretary of Energy can contract with the private entity operating an interim storage facility to store used fuel from civilian nuclear power plants. Priority of acceptance is given to the used fuel being stored at plants that have been permanently shut down and decommissioned—the orphan sites. The Secretary is then authorized to enter into an agreement with those which it has contractual obligations to under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, to settle all claims and liabilities for the Government's failure to take title of the used nuclear fuel, thus saving the Government, and future taxpayers, billions of dollars.

I want to be clear. In no way shape or form does this legislation diminish or replace the need for a permanent repository. I have been, and continue to be, supportive of using Yucca Mountain for that purpose. Until such a repository can be opened, however, we have a responsibility to put a plan into action

that will consolidate the used fuel sitting at all of these sites across the nation, as well as settle the Federal Government's liability for its failure to take title to that spent fuel, costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars each year. I believe this legislation moves us in that direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1320

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Nuclear Fuel Storage Improvement Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 3. INCENTIVES FOR SITING OF TEMPORARY USED FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ''agreement'' means a temporary used fuel storage facility agreement entered into under subsection (e).

(2) FIRST USED FUEL RECEIPT.—The term ''first used fuel receipt'' means the receipt of used fuel by a temporary used fuel storage facility at a site within the jurisdiction of a unit of local government that is a party to an agreement.

(3) NUCLEAR WASTE FUND.—The term ''Nuclear Waste Fund'' means the Nuclear Waste Fund established under section 302 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222).

(4) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term ''unit of local government'' means any borough, city, county, parish, town, township, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State, or association of 2 or more political subdivisions of a State.

(5) USED FUEL.—The term ''used fuel'' means nuclear fuel that has been withdrawn from a nuclear reactor following irradiation, the constituent elements of which have not been separated by reprocessing.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall offer to enter into temporary used fuel storage facility agreements in accordance with this section.

(c) NOTICE FROM UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO SECRETARY.—Not later than January 1, 2013, representatives of a unit of local government, with the written approval of the Governor of the State in which the jurisdiction of the local government is located, may submit to the Secretary written notice that the unit of local government is willing to have a privately owned and operated temporary used fuel storage facility located at an identified site within the jurisdiction of the unit of local government.

(d) PRELIMINARY COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make payments of $1,000,000 each year to not more than 3 units of local government that have submitted notices under subsection (c).

(2) MULTIPLE NOTICES.—If more than 3 notices are received under subsection (c), the Secretary shall make payments to the first 3 units of local government, based on the order in which the notices are received.

(3) TIMING.—The payments shall be made annually for a 3-year period, on the anniversary date of the filing of the notice under subsection (c).

(e) AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the docketing of an application for a license for a temporary used fuel storage facility, in accordance with part 72 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, at a site within the jurisdiction of a unit of local government by the Commission, the Secretary shall offer to enter into a temporary used fuel storage facility economic impact agreement with the unit of local government.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An agreement between the Secretary and a unit of local government under this subsection shall contain such terms and conditions (including such financial and institutional arrangements) as the Secretary and the unit of local government determine to be reasonable and appropriate.

(3) AMENDMENT.—An agreement may be—

(A) amended only with the mutual consent of the parties to the agreement; and

(B) terminated only in accordance with paragraph (4).

(4) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate an agreement if the Secretary determines that any major element of the temporary used fuel storage facility required under the agreement will not be completed.

(5) NUMBER OF AGREEMENTS.—Not more than 2 agreements may be in effect at any time.

(6) PAYMENT SCHEDULE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary enters into an agreement under this subsection, the Secretary shall make to the unit of local government and the State in which the unit of local government is located—

(i) payments of—

(I) on the date of entering into the agreement under this subsection, $6,000,000;

(II) during the period beginning on the date of entering into an agreement and ending on the date of first used fuel receipt or denial of the license application for a temporary used fuel storage facility by the Commission, whichever is later, $10,000,000 for each year; and

(III) during the period beginning on the date of first used fuel receipt and ending on the date of closure of the facility, a total of the higher of—

(aa) $15,000,000 for each year; or

(bb) $15,000 per metric ton of used fuel received at the facility for each year, up to a maximum of $25,000,000 for each year; and

(ii) a payment of $20,000,000 on closure of the facility.

(B) TIMING OF ANNUAL PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make annual payments under subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) in the case of annual payments described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II), on the anniversary of the date of the docketing of the license application by the Commission; and

(ii) in the case of annual payments described in subparagraph (A)(i)(III), on the date of the first used fuel receipt and thereafter on the anniversary date of the first used fuel receipt, in lieu of annual payments described in subparagraph (A)(i)(II).

(C) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—Subject to subparagraph (A)(ii), the authority to make payments under this paragraph terminates on the date of closure of the facility.

(f) FUNDING.—Funding for compensation and payments provided for, and made under, this section shall be made available from amounts available in the Nuclear Waste Fund.

SEC. 4. ACCEPTANCE, STORAGE, AND SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall offer to enter into a long-term contract for the storage of used fuel from civilian nuclear power plants with a private entity that owns or operates an independent used fuel storage facility licensed by the Commission that is located within the jurisdiction of a unit of local government to which payments are made pursuant to section 3(e).

(b) SETTLEMENT AND ACCEPTANCE OF USED FUEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a party to a contract under section 302(a) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(a)), the Secretary may enter into an agreement for the settlement of all claims against the Secretary under a contract for failure to dispose of high-level radioactive waste or used nuclear fuel not later than January 31, 1998.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A settlement agreement described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall contain such terms and conditions (including such financial and institutional arrangements) as the Secretary and the party to the contract determine to be reasonable and appropriate; and

(B) may include the acceptance of used fuel from the party to the contract for storage at a facility with respect to which the Secretary has a long-term contract under subsection (a).

(c) PRIORITY FOR ACCEPTANCE FOR CLOSED FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a request for fuel acceptance is made under this section by a facility that has produced used nuclear fuel and that is shut down permanently and the facility has been decommissioned, the Secretary shall provide priority for the acceptance of the fuel produced by the facility.

(2) SCHEDULE.—Spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste generated by a facility in existence as of the date of enactment of this Act shall be offered a schedule in accordance with the priority established pursuant to Article IV.b.5 of the contract entitled ''Contract for Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and/or High-Level Radioactive Waste'', as specified in section 961.11 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

(d) TRANSPORTATION OF USED FUEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for the transportation of used fuel accepted by the Secretary under this section.

(2) SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall procure all systems and components necessary to transport used fuel from facilities designated by contract holders to 1 or more storage facilities under this section.

(B) CASKS.—The Secretary shall—

(i) use transportation and storage casks that are approved by the Commission in use at facilities designated by contract holders; and

(ii) compensate the owner and operator of each facility for the use of the casks.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1323. A bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit; placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1323

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SHARED SACRIFICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Wall Street Journal reports that median pay for chief financial officers of S&P 500 companies increased 19 percent to $2,900,000 last year.

(2) Over the past 10 years, the median family income has declined by more than $2,500.

(3) Twenty percent of all income earned in the United States is earned by the top 1 percent of individuals.

(4) Over the past quarter century, four-fifths of the income gains accrued to the top 1 percent of individuals.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that any agreement to reduce the budget deficit should require that those earning $1,000,000 or more per year make a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 223—DESIGNATING JULY 1, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL CARETAKERS DAY''

Ms. LANDRIEU submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 223

Whereas caretakers provide necessary support to a variety of individuals, including children, the elderly, and the mentally or physically disabled;

Whereas an estimated 80 percent of caretakers who work with adults provide assistance to those adults every day of the week;

Whereas childcare providers offer a safe environment for the development of children that might not otherwise be available;

Whereas individuals who received dependable childcare as children are more likely to have greater success in school, lower rates of juvenile crime, and a reduced risk of teen pregnancy; and

Whereas childcare providers enable the physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual growth of children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 1, 2011, as ''National Caretakers Day''; and

(2) recognizes the contributions of caretakers to their communities in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 224—CONGRATULATING THE SOIL SCIENCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA ON ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 224

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America was founded on November 18, 1936;

Whereas Richard Bradfield served as the first President of the Soil Science Society of America;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America was established during the dust bowl era, a time of extreme soil degradation;

Whereas since the dust bowl era, the Soil Science Society of America has continued to provide an understanding of the sustainable use of soil and the role soil plays in society;

Whereas soil is an essential natural resource, and soil professionals serve a critical role in managing that resource;

Whereas the core purpose of the Soil Science Society of America is to advance soils as fundamental to life;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America is 1 of the premier scientific societies and is comprised of more than 6,000 members in the United States and internationally, including scientists, practicing professionals, and students;

Whereas soil is a dynamic system that performs many functions and services vital to human activities and ecosystems;

Whereas soil, plant, animal, and human health are intricately linked, and the sustainable use of soil affects climate, water, and air quality, human health, biodiversity, food safety and security, and bioenergy;

Whereas soil faces increasing human-linked threats from contamination, unplanned urban development, desertification, salinization, mismanagement, and erosion;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America provides the knowledge and tools to ensure sustainable use of soils in support of societal needs, including food and energy security and ecosystem services;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America promotes the awareness and education of soils to elementary and secondary students, undergraduate and graduate students, practicing professionals, and the public; and

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America promotes effective research, disseminating scientific information, facilitating technology transfer, fostering high standards of education, maintaining high standards of ethics, promoting advancements in the soils profession, and cooperating with other organizations with similar objectives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Soil Science Society of America on its 75th anniversary;

(2) commends the Soil Science Society of America for its dedicated service to advance the science and management of soil; and

(3) supports the promise of the Soil Science Society of America to continue to enrich the lives of all people of the United States by improving stewardship of the environment, combating world hunger, and enhancing the quality of life for the future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 225—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA BASEBALL TEAM FOR ITS GRITTY AND RECORD-BREAKING PURSUIT OF BACK-TO-BACK NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I BASEBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. DEMINT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 225

Whereas, on June 28, 2011, the University of South Carolina Gamecocks won the 2011 National Collegiate Athletic Association College World Series with a 5–2 victory over the University of Florida Gators at TD Ameritrade Park in Omaha, Nebraska;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team has secured the University's second national championship in men's athletics since the founding of the University in 1801;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team became just the sixth team in college baseball history to win back-to-back national championships;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team won a record 11 consecutive games at the College World Series;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team won a record 16 consecutive games at the National Collegiate Athletic Association baseball tournament;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team, in its 10th appearance at the College World Series, became the first team to go 10–0 in the National Collegiate Athletic Association tournament;

Whereas head coach Ray Tanner won his second national title as Head Coach in his 15th season at the University of South Carolina;

Whereas second baseman Scott Wingo was named Most Outstanding Player of the 2011 College World Series;

Whereas first baseman Christian Walker, catcher Robert Berry, second baseman Scott Wingo, shortstop Peter Mooney, pitchers Michael Roth and Matt Price, and designated hitter Brady Thomas were named to the 2011 College World Series All-Tournament Team;

Whereas the State of South Carolina was proud to send the University of South Carolina baseball team to the College World Series for the second consecutive season; and

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team is the 2011 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Baseball Champion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of South Carolina Gamecocks for winning the 2011 National Collegiate Athletic Association College World Series;

(2) recognizes the achievement and dedication of all players, coaches, and support staff who battled and made winning 2 consecutive national championships possible;

(3) congratulates the people of South Carolina, the University of South Carolina, and Carolina Gamecocks fans everywhere; and

(4) requests that the Secretary of the Senate submit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Dr. Harris Pastides, President of the University of South Carolina;

(B) Eric Hyman, Director of Athletics at the University of South Carolina; and

(C) Ray Tanner, Head Coach of the University of South Carolina baseball team.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, July 12, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1160, the Department of Energy Administrative Improvement Act of 2011; S. 1108, the 10 Million Solar Roofs Act of 2011; and S. 1142, the Geothermal Exploration and Technology Act of 2011.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by e-mail to AbigailCampbell@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Jonathan Epstein or Abby Campbell.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee

on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, July 14, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing entitled ''Native Women: Protecting, Shielding, and Safeguarding Our Sisters, Mothers, and Daughters.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 30, 2011, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''FDIC: Deposit Insurance, Consumer Protection, and Financial Stability.''

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 30, 2011, at 2:15 p.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing on S. 1262, the Native Culture, Language, and Access for Success in Schools Act—Native CLASS.

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

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONTRACTING OVERSIGHT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the senate on June 30, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Afghanistan Reconstruction Contracts: Lessons Learned and Ongoing Problems.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 30, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE COURTS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Court, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on June 30, 2011, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 30, 2011, at 10 a.m. in Dirksen 406 to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Oversight: Review of EPA Regulations Replacing the Clean Air Interstate rule (CAIR) and the Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR).''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND FINANCE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, Subcommittee on Security and International Trade and Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 30, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct hearing entitled ''Stakeholder Perspectives on Reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE, PEACE CORPS, AND GLOBAL NARCOTICS AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 30, 2011, at 10 a.m., to hold a Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs subcommittee hearing entitled, ''The State of Democracy in the Americas.''

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be extended to Britta Lakting and Lucy Kissel.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and consider the following nominations: 102, 120, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 195, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227, 228, 229, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, and nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations, any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Jenni Rane LeCompte, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

David S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following named officer for temporary appointment to the grade indicated in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Michael S. Devany

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under Title 14, U.S.C., Section 271:

To be rear admiral upper half

Rear Adm. (lh) Vincent B. Atkins
Rear Adm. (lh) Robert E. Day, Jr.
Rear Adm. (lh) John H. Korn
Rear Adm. (lh) William D. Lee
Rear Adm. (lh) Stephen E. Mehling
Rear Adm. (lh) Charles D. Michel
Rear Adm. (lh) Michael N. Parks
Rear Adm. (lh) Sandra E. Stosz

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Felicia C. Adams, of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Ronald W. Sharpe, of the Virgin Islands, to be United States Attorney for the District of the Virgin Islands for the term of four years.

George Lamar Beck, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Alabama for the term of four years.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Richard C. Howorth, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2015.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

William Charles Ostendorff, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2016.

Wilma Antoinette Lewis, of the District of Columbia, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Thomas Gray Walker, of North Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina for the term of four years.

Charles F. Salina, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of New York for the term of four years.

Robert William Mathieson, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.

Juan Mattos Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Jersey for the term of four years.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Major General Marilyn A. Quagliotti, USAF (Ret.), of Virginia, to be Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Alfred Cooper Lomax, of Missouri, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri for the term of four years.

David L. McNulty, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of New York for the term of four years.

Ryan C. Crocker, of Washington, Personal Rank of Career Ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Robert R. Allardice

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Bradley A. Heithold

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Stanley E. Clarke

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Paul J. Selva

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Terrence A. Feehan

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Gen. James D. Thurman

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Kathleen M. Gainey

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. John A. Hammond

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James T. Walton

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 3064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stephen L. Jones
Brig. Gen. Richard W. Thomas

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brigadier General Marcia M. Anderson
Brigadier General William G. Beard
Brigadier General Nickolas P. Tooliatos
Brigadier General Jimmie J. Wells.

To be brigadier general

Colonel Margarett E. Barnes
Colonel Robert D. Carlson
Colonel Scottie D. Carpenter
Colonel Allan W. Elliott
Colonel Thomas P. Evans
Colonel Janice M. Haigler
Colonel Kurt A. Hardin
Colonel Kenneth D. Jones
Colonel Christopher R. Kemp
Colonel Michael A. Mann
Colonel James H. Mason
Colonel Cynthia A. O'Connell
Colonel Alan L. Stolte
Colonel George R. Thompson
Colonel Tracy A. Thompson
Colonel Kevin R. Turner
Colonel Bryan W. Wampler

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Keith M. Huber

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. A. C. Roper, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Curtis M. Scaparrotti

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Daniel P. Bolger

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John F. Campbell

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. James K. Brown, Jr.

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Antonio J. Vicens-Gonzalez

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John R. Allen

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Mark J. Belton

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) George W. Ballance
Rear Adm. (lh) Robin R. Braun
Rear Adm. (lh) Russell S. Penniman, IV
Rear Adm. (lh) Gary W. Rosholt

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Althea H. Coetzee
Capt. Valerie K. Huegel

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Captain Sandra E. Adams
Captain Mark L. Leavitt
Captain Jon G. Matheson
Captain Kerry M. Metz
Captain John F. Weigold

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas C. Traaen

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) William M. Roberts

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. William H. McRaven

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. John G. King

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) William E. Leigher

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Annie B. Andrews

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Robert V. Hoppa

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Captain Richard W. Butler
Captain Matthew J. Carter
Captain Lawrence E. Creevy
Captain Mark W. Darrah
Captain Christopher W. Grady
Captain Michael E. Jabaley, Jr.
Captain Colin J. Kilrain
Captain David M. Kriete
Captain Joseph W. Kuzmick
Captain William C. McQuilkin
Captain Victorino G. Mercado
Captain DeWolfe H. Miller
Captain Stuart B. Munsch
Captain Kenneth M. Perry
Captain Fernandez L. Ponds
Captain John C. Scorby, Jr.
Captain Dwight D. Shepherd
Captain Michael E. Smith
Captain Richad P. Snyder
Captain Scott A. Stearney
Captain Hugh D. Wetherald

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Lewis Alan Lukens, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Kenneth J. Fairfax, of Kentucky, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kazakhstan.

D. Brent Hardt, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana.

Donld W. Koran, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Geeta Pasi, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Djibouti.

James Harold Thessin, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Paraguay.

Lisa J. Kubiske, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

Michael H. Corbin, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Emirates.

Jeanine E. Jackson, of Wyoming, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Malawi.

Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

Susan Laila Ziadeh, of Washington, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Qatar.

Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Personal Rank of Career Ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Dereth Britt Glance, of New York, to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

Richard M. Moy, of Montana, to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ariel Pablos-Mendez, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN593 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning TODD A. EADS, and ending NICHOLE L. INGALLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2011.

PN690 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY B. WARNER, and ending GARY S. WOLLAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

IN THE ARMY

PN594 ARMY nomination of Shaun A. Price, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2011.

PN595 ARMY nominations (2) beginning CHRISTOPHER R. BRADEN, and ending CM DYER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2011.

PN640 ARMY nomination of Matthew B. Phillips, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN641 ARMY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL E. LOESCHER, and ending LESLIE W. ROBERSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN642 ARMY nominations (5) beginning ERIC G. PUTTLER, and ending PRASAD V. YALAVARTHI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN643 ARMY nominations (3) beginning JAMES L. BENJAMIN, and ending GILBERTO RUIZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN644 ARMY nominations (16) beginning ENRIQUE A. ARANIZ, and ending Clifford W. WILKINS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN655 ARMY nominations (137) beginning ERIC D. AGUILA, and ending OMAYA H. YOUSSEF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN656 ARMY nominations (16) beginning ALFRED C. ANDERSON, and ending MARK A. VANCE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN657 ARMY nominations (92) beginning TIMOTHY S. ADAMS, and ending HEATHER L. ZUNIGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN658 ARMY nominations (91) beginning GINA E. ADAM, and ending D006403, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN659 ARMY nominations (17) beginning ASMA S. BUKHARI, and ending D005266, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN660 ARMY nominations (18) beginning STEVEN A. BATY, and ending CHAD A. WEDDELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN691 ARMY nomination of Karyn L. Armstrong, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN692 ARMY nomination of Jodi L. Smith, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN693 ARMY nomination of Jayme M. Sutton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN694 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ROBERT HWANG, and ending ANTHONY C. KIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN695 ARMY nominations (5) beginning FARRUKH HAMID, and ending ERIC W. SIMONS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN696 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JENNIFER L. FELTWELL, and ending JOSHUA P. STAUFFER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN697 ARMY nominations (2) beginning ANDREW C. BROWN, and ending JOHN W. EANES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN698 ARMY nominations (4) beginning COLLEEN M. MURPHY, and ending JAMES T. NORA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN699 ARMY nominations (4) beginning AMY A. BLANK, and ending PETER V. HUYNH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN700 ARMY nominations (8) beginning MARTI J. BISSELL, and ending CARLA S. ROMERO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN701 ARMY nominations (8) beginning DAVID A. AUCH, and ending JAMES M. ROLLINS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

IN THE COAST GUARD

PN432 COAST GUARD nominations (3) beginning MICHAEL J. PLUMLEY, and ending MARIETTE C. OGG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN556 COAST GUARD nomination of Kristin L. Conville, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2011.

PN557 COAST GUARD nomination of Edward L. Lacy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2011.

PN558 COAST GUARD nomination of Jason M. Biggar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2011.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN544 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (203) beginning Naadia Lisa Porter, and ending Mara R. Tekach-Ball, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2011.

IN THE NAVY

PN444 NAVY nomination of Jose Ayala, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN446 NAVY nomination of Michael B. Tanner, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN447 NAVY nomination of Kenneth S. Mitchell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN448 NAVY nomination of Gregory D. Mitchell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN449 NAVY nomination of Theresa H. Dewitt, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN450 NAVY nominations (2) beginning THOMAS J. LOPEZ, and ending GREGORY D. ROWE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN451 NAVY nominations (2) beginning RANDY L. CRYSEL, and ending SUSAN M. HELLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN452 NAVY nominations (2) beginning KATHERINE A. MCCABE, and ending JAY M. STANDRING, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN453 NAVY nominations (6) beginning MARK G. BENTON, and ending SCOTT W. THOMAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN454 NAVY nominations (4) beginning THOMAS M. ADKINS, and ending CHRISTOPHER T. SCHOLL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN455 NAVY nominations (45) beginning PETER B. BELL, and ending ERIC A. WILLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN456 NAVY nominations (17) beginning ERRIN P. ARMSTRONG, and ending LYLE D. STUFFLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN457 NAVY nominations (17) beginning BRIAN M. ACKERMAN, and ending FRANK J. ZELENKA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN458 NAVY nominations (11) beginning BRADLEY H. BOYER, and ending THOMAS J. VONKOLNITZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 2, 2011.

PN545 NAVY nomination of William L. Nooney, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 12, 2011.

PN596 NAVY nomination of Calvin B. Suffridge, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2011.

PN597 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ELIZABETH J. JACKSON, and ending JOHN M. MIYAHARA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2011.

PN606 NAVY nomination of Jeffrey R. Macris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN607 NAVY nomination of Toby C. Swain, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN608 NAVY nomination of Daniel J. Hernandez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN609 NAVY nominations (4) beginning RAYMOND R. DELGADO, III, and ending STEVEN P. SOPKO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN610 NAVY nominations (5) beginning JOHN S. CRAWMER, and ending JOSEPH A. RODRIGUEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN611 NAVY nominations (6) beginning CLIFFORD W. BEAN, III, and ending ANDREW D. STEWART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN612 NAVY nominations (6) beginning STEVEN J. AVERETT, and ending JOHN A. WATKINS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN613 NAVY nominations (7) beginning LOUIS W. ARNY, IV, and ending BRIAN A. TREAT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN614 NAVY nominations (8) beginning CHRISTOPHER D. BOWNDS, and ending KARIN A. VERNAZZA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN615 NAVY nominations (9) beginning JAMES T. DENLEY, and ending THOMAS B. WEBBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN616 NAVY nominations (9) beginning ELIZABETH J. FRENCH, and ending YVONNE TAPIA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN617 NAVY nominations (10) beginning THOMAS W. ARMSTRONG, and ending JAMES S. TALBERT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN618 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JOHN W. CARSON, III, and ending CHARLES S. WILLMORE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN619 NAVY nominations (12) beginning KARL A. ANDINA, and ending NORMAN M. TOBLER, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN620 NAVY nominations (13) beginning SYED N. AHMAD, and ending SCOTT F. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN621 NAVY nominations (17) beginning THOMAS J. ANDERSON, and ending ALLAN R. WALTERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN622 NAVY nominations (17) beginning KYLE B. BECKMAN, and ending TRACY A. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN623 NAVY nominations (21) beginning TIMOTHY A. ACKERMAN, and ending RANDALL J. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN624 NAVY nominations (26) beginning ANTHONY A. ARITA, and ending JONATHAN P. WILCOX, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN625 NAVY nominations (26) beginning RAYMOND W. BICHARD, and ending EDWARD L. ZAWISLAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN626 NAVY nominations (90) beginning KARLYNA L. D. ANDERSEN, and ending TARA J. ZIEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN627 NAVY nominations (183) beginning LYNN ACHESON, and ending JOHN M. ZUZICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 26, 2011.

PN645 NAVY nomination of Roger S. Thompson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN646 NAVY nomination of Monserrat Jorden, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN647 NAVY nomination of Timothy W. Grasmick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2011.

PN661 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEANETTE D. GROENEVELD, and ending JOHN T. SCHOFIELD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN662 NAVY nominations (275) beginning DAVID A. ABERNATHY, and ending JAMES G. ZOULIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN663 NAVY nominations (18) beginning KERTRECK V. BROOKS, and ending MICHAEL G. WHEELER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN664 NAVY nominations (35) beginning JOHN A. ANDERSON, and ending BENJAMIN D. ZITTERE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN665 NAVY nominations (10) beginning RYAN G. BATCHELOR, and ending CHRISTOPHER M. SYLVESTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN666 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JAMES M. BELMONT, and ending DAVID A. VONDRAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN667 NAVY nominations (12) beginning GREGORY A. FRANCIOCH, and ending WILLIAM J. YODER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN668 NAVY nominations (7) beginning MICHAEL CORNELIUS, and ending DOUGLAS T. WAHL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN669 NAVY nominations (14) beginning JAMES W. ADKISSON, III, and ending SHERRI R. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN670 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARC C. FRYMAN, and ending JAMES J. WATSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN671 NAVY nominations (42) beginning CHRISTOPHER R. ANDERSON, and ending DAVID P. WOLYNSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN672 NAVY nominations (54) beginning AMY R. ALCORN, and ending MICHAEL A.

ZURICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 9, 2011.

PN702 NAVY nomination of Gregory A. Pinkley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN703 NAVY nomination of Li Sung, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN704 NAVY nomination of Gregory C. Pedro, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN705 NAVY nomination of Chad W. Gagnon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN706 NAVY nomination of Julie R. Wetmore, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN707 NAVY nomination of Phillip E. Lee, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN708 NAVY nominations (2) beginning PAUL D. HANSON, and ending MICHAEL J. STIGLITZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011

PN709 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CARMEN I. BOIS, and ending BRENT B. HUTSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN710 NAVY nominations (3) beginning CHRISTOPHER A. ASSELTA, and ending ERNST K. WALGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN711 NAVY nominations (3) beginning REBECCA L. DUNAVENT, and ending CHRISTINE C. RIVERA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN712 NAVY nominations (11) beginning HEATHER C. BEASLEY, and ending RUSSELL J. VERBY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN713 NAVY nominations (8) beginning KEVIN J. BARTOL, and ending BRUCE J. WEIDNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

PN714 NAVY nominations (12) beginning SHANE A. BOWEN, and ending WARREN D. WOLLIN, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 16, 2011.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to Senator SANDERS and Senator LEAHY, my longtime friend, former employee in the Department of Justice Ron Wyche, and the Attorney General and others for working to help us get through this stalemate in which we were involved.

NOMINATION OF DAVID S. COHEN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I support the confirmation of David S. Cohen to be Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes. Mr. Cohen previously served as the Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, and has previously served in the Department of the Treasury's General Counsel's Office. His strong record of service is commendable and his expertise will serve him well in this new role.

Mr. Cohen's nomination has been carefully considered by the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, both of which favorably reported the nomination of Mr. Cohen to the full Senate.

The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over some of the crimes that Mr. Cohen will fight in his new role at the Department, both at the international and domestic level. I appreciate Mr. Cohen's commitment to me that he will make himself available to the Committee on the Judiciary for hearings and activities within the committee's legislative and oversight jurisdiction that overlap with the Undersecretary's responsibilities. As the committee considers terrorism financing, material support for terrorism, and money laundering, among other topics, I look forward to working with Mr. Cohen.

NOMINATIONS DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from the following nominations: PN 678 Public Health Service nominations beginning with Mary J.W. Choi and ending with Christopher P. Morris; that the nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar; the nominations be confirmed en bloc; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that there be no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be surgeon

Mary J. W. Choi

To be dental officer

Brooks B. Horan

To be senior assistant dental officer

Ethan F. Higson

To be assistant dental officer

Tiara L. Applequist
Timothy B. House
Cara B. Schriner
Lauren B. Sims
Meredith A. Snyder

To be nurse officer

Patina S. Walton-Geer

To be assistant nurse officer

Michelle A. Krayer
Heidi M. Sabol

To be junior assistant nurse officer

Kenia P. Altamirano
Shannon C. Best
Rebecca M. Kibel
Timothy N. Onserio
Herbert P. Partsch
Justin R. Plott
Brandy Torres

To be junior assistant health services officer

Jaren T. Meldrum
Christopher P. Morris

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of the following nominations:

PN341, MG Michael J. Walsh, U.S. Army, to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission; PN342, RADM Jonathan W. Bailey, NOAA, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; that the nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Major General Michael J. Walsh, United States Army, to be a Member and President of the Mississippi River Commission.

Rear Admiral Jonathan W. Bailey, NOAA, to be a Member of the Mississippi River Commission.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for another hour, for debate only, and that Senators be allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 79; that the nomination be confirmed; that any statement related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Daniel M. Ashe, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 165, and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 165) designating July 23, 2011, as National Day of the American Cowboy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 165) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 165

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as ''cowboys'', helped establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of the culture of the United States for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the Nation who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, and rodeo is one of the most-watched sports in the Nation;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an icon in the United States; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 23, 2011, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

HONORING ADMIRAL THAD ALLEN, U.S. COAST GUARD, RETIRED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 170, and that the Senate then proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 170) honoring Admiral Thad Allen of the United States Coast Guard (Ret.) for his lifetime of selfless commitment and exemplary service to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 170) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 170

Whereas Admiral Thad Allen, the 23rd Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, retired from the Coast Guard on June 30, 2010, after 39 distinguished years of service;

Whereas Admiral Allen graduated from the United States Coast Guard Academy in 1971 and served in a number of capacities, including serving as the Principal Federal Official for response and recovery operation for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, Coast Guard Chief of Staff, and most recently as National Incident Commander for the Deepwater Horizon Disaster in the Gulf of Mexico;

Whereas Admiral Allen commanded with distinction the foremost Coast Guard in the world from 2006 to 2010 and has embodied the Coast Guard's enduring values of honor, respect, and devotion to duty;

Whereas Admiral Allen, during his tenure as Commandant, focused the Coast Guard on modernization and improved readiness in responding to natural disasters;

Whereas Admiral Allen, during his tenure as Commandant, worked to ensure the safety of professional mariners and millions of recreational and commercial vessels, facilitate commerce, protect the ports and maritime infrastructure of the United States from terrorism, conduct humanitarian operations, protect our marine environment, secure United States borders, combat drug trafficking, support anti-piracy efforts, and support Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas Admiral Allen demonstrated the vision and transformational leadership that will provide the United States with a Coast Guard that is not only capable of meeting and exceeding the ever-changing maritime challenges of the United States, but also able to better anticipate future challenges and missions;

Whereas Admiral Allen provided steady leadership in times of crisis;

Whereas as Dwight Eisenhower, the 34th President of the United States once said, ''The qualities of a great man are vision, integrity, courage, understanding, the power of articulation, and profundity of character''; and

Whereas as we bid fair winds and following seas to Admiral Allen, it is appropriate that he be remembered as exemplifying such trademark characteristics exhibited by great leaders: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(a) recognizes and honors Admiral Thad Allen of the United States Coast Guard (retired), on behalf of a grateful Nation, for his lifetime of selfless commitment and exemplary service; and

(b) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to Admiral Thad Allen.

CONGRATULATING THE SOIL SCIENCE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 224.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 224) congratulating the Soil Science Society of America on its 75th anniversary.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 224

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America was founded on November 18, 1936;

Whereas Richard Bradfield served as the first President of the Soil Science Society of America;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America was established during the dust bowl era, a time of extreme soil degradation;

Whereas since the dust bowl era, the Soil Science Society of America has continued to provide an understanding of the sustainable use of soil and the role soil plays in society;

Whereas soil is an essential natural resource, and soil professionals serve a critical role in managing that resource;

Whereas the core purpose of the Soil Science Society of America is to advance soils as fundamental to life;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America is 1 of the premier scientific societies and is comprised of more than 6,000 members in the United States and internationally, including scientists, practicing professionals, and students;

Whereas soil is a dynamic system that performs many functions and services vital to human activities and ecosystems;

Whereas soil, plant, animal, and human health are intricately linked, and the sustainable use of soil affects climate, water,

and air quality, human health, biodiversity, food safety and security, and bioenergy;

Whereas soil faces increasing human-linked threats from contamination, unplanned urban development, desertification, salinization, mismanagement, and erosion;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America provides the knowledge and tools to ensure sustainable use of soils in support of societal needs, including food and energy security and ecosystem services;

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America promotes the awareness and education of soils to elementary and secondary students, undergraduate and graduate students, practicing professionals, and the public; and

Whereas the Soil Science Society of America promotes effective research, disseminating scientific information, facilitating technology transfer, fostering high standards of education, maintaining high standards of ethics, promoting advancements in the soils profession, and cooperating with other organizations with similar objectives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Soil Science Society of America on its 75th anniversary;

(2) commends the Soil Science Society of America for its dedicated service to advance the science and management of soil; and

(3) supports the promise of the Soil Science Society of America to continue to enrich the lives of all people of the United States by improving stewardship of the environment, combating world hunger, and enhancing the quality of life for the future.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA BASEBALL TEAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 225) congratulating the University of South Carolina baseball team for its gritty and record-breaking pursuit of back-to-back National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Baseball National Championships.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 225) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 225

Congratulating the University of South Carolina baseball team for its gritty and record-breaking pursuit of back-to-back National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Baseball National Championships.

Whereas, on June 28, 2011, the University of South Carolina Gamecocks won the 2011 National Collegiate Athletic Association College World Series with a 5–2 victory over the University of Florida Gators at TD Ameritrade Park in Omaha, Nebraska;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team has secured the University's second national championship in men's athletics since the founding of the University in 1801;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team became just the sixth team in college baseball history to win back-to-back national championships;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team won a record 11 consecutive games at the College World Series;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team won a record 16 consecutive games at the National Collegiate Athletic Association baseball tournament;

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team, in its 10th appearance at the College World Series, became the first team to go 10–0 in the National Collegiate Athletic Association tournament;

Whereas head coach Ray Tanner won his second national title as Head Coach in his 15th season at the University of South Carolina;

Whereas second baseman Scott Wingo was named Most Outstanding Player of the 2011 College World Series;

Whereas first baseman Christian Walker, catcher Robert Berry, second baseman Scott Wingo, shortstop Peter Mooney, pitchers Michael Roth and Matt Price, and designated hitter Brady Thomas were named to the 2011 College World Series All-Tournament Team;

Whereas the State of South Carolina was proud to send the University of South Carolina baseball team to the College World Series for the second consecutive season; and

Whereas the University of South Carolina baseball team is the 2011 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Baseball Champion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of South Carolina Gamecocks for winning the 2011 National Collegiate Athletic Association College World Series;

(2) recognizes the achievement and dedication of all players, coaches, and support staff who battled and made winning 2 consecutive national championships possible;

(3) congratulates the people of South Carolina, the University of South Carolina, and Carolina Gamecocks fans everywhere; and

(4) requests that the Secretary of the Senate submit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) Dr. Harris Pastides, President of the University of South Carolina;

(B) Eric Hyman, Director of Athletics at the University of South Carolina; and

(C) Ray Tanner, Head Coach of the University of South Carolina baseball team.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1317 AND S. 1323

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the following bills which are at the desk be considered to have been read twice en bloc and placed on the calendar: S. 1317 from Senator DEMINT, S. 1323 from Senator REID of Nevada.

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

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AUTHORIZING THE LIMITED USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SUPPORT OF THE NATO MISSION IN LIBYA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 20) authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya.

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res. 20, a joint resolution authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya.

Harry Reid, John F. Kerry, Daniel K. Inouye, Jeff Bingaman, Joseph I. Lieberman, Benjamin L. Cardin, Al Franken, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Ben Nelson, Jeanne Shaheen, Mark R. Warner, Dianne Feinstein, Bill Nelson, Mark Udall.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture occur at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, July 5, and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 1, 2011, AND TUESDAY, JULY 5, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., on Friday, July 1, for a pro forma session only, with no business conducted; that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 1, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m., on Tuesday, July 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed

to Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res. 20, the Kerry-McCain resolution regarding Libya.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the first vote will occur next Tuesday, July 5, at 5 p.m., on cloture on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 20. We will run longer than usual to accommodate Senators returning after the Independence Day holiday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent we adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:51 p.m., adjourned until Friday, July 1, 2011, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS CHARLES KRAJESKI, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF BAHRAIN.

ROBERT A. MANDELL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LUXEMBOURG.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW, THE FOLLOWING FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION:

To be captain

RICHARD R. WINGROVE
JOHN J. ADLER
ERIC W. BERKOWITZ
JON D. SWALLOW
JOSEPH A. PICA

To be commander

MARK M. SWEENEY
DEVIN R. BRAKOB
JOE C. BISHOP
PETER V. SIEGEL
MICHAEL F. ELLIS
NANCY L. ASH
ELIZABETH I. JONES

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTIAN J. SLOAN
JUSTIN N. KIBBEY
DONALD E. BEAUCAGE
KATHERINE R. PEET
PATRICK D. DIDIER
NICOLA S. VERPLANCK
COLIN D. LITTLE

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

STEVEN T. LOY
ALEXANDER G. JOHNSTON
ALICE E. DRURY
LEIGH C. HEDGEPETH
ADAM C. PFUNDT
AMBER M. PAYNE
JASON P. WILSON
ALISE N. PARRISH
LINH K. NGUYEN

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY J. W. CHOI AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. MORRIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

MAJOR GENERAL MICHAEL J. WALSH, UNITED STATES ARMY, TO BE A MEMBER AND PRESIDENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

REAR ADMIRAL JONATHAN W. BAILEY, NOAA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30, 2011:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

DANIEL M. ASHE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

JENNI RANE LECOMPTE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

DAVID S. COHEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES.

TIMOTHY G. MASSAD, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW, THE FOLLOWING FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.

To be rear admiral (lower half)

MICHAEL S. DEVANY

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271:

To be rear admiral upper half

REAR ADM. (LH) VINCENT B. ATKINS
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT E. DAY, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN H. KORN
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM D. LEE
REAR ADM. (LH) STEPHEN E. MEHLING
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES D. MICHEL
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL N. PARKS
REAR ADM. (LH) SANDRA E. STOSZ

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FELICIA C. ADAMS, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

RONALD W. SHARPE, OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

GEORGE LAMAR BECK, JR., OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

RICHARD C. HOWORTH, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2015.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WILLIAM CHARLES OSTENDORFF, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2016.

THE JUDICIARY

WILMA ANTOINETTE LEWIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

THOMAS GRAY WALKER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

CHARLES F. SALINA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

ROBERT WILLIAM MATHIESON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

JUAN MATTOS JR., OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MAJOR GENERAL MARILYN A. QUAGLIOTTI, USAF (RET.), OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR SUPPLY REDUCTION, OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ALFRED COOPER LOMAX, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DAVID L. MCNULTY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RYAN C. CROCKER, OF WASHINGTON, PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

DAVID H. PETRAEUS, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT R. ALLARDICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRADLEY A. HEITHOLD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STANLEY E. CLARKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. PAUL J. SELVA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TERRENCE A. FEEHAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. JAMES D. THURMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KATHLEEN M. GAINEY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN A. HAMMOND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES T. WALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN L. JONES
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD W. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL MARCIA M. ANDERSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM G. BEARD
BRIGADIER GENERAL NICKOLAS P. TOOLIATOS
BRIGADIER GENERAL JIMMIE J. WELLS

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MARGARETT E. BARNES

COLONEL ROBERT D. CARLSON
COLONEL SCOTTIE D. CARPENTER
COLONEL ALLAN W. ELLIOTT
COLONEL THOMAS P. EVANS
COLONEL JANICE M. HAIGLER
COLONEL KURT A. HARDIN
COLONEL KENNETH D. JONES
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER R. KEMP
COLONEL MICHAEL A. MANN
COLONEL JAMES H. MASON
COLONEL CYNTHIA A. O'CONNELL
COLONEL ALAN L. STOLTE
COLONEL GEORGE R. THOMPSON
COLONEL TRACY A. THOMPSON
COLONEL KEVIN R. TURNER
COLONEL BRYAN W. WAMPLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KEITH M. HUBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. A. C. ROPER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DANIEL P. BOLGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN F. CAMPBELL

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES K. BROWN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ANTONIO J. VICENS-GONZALEZ

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. JOHN R. ALLEN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARK J. BELTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GEORGE W. BALLANCE
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBIN R. BRAUN
REAR ADM. (LH) RUSSELL S. PENNIMAN IV
REAR ADM. (LH) GARY W. ROSHOLT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ALTHEA H. COETZEE
CAPT. VALERIE K. HUEGEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN SANDRA E. ADAMS
CAPTAIN MARK L. LEAVITT
CAPTAIN JON G. MATHESON
CAPTAIN KERRY M. METZ
CAPTAIN JOHN F. WEIGOLD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS C. TRAAEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM M. ROBERTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. WILLIAM H. MCRAVEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN G. KING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM E. LEIGHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANNIE B. ANDREWS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ROBERT V. HOPPA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10,U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN RICHARD W. BUTLER
CAPTAIN MATTHEW J. CARTER
CAPTAIN LAWRENCE E. CREEVY
CAPTAIN MARK W. DARRAH
CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY
CAPTAIN MICHAEL E. JABALEY, JR.
CAPTAIN COLIN J. KILRAIN
CAPTAIN DAVID M. KRIETE
CAPTAIN JOSEPH W. KUZMICK
CAPTAIN WILLIAM C. MCQUILKIN
CAPTAIN VICTORINO G. MERCADO
CAPTAIN DEWOLFE H. MILLER
CAPTAIN STUART B. MUNSCH
CAPTAIN KENNETH M. PERRY
CAPTAIN FERNANDEZ L. PONDS
CAPTAIN JOHN C. SCORBY, JR.
CAPTAIN DWIGHT D. SHEPHERD
CAPTAIN MICHAEL E. SMITH
CAPTAIN RICHARD P. SNYDER
CAPTAIN SCOTT A. STEARNEY
CAPTAIN HUGH D. WETHERALD

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LEWIS ALAN LUKENS, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA-BISSAU.

KENNETH J. FAIRFAX, OF KENTUCKY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN.

D. BRENT HARDT, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA.

DONALD W. KORAN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF RWANDA.

GEETA PASI, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF DJIBOUTI.

JAMES HAROLD THESSIN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY.

LISA J. KUBISKE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS.

MICHAEL H. CORBIN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.

JEANINE E. JACKSON, OF WYOMING, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALAWI.

MATTHEW H. TUELLER, OF UTAH, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF KUWAIT.

SUSAN LAILA ZIADEH, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF QATAR.

ANNE W. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA

DERETH BRITT GLANCE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A COMMISSIONER ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

RICHARD M. MOY, OF MONTANA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ARIEL PABLOS-MENDEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD A. EADS AND ENDING WITH NICHOLE L. INGALLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2011.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY B. WARNER AND ENDING WITH GARY S. WOLLAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHAUN A. PRICE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. BRADEN AND ENDING WITH CM DYER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MATTHEW B. PHILLIPS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. LOESCHER AND ENDING WITH LESLIE W. ROBERSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC G. PUTTLER AND ENDING WITH PRASAD V. YALAVARTHI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES L. BENJAMIN AND ENDING WITH GILBERTO RUIZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ENRIQUE A. ARANIZ AND ENDING WITH CLIFFORD W. WILKINS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 7, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC D. AGUILA AND ENDING WITH OMAYA H. YOUSSEF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALFRED C. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH MARK A. VANCE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY S. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH HEATHER L. ZUNIGA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GINA E. ADAM AND ENDING WITH D006403, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ASMA S. BUKHARI AND ENDING WITH D005266, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN A. BATY AND ENDING WITH CHAD A. WEDDELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KARYN L. ARMSTRONG, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JODI L. SMITH, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAYME M. SUTTON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT HWANG AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY C. KIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FARRUKH HAMID AND ENDING WITH ERIC W. SIMONS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER L. FELTWELL AND ENDING WITH JOSHUA P. STAUFFER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW C. BROWN AND ENDING WITH JOHN W. EANES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COLLEEN M. MURPHY AND ENDING WITH JAMES T. NORA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AMY A. BLANK AND ENDING WITH PETER V. HUYNH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARTI J. BISSELL AND ENDING WITH CARLA S. ROMERO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. AUCH AND ENDING WITH JAMES M. ROLLINS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOSE AYALA, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL B. TANNER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KENNETH S. MITCHELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY D. MITCHELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF THERESA H. DEWITT, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS J. LOPEZ AND ENDING WITH GREGORY D. ROWE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANDY L. CRYSEL AND ENDING WITH SUSAN M. HELLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KATHERINE A. MCCABE AND ENDING WITH JAY M. STANDRING, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK G. BENTON AND ENDING WITH SCOTT W. THOMAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS M. ADKINS AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER T. SCHOLL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PETER B. BELL AND ENDING WITH ERIC A. WILLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERRIN P. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH LYLE D. STUFFLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN M. ACKERMAN AND ENDING WITH FRANK J. ZELENKA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADLEY H. BOYER AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. VONKOLNITZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM L. NOONEY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CALVIN B. SUFFRIDGE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELIZABETH J. JACKSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN M. MIYAHARA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JEFFREY R. MACRIS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TOBY C. SWAIN, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANIEL J. HERNANDEZ, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAYMOND R. DELGADO III AND ENDING WITH STEVEN P. SOPKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN S. CRAWMER AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH A. RODRIGUEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CLIFFORD W. BEAN III AND ENDING WITH ANDREW D. STEWART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN J. AVERETT AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. WATKINS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LOUIS W. ARNY IV AND ENDING WITH BRIAN A. TREAT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER D. BOWNDS AND ENDING WITH KARIN A. VERNAZZA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES T. DENLEY AND ENDING WITH THOMAS B. WEBBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELIZABETH J. FRENCH AND ENDING WITH YVONNE TAPIA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS W. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH JAMES S. TALBERT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN W. CARSON III AND ENDING WITH CHARLES S. WILLMORE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARL A. ANDINA AND ENDING WITH NORMAN M. TOBLER II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SYED N. AHMAD AND ENDING WITH SCOTT F. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS J. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ALLAN R. WALTERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KYLE B. BECKMAN AND ENDING WITH TRACY A. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY A. ACKERMAN AND ENDING WITH RANDALL J. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY A. ARITA AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN P. WILCOX, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAYMOND W. BICHARD AND ENDING WITH EDWARD L. ZAWISLAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARLYNA L. D. ANDERSEN AND ENDING WITH TARA J. ZIEBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LYNN ACHESON AND ENDING WITH JOHN M. ZUZICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 26, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROGER S. THOMPSON, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MONSERRAT JORDEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY W. GRASMICK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEANETTE D. GROENEVELD AND ENDING WITH JOHN T. SCHOFIELD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. ABERNATHY AND ENDING WITH JAMES G. ZOULIAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KERTRECK V. BROOKS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL G. WHEELER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN A. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH BENJAMIN D. ZITTERE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RYAN G. BATCHELOR AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER M. SYLVESTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES M. BELMONT AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. VONDRAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY A. FRANCIOCH AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM J. YODER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL CORNELIUS AND ENDING WITH DOUGLAS T. WAHL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES W. ADKISSON III AND ENDING WITH SHERRI R. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARC C. FRYMAN AND ENDING WITH JAMES J. WATSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH DAVID P. WOLYNSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AMY R. ALCORN AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. ZURICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 9, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY A. PINKLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LI SUNG, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY C. PEDRO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHAD W. GAGNON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JULIE R. WETMORE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PHILLIP E. LEE, JR., TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL D. HANSON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. STIGLITZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARMEN I. BOIS AND ENDING WITH BRENT B. HUTSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER A. ASSELTA AND ENDING WITH ERNST K. WALGE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA L. DUNAVENT AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINE C. RIVERA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATHER C. BEASLEY AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL J. VERBY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN J. BARTOL AND ENDING WITH BRUCE J. WEIDNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHANE A. BOWEN AND ENDING WITH WARREN D. WOLLIN II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. PLUMLEY AND ENDING WITH MARIETTE C. OGG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 2, 2011.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF KRISTIN L. CONVILLE, TO BE LIEUTENANT.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF EDWARD L. LACY, TO BE LIEUTENANT.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF JASON M. BIGGAR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NAADIA LISA PORTER AND ENDING WITH MARA R. TEKACH-BALL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 12, 2011.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

MAJOR GENERAL MICHAEL J. WALSH, UNITED STATES ARMY, TO BE A MEMBER AND PRESIDENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

REAR ADMIRAL JONATHAN W. BAILEY, NOAA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY J. W. CHOI AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. MORRIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 16, 2011.

CORRECTION

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4243–S4308

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1305–1323, and S. Res. 223–225. **Pages S4291–92**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 112–29) **Page S4291**

Measures Passed:

National Day of the American Cowboy: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 165, designating July 23, 2011, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S4304**

Honoring Admiral Thad Allen: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 170, honoring Admiral Thad Allen of the United States Coast Guard (Ret.) for his lifetime of selfless commitment and exemplary service to the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S4304**

Soil Science Society of America 75th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 224, congratulating the Soil Science Society of America on its 75th anniversary. **Pages S4304–05**

Congratulating the University of South Carolina Baseball Team: Senate agreed to S. Res. 225, congratulating the University of South Carolina baseball team for its gritty and record-breaking pursuit of back-to-back National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Baseball National Championships. **Page S4305**

Measures Considered:

Limited Use of U.S. Armed Forces in Libya Resolution—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 20, authorizing the limited use of the United States Armed Forces in support of the NATO mission in Libya. **Page S4305**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, June 30, 2011, a vote on cloture will occur at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, July 5, 2011. **Page S4305**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 1, 2011, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m., on Tuesday, July 5, 2011, and that following any Leader remarks, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 20. **Pages S4305–06**

Finance Committee—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the order with respect to the Committee on Finance of Wednesday, June 29, 2011, be vitiated. **Page S4244**

Second Reading—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that S. 1317 and S. 1323, be considered to have been read twice, en bloc, and placed on the Calendar. **Page S4305**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. EX. 104), David H. Petraeus, of New Hampshire, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. **Pages S4255–68**

Daniel M. Ashe, of Maryland, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Jenni Rane LeCompte, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

David S. Cohen, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

Major General Marilyn A. Quagliotti, USAF (Ret.), of Virginia, to be Deputy Director for Supply Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Wilma Antoinette Lewis, of the District of Columbia, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Thomas Gray Walker, of North Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina for the term of four years.

Felicia C. Adams, of Mississippi, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years.

Alfred Cooper Lomax, of Missouri, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Charles F. Salina, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of New York for the term of four years.

Ronald W. Sharpe, of the Virgin Islands, to be United States Attorney for the District of the Virgin Islands for the term of four years.

Robert William Mathieson, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.

Juan Mattos, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States Marshal for the District of New Jersey for the term of four years.

Dereth Britt Glance, of New York, to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

Richard M. Moy, of Montana, to be a Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.

Major General Michael J. Walsh, United States Army, to be a Member and President of the Mississippi River Commission. (Prior to this action, Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration.)

Pages S4299–S4303, S4306–08

Rear Admiral Jonathan W. Bailey, NOAA, to be a Member of the Mississippi River Commission. (Prior to this action, Committee on Environment and Public Works was discharged from further consideration.) **Page S4303, S4306**

Lewis Alan Lukens, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Ariel Pablos-Mendez, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Richard C. Howorth, of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2015.

Kenneth J. Fairfax, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kazakhstan.

George Lamar Beck, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Alabama for the term of four years.

David L. McNulty, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of New York for the term of four years.

D. Brent Hardt, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana.

Donald W. Koran, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda.

Geeta Pasi, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Djibouti.

Timothy G. Massad, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

James Harold Thessin, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Paraguay.

Lisa J. Kubiske, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras.

William Charles Ostendorff, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2016.

Ryan C. Crocker, of Washington, Personal Rank of Career Ambassador, to be Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Michael H. Corbin, of California, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates.

Jeanine E. Jackson, of Wyoming, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Malawi.

Matthew H. Tueller, of Utah, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait.

Susan Laila Ziadeh, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar.

Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

5 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

34 Army nominations in the rank of general.

8 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

1 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration nomination in the rank of admiral.

40 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, and Navy.

Pages S4299–S4303, S4306–08

Routine list in the Public Health Service. (Prior to this action, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions was discharged from further consideration.) **Page S4303**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Deborah A. P. Hersman, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years.

Thomas Charles Krajeski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Robert A. Mandell, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Luxembourg.

A routine list in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. **Page S4306**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: Pages S4244, S4290, S4305

Executive Communications: Pages S4290–91

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S4292–93

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S4293–98

Additional Statements: Pages S4287–90

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Pages S4298–99

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S4299

Privileges of the Floor: Page S4299

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—104) Page S4268

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:51 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Friday, July 1, 2011. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4306.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 2055, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Security and International Trade and Finance concluded a hearing to examine stakeholder perspectives on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, after receiving testimony from Osvaldo Luis Gratacos, Inspector General, Export-Import Bank of the United States; and Clay Thompson, Caterpillar, Inc., Douglas Norlen, Pacific Environment, and David Ickert, Air Tractor, Inc., all of Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), focusing on deposit insurance, consumer protection, and financial stability, after receiving testimony from Sheila C. Bair, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGULATIONS OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety concluded an oversight hearing to examine a review of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations replacing the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) and the Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR), after receiving testimony from Regina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; Collin O'Mara, Delaware Secretary of the Environment and Energy, Dover; Bryan W. Shaw, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Chairman, Austin; Susan F. Tierney, Analysis Group, Boston, Massachusetts; Barbara Walz, Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc., Westminster, Colorado; and David O. Carpenter, University at Albany Institute for Health and Environment, Rensselaer, New York.

STATE OF DEMOCRACY IN THE AMERICAS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Peace Corps and Global Narcotics Affairs concluded a hearing to examine the state of democracy in the Americas, after receiving testimony from Roberta Jacobson, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs (WHA); Michael Reid, The Economist, London, United Kingdom; Jorge I. Dominguez, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts; and Daniel W. Fisk, International Republican Institute (IRI), Washington, D.C.

AFGHANISTAN RECONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight concluded a hearing to examine Afghanistan reconstruction contracts, focusing on lessons learned and ongoing problems, and actions needed to address contract oversight and vetting on non-United States vendors in Afghanistan, after receiving testimony from William M. Solis, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office; David S. Sedney, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Central Asia, and Kim D. Denver, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Procurement, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, both of the Department of Defense; J. Alexander Thier, Assistant to the Administrator, and Director, Office of Afghanistan and Pakistan Affairs, United States Agency for International Development; Larry D. Walker, The Louis Berger Group, Inc., Washington, D.C.; and Wahid Hakki, Contrack International, Inc., Mclean, Virginia.

NATIVE CULTURE, LANGUAGE, AND ACCESS FOR SUCCESS IN SCHOOLS ACT

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1262, to improve Indian education, after receiving testimony from William Mendoza, Acting Director, White House Initiative for Tribal Colleges and Universities, Department of Education; Keith Moore, Director, Bureau of Indian Education, Department of the Interior; Cedric Cromwell, Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, Mashpee, Massachusetts, on behalf of the United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc.; Scott Russell, National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), Crow Agency, Montana; Amy Bowers, Native American Rights Fund (NARF), Boulder, Colorado; Dayna Brave Eagle, Oglala Sioux Tribe, Kyle, South Dakota; and Jessica Imotichey, Chickasaw Nation, Washington, D.C.

FINANCIAL FRAUD ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force, including S. 890, to establish the supplemental fraud fighting account, after receiving testimony from B. Todd Jones, United States Attorney, District of Minnesota, Chairman, Attorney General's Advisory Committee, and Robb Adkins, Executive Director, Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force, both of the Department of Justice.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, July 1, 2011 in pro forma session.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D699)*

H.R. 2279, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend the airport improvement program. Signed on June 29, 2011. (Public Law 112–21)

S. 349, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4865 Tallmadge Road in Rootstown, Ohio, as the "Marine Sgt. Jeremy E. Murray Post Office". Signed on June 29, 2011. (Public Law 112–22)

S. 655, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 95 Dogwood Street in Cary, Mississippi, as the "Spencer Byrd Powers, Jr. Post Office". Signed on June 29, 2011. (Public Law 112–23)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 1, 2011

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Friday, July 1

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Friday, July 1

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in pro forma session at 10 a.m.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.