jurisdiction—Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs—or not; whether they were a Democrat or not. To my knowledge, he has met with all of us who wanted to spend time with him.

The last thing I would say—and one of the things I found so refreshing—is that he is not a political guy. This is someone who is a scientist. He is a statistician. He is good at leading a large organization. He gets this stuff. He enjoys this stuff. How lucky we are to get someone who wants to take on this challenge for us in our Nation's history.

For these reasons and others that Senator COLLINS and I have mentioned, he deserves our support. I hope in 10 minutes or so, when we have the opportunity to vote, we will vote for him in very large, overwhelming numbers.

Madam President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty seconds remain.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant 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 nomination of Robert M. Groves, of Michigan, to be Director of the Census.

Harry Reid, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Christopher J. Dodd, Arlen Specter, Richard J. Durbin, Mark Begich, Mark Udall, Michael F. Bennet, Jeff Bingaman, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Frank R. Lautenberg, Blanche L. Lincoln, Tom Udall, Bill Nelson, Byron L. Dorgan, Claire McCaskill, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Robert M. Groves, of Michigan, to be Director of the Census, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Akaka	Franken	McConnell
Alexander	Gillibrand	Menendez
Baucus	Graham	Merkley
Bayh	Grassley	Mikulski
Begich	Gregg	Murkowski
Bennet	Hagan	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Hatch	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Inhofe	Pryor
Brown	Inouye	Reed
Burr	Johanns	Reid
Burris	Johnson	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaufman	Schumer
Cardin	Kerry	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Snowe
Casey	Kohl	Specter
Coburn	Kyl	Tester
Cochran	Landrieu	Thune
Collins	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Corker	Levin	Warner
Dodd	Lieberman	Webb
Dorgan	Lincoln	Whitehouse
Durbin	Martinez	Wyden
Feingold	McCain	
Feinstein	McCaskill	

NAYS—15

Barrasso	Crapo	Roberts
Brownback	Ensign	Sessions
Bunning	Enzi	Shelby
Chambliss	Isakson	Vitter
Cornyn	Risch	Wicker

NOT VOTING—9

Bennett	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Stabenow
DeMint	Lugar	Voinovich

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 15. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the confirmation of the nominee.

The nomination was confirmed.

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.)

• Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I was necessarily absent for tonight's vote on the nomination of Robert M. Groves, of Michigan, to be Director of the Bureau of the Census at the Department of Commerce. I was in Michigan attending an event with the Secretary of Agriculture. Had I been present for the vote on this nomination, I would have voted in favor of both the motion to invoke cloture and on confirmation of the nomination.•

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—Continued

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I rise this evening to express my opposition to the Levin-McCain amendment which would cut short the production of the F–22 fighter. I understand my position on this puts me at odds with our President, President Obama, as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, both fine public servants for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect and with whom I have worked on numerous occasions, and I look forward to doing so in the future once we get beyond this.

I also think I have a duty to stand up for an airplane built by constituents of mine. I wouldn't make the case strictly on job loss in an individual State. That is not a legitimate argument to make to 99 of my colleagues from around the country. If we made the case that job losses would occur in our own respective districts or States, obviously it would lead to chaos and we wouldn't have a situation like that.

My argument in support of this F–22 goes far beyond the potential job losses in my State, although that is not insignificant. Some 2,000 jobs could be lost potentially in Connecticut. More important than the job loss, as important as that is, is the potential loss of the industrial base that is absolutely critical to maintaining the ability to produce the superior engines that we historically have been able to produce at the Pratt & Whitney Division of United Technologies, a corporation in my home State. The work being done by machinists and engineers and technicians in my State and others all across the country not only produce quality work but also make a significant difference in saving lives and in giving us the superior ability to deal with potential threats that our Nation faces. That has been a hallmark of every generation that has come before us, not to achieve parity with potential adversaries but to be in a superior position to potential adversaries.

So let me begin with my concerns over this amendment's potential impact on our national security. Since the advent of modern warfare, military strategists have sought the highest

ground on the battlefield to gain technical advantage. In the age of the fighter jet, that means commanding the skies. In a modern era, air superiority has become a cornerstone of American strategy. The F–22 is the reason we can lay claim to this superiority at this critical time. It is a fast plane, reaching speeds of mach 1.5 in 90 seconds. That is without thrusters. It is stealthy. It also has the ability to engage targets before it can be detected. It is highly equipped with advanced intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance tools.

As an instrument of air superiority, the F–22 Raptor is unmatched by any foreign competitor, including the much heralded MiG–29, the Russian-built MiG–29 flown by various militaries around the world.

I am going to point to this particular chart I have, which is rather difficult to read even from where the Presiding Officer is, given it is a map, obviously, of the world, and there are a series of color-coded dots on this map. Let me explain what the dots are, and then I will explain what we are looking at in existing technologies in the fourth generation of development of aircraft technology and what is being done on a fifth generation by nation states, particularly the Russians and the Chinese.

The countries in red on this chart indicate those nations that already operate or have ordered fourth generation fighters, and there are a number of countries around the world in that category. The yellow coded areas are expected to order by the year 2010, these fourth generation fighters. You get an idea in the Middle East, some of the North African States, and some out in the Far East as well. The red dots themselves operate or have ordered advanced surface-to-air missiles. Again, this is critical technology that has the capacity to take out our aircraft. Then the yellow dots, the round dots, they are ordering or are considering advanced surface-to-air missiles.

So we get some idea of what is occurring.

This over here: Air dominance is not guaranteed, is the point I wanted to make with this chart. According to the information on this map sanctioned by the Air Force, there are Russian-made aircraft known as SU–27s, which have air-to-air capability, more of the dogfight kind of capability. Those planes are operated already by Algeria, Belarus, China, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Russia, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, and Vietnam. And then there is the MiG–29, which is both an air-to-air and an air-to-ground fighter. It is also a Russian-built aircraft, and is capable of challenging our current fleet of F–15s and F–16s. The MiG–29 is operated by the militaries of Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bulgaria, Cuba, Eritrea, Hungary, India, Iran, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, North Korea, Peru, Poland, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Sudan, Syria, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Yemen. Again, widespread globally, that air-to-ground capability and air-to-air capability.

Today, there is a fifth generation being developed that will be highly competitive with the F–22 and the F–35. That fifth generation fighter is currently being developed by Russia and China to challenge the F–22 and the F–35. So that gives us some sense of where we are today. These are very sophisticated aircraft operating today. The surface-to-air missiles are very sophisticated and in countries today that can take out, in fact, our existing technology in many areas.

Of course, the fifth generation is what we are talking about being ready for the midpart of this century. Our air superiority has not gone unnoticed by others in many ways, as identified by this map. All the countries in red, as I have pointed out, have an air capability comparable to the MiG. That means they are all on a par with our current aircraft technology; specifically, the F–15 and F–16 fighters known as the fourth generation of jets.

So our F–15 and F–16 are very competent, very good, and they are on parity—they are not superior but on parity—with these aircraft.

To give my colleagues some idea of what I mean by the comparison of generations, an exercise was conducted in January 2007, in which the F–22 was matched up against the F–15 and F/A–18, to demonstrate how each aircraft would fare in actual dogfights with one another. The F–22 in comparative battles beat the F–15 and F/A–18, 144 to 0—144 to 0—to give my colleagues an idea of how much more superior the F–22 can be in command of the airspace as opposed to what is comparable to the F–15 today. So the F–22 is a very important piece of technology when it comes to regaining the superior capabilities that are absolutely essential.

According to the Air Force, what is more, this map shows that 30 nations are at parity with or exceeding the capabilities of the F–15 and F–16, and that puts our missions and the lives of our pilots at risk. On top of that, Russia and China are currently both developing their own fifth generation of fighter to counter the F–22 and the F–35. There are a dozen nations around the world, marked by these red dots, that are today operating surface-to-air missile launchers capable of shooting down the F–15 Strike Eagles that the F–22 would replace.

The yellow dots indicate other countries considering the purchase of such weapons, and I pointed those out as well.

Our current fourth generation fighter jets are vulnerable to these threats because they don't have the stealth technology found in the F–22. Regrettably, we witnessed this danger during Operation Desert Storm when 37 of our nonstealthy aircraft were shot down and 40 more were damaged, and an early stealth fighter, the F–117, as well as the F–16, were brought down during the 1999 Kosovo operations by rudimentary Serbian surface-to-air missiles. These are risks that we shouldn't have to take and don't have to take. These are risks we don't have to force upon our pilots. These are risks that are entirely preventable if we arm ourselves with the next generation, and that is why the F–22 is so critically important.

If this amendment is being offered to strike and eliminate the F–22, then we cannot guarantee America's continuing air dominance. Our allies will not always look like those we faced in Afghanistan in 2001 or Iraq in 2003, enemies whose air defenses were in tatters. We do not always choose when and where our battles are going to be fought. We must be prepared and we must retain our competitive edge for the sake of our national security and the lives, obviously, of our troops.

If the pending amendment is approved, our F–22 fleet will be limited to 187 aircraft. According to military officials, such a figure is simply not enough to address the current capabilities of our military's competitors.

I have a letter dated June 9 of this year from GEN John Corley who is currently in charge of Air Combat Command for the Air Force. In this letter he reiterated his perception. I think my colleagues will understand as well that when we have a general serving in charge of air combat and command missions for the Air Force who disagrees with the Secretary of Defense in a public way, we get some idea of the depth of feeling that occurs with a matter like this.

Let me quote:

> At Air Combat Command, we have held the need for 381 F–22s. . . . In my opinion, a fleet of 187 F–22s puts execution of our current national security strategy at high risk in the near to mid term. To my knowledge, there are no studies that demonstrate 187 F–22s are adequate to support our national military strategy. Air Combat Command analysis, done in concert with Headquarters Air Force, shows a moderate risk force can be obtained with an F–22 fleet of approximately 250 aircraft.

General Corley, responsible for the aircraft readiness of the U.S. Air Force, says we will incur moderate risk with even 250 aircraft, and the command needs 381 aircraft to be fully capable. Yet we insist on giving them only 187.

That is deeply troubling. I think we owe to it our troops to give them what they need to protect our Nation as well.

Our security also depends on a robust manufacturing base, and the proposed amendment could be devastating to our critical aerospace industrial capabilities.

If this amendment we are talking about passes, the F–22 assembly will halt at 2011, and fighter jet production lines will run down until 2014, when the F–35 manufacturing begins in earnest.

What does this mean for the aerospace industry in this Nation?

In Connecticut, we are blessed to have a large contingent of skilled aerospace workers who keep our country safe and produce, of course, magnificent engines. They are highly skilled engineers, machinists, and technicians and, on average, they are in their mid to late forties. They may retire, obviously, they may pack up and relocate, they may leave the trade entirely; but they won't sit idle for 3 years. Our Nation cannot afford to lose them.

That is represented by this area here on the chart. To lay these people off and then to once again rehire them—in many cases, they will be in their midfifties—is unrealistic. That synergy that is critically important is going to be lost.

The Commission on the Future of the U.S. Aerospace Industry recently recommended ''that the Nation immediately reverse the decline in and promote the growth of a scientifically and technologically trained U.S. aerospace workforce . . .'' adding that ''the breakdown of America's intellectual and industrial capacity is a threat to national security and our capability to continue as a world leader.''

The Commission also stated that resolving the crisis will require government, industry, labor, and academia to work together to reverse this trend.

I am afraid this amendment does the opposite of what we are being warned to try to stop. According to the Aerospace Industry Association, the industry faces impending retirements and a shortage of trained technical graduates, a situation already expected to worsen within the decade.

Some companies address this issue by outsourcing work around the globe. In aerospace and defense, however, security requirements dictate that most design work on military systems must be done by U.S. citizens. Thus, the need for U.S.-developed technical talent is particularly acute if we want to ensure a world-class aerospace workforce ready to lead in a global economy of the 21st century.

On this chart, this is the F–22 production, which ends in 2011, marked by this point here. This is the F–35 production, which begins in 2014. This gap represents hundreds of jobs at Pratt & Whitney—as many as 2,000 in Connecticut—and it represents tens of thousands of jobs across the nation. You can take those numbers—and I cannot speak for other places around the Nation, but you end up with that kind of loss in an economy that our people are already struggling with. That is not the only argument that I make, but we ought to keep people working on a new defense system. The most important issue is our national security. You ought to understand that even if you decide to ramp up F–35 production after 2014, because F–22 production will prematurely end under this amendment, you will lose a workforce that is critical, and it gets harder and harder to reconstitute.

In fact, the Defense Department recognized this gap years ago. In the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review, published by the military to identify the needs and strategy of our Armed Forces, they stated that F–22 production should be extended ''through fiscal year 2010 with a multiyear acquisition contract, to ensure the Department does not have a gap in fifth generation stealth capabilities.''

That is a direct quote from the Quadrennial Defense review report in 2006.

The military identified in 2006, the most recent published report of this type, that our Nation would suffer a loss in aerospace manufacturing capabilities if fighter production doesn't have a seamless transition.

Yet, for some reason, we find ourselves in the very position the military had, only 3 years ago, realized we should avoid.

In addition to our national security and the readiness of our aerospace production industry, this amendment would have a negative impact on jobs. Our unemployment rate is at 9.5 percent, and we continue to face the worst economic conditions in decades.

That is why the administration and this Congress have taken unprecedented steps to put Americans back to work. It is why the government has stepped in to save critical manufacturing sectors, such as the domestic automobile industry.

This amendment suggests that the same government doesn't believe our tactical aircraft manufacturing sector warrants similar treatment.

In my State, where the impact of the Recovery Act is just beginning to be felt, the success of this amendment would be a devastating blow. I am determined to do everything I can to see that we can avoid it. I don't want to see America's aerospace workers—among the finest workers in the world—remain under assault.

Allow me to introduce two such workers, Frank Lentini and Rocco Marone. They are workers at the Pratt & Whitney plant in Middletown, CT, which manufactures the engine for the F–22. They are both engine test mechanics.

In this picture, the two of them are preparing an F–22 engine for testing by attaching instrumentation used to collect data as the engine goes through a series of computerized tests. The highly advanced nature of this engine requires countless hours of testing and retesting, inspection and reinspection, to ensure that when it is shipped to the assembly plant, it operates flawlessly.

These workers understand that a mistake on their part could cost the lives of our American forces. That is why it is so important that these gentlemen have years of experience to ensure that only the best quality engines are put on these aircraft.

These are the same workers who will build the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter's engine—but only if the F–22 production is allowed to continue for the next 4 years.

Frank, the one in the blue shirt, has worked in the Middletown plant for 31 years, starting on the assembly line, finally rising to his current job on the test line for the plant's most advanced engine, the F–22. He is married, with two sons, ages 17 and 12, whom he hopes to send off to college.

The prospect of cutting the F–22 production makes him worry every day about his sons' futures, not only about whether he will be able to send them to college but also whether there will be any jobs for the next generation of children in Connecticut's aerospace industry.

Rocco Marone—known as Rocky—has worked at the Pratt & Whitney engine facility in Middletown for 34 years. Like Frank, he is an engine test mechanic. He trains and works with the younger mechanics and imparts his experience to them, both from his time on the assembly line and working in the test cell.

It is workers such as these two men at the Middletown plant in Middletown CT—with a combined 65 years, taking that knowledge they have acquired and building the finest engines in the world for the past 80 years—the plant has. It is these seasoned workers who, by training the next generation, will ensure that the trade secrets of engine building are never lost. This amendment puts all of that at risk.

As I mentioned, if the F–22 is canceled in 2011 at 187 aircraft—the numbers we are now talking about—then these two individuals and tens of thousands of others in our country will face very difficult odds. These highly skilled, quality control experts will be left wondering what lies ahead for them and their families. Will they retain their jobs? How many of their colleagues will be signing on to the unemployment rolls? What other opportunities exist for workers with such highly refined but specialized skill sets?

If we end the F–22 before 2014, we will all be wondering something as well: When these gentlemen walk out the door, and take decades of experience and skills with them, will we ever get them back again?

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment being offered by the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. I have tremendous respect for both these individuals, but I think it is important not just on a parochial basis—I couldn't stand here and ask my colleagues merely to vote for this program because of jobs in my State. I also want them to understand what happens to people. This isn't just numbers we are talk about. There are lives, skill sets, and there is a valuable resource at risk when we cast our votes on whether to continue this program and allow for that seamless transition that will maintain the superiority and effectiveness necessary for our aircraft in the 21st century.

On the chart I showed you of these nations around the world—others are not sitting idly by. They are developing surface-to-air missiles and the

fifth generation of fighters to challenge us. We find ourselves in a situation where we might be taking a backseat at a time when I think we can least afford it. This is not inexpensive to do this. Senator CHAMBLISS provided an offset in committee for the cost of continuing this program until 2014. That is an important consideration.

I respect the members of the committee who wrestle with these issues. I wished to share with my colleagues this information, and particularly what it means in a State such as mine that has an 80-year history of producing these terrific engines, and workers such as the two individuals I have introduced to you this evening, whose talents and abilities we will potentially lose as a result of this decision. It is one of great importance to our country, to our national security, and to the people who provide the wonderful skill sets that give us these remarkable engines.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 5 minutes and that Senator THUNE be recognized immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise to affirm everything the Senator from Connecticut said. He made an articulate, detailed case for the F–22, in opposition to the amendment. I commend him.

I wish to add three thoughts, three good reasons, for the F–22 and not to adopt the amendment: No. 1, when the U.S. Air Force wrote the RFP for the weapon system of the 21st century to replace three existing, aging aircraft, the F–22 met and exceeded every single part of the RFP. No. 2, for those who say the cost is some $2,000 an hour more for maintenance, you have to quantify that. Look what you are buying. You are buying stealth technology that exists nowhere else in the world and the ability to deliver munitions and leave without ever having been seen. Most recently, in Alaska, the F–22, in a mock battle, destroyed 144 aircraft before it lost its first one.

Lastly, and most importantly, while it may not be the plane exactly for Afghanistan and Iraq today, what about North Korea? What about Iran? What about what happened to us in the Balkans in the late 1990s, when President Clinton deployed our air strength to put together what was a terrible situation? We must be prepared for whatever will come in the 21st century. If there is anything we have learned, you cannot underestimate what may come. I commend the Senator for his articulate statement and affirm everything he said in support of not adopting the amendment and to continue to purchase the F–22 beyond the 187 currently being capped—or asked to be capped at. I commend the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. That number of 144, I suspect people won't believe that number, but that is a real number. Pilots don't always necessarily comment on these matters. I am told by those who have been interviewed, pilots who fly the F–22 use superlatives to describe that aircraft they have never used about any other aircraft, including the ability to reach the speed of Mach 1.5 in 90 seconds, the stealthy quality, the maneuverability, and the agility exceeds anything else that exists anywhere else in the world.

There is a generation coming along in nations with whom we have pretty good relationships, but we can never predict what is going to happen. We have seen what happened with the SU–27 and the MiG 29, where those are widely disseminated worldwide now. They pose a parity with the aircraft we have. We need to have that superior quality.

I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I thank, first of all, my friend from South Dakota for yielding to me for just a moment. He was to be next recognized. This will take just a moment.

We have been attempting to work out a unanimous consent agreement so we could first vote tomorrow. That was not convenient for a number of Senators. We then tried to work out a unanimous consent agreement for first thing on Wednesday morning to vote on the Levin-McCain amendment. We have so far been unsuccessful in getting that agreement. We will continue to work tomorrow to see if we cannot get such an agreement. In the meantime, that is where it stands.

Again, I thank my friend from South Dakota for yielding.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for not more than 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO EMILY COX

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to pause for a second and tell everybody in the Senate that on the 1st day of August of this coming month, in Waynesboro, GA, there is going to be birthday party for a 96-year-old lady, Emily Cox. She is not just another 96-year-old lady.

Emily Cox was the mother of Jackson Elliot Cox, my best friend in college. When he graduated from college, he left to join the U.S. Marine Corps, went through OCS, went to Vietnam, and he died on behalf of his country. Miss Emily was saddened, obviously, by the tragedy, as was her husband Sidney.

When Alex Crumbley, myself, and Pierre Howard went to be at the wake and to wait for the body to return and to try to soothe Miss Emily, she soothed us for the loss of our best friend. Since that day, Miss Emily Cox has traveled our State on behalf of veterans, on behalf of the U.S. Marine Corps, and on behalf of our country. She is a living legend in Georgia for her sweetness, for her strength, for her love of country, and for her sacrifice.

While I will not be able to be in Waynesboro, GA, on August 1 to celebrate her 96th birthday, from the floor of the Senate, I send her my greetings and my thanks. She has been a rock for me, a rock for her community.

Miss Emily, we love you, and happy birthday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

CAP-AND-TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week we work on the Defense authorization bill. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, that is something in which I have a keen interest. Many of the discussions you heard already and we will hear throughout the course of the week will deal fundamentally with our Nation's national security interests, making sure we continue to fund our troops at the appropriate level; making sure, in terms of pay and benefits, recruiting and retaining the finest men and women in uniform in the world, that they have the very best of technology to use when it comes to doing their jobs. You already heard a discussion about some of those various technologies, platforms—the F–22s and F–35s. I am very interested in the next generation of bombers and the importance of having long-range strike capability so we are able to continue to penetrate some of the more sophisticated air defense systems that are being developed by our adversaries and potential adversaries around the world. It is a great debate to have. It is one we have annually. I look forward to engaging in some of the discussions on these very important and critical national security issues.

I wish to speak this evening to some of the things going on on the domestic front. I always believe if we do not get national security right, the rest is conversation, which is why this Defense authorization bill is so important. But when we do get past the Defense authorization bill, I think we have a couple of big, epic battles that are going to be waged in the Senate coming up perhaps this month; if not, I suggest certainly in the fall. One deals with a bill that passed the House a little over a week ago now, the cap-and-trade legislation. The other deals with the issue of health care reform, which is one-sixth of America's economy. We are