United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2011 No. 120

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Give ear to our prayers, Eternal God, and guide us like a shepherd leads a flock. Turn us toward You, as You cause Your face to shine so that we shall be saved. Feed our lawmakers with the bread of wisdom so that they will accomplish Your purposes. Delivering them from the tyranny of the trivial, may they trust You to guide their steps. As they remember the high price and preciousness of freedom, inspire them with the relentless and sacrificial vigilance required to preserve it.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN 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 as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Tuesday, August 2, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. SHAHEEN 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. Madam President, following any leader remarks, I will make a motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 365, the legislative vehicle for the debt limit compromise.

The time until noon will be equally divided and controlled for debate on the legislation.

At noon, the Senate will conduct a rollcall vote on the motion to concur in the House message, with a 60-vote threshold.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

AMENDING THE EDUCATION SCIENCES REFORM ACT OF 2002

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the House message to accompany S. 365.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved that the bill from the Senate (S. 365) entitled ''An Act to make a technical amendment to the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002'' do pass, with an amendment.

Mr. REID. Madam President, as provided under the previous order, I now move to concur in the House amendment to S. 365.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is pending.

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator MCCONNELL and I have completed our statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes under the time allocated to the Republican side.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, finally, Washington is taking some responsibility for spending money that we don't have. At a time when the Federal Government is borrowing 40 cents of every dollar it spends, this is a welcome change in behavior. I gladly support it. Make no mistake, this is a change in behavior—from spend, spend, spend, to cut, cut, cut. Let me give you one example.

On Christmas Eve 2010 Congress raised the debt ceiling and attached to it $1 trillion in new spending over 10 years in the new health care law. This time, for every dollar we are raising the debt ceiling, we are reducing spending by a dollar, not adding to it. This reduction in spending over 10 years is about $2.4 trillion.

Here is another example: According to Senator PORTMAN, who used to be the Nation's budget director, the CBO would say if Congress did this kind of dollar-for-dollar reduction for spending every time a President asked us to raise the debt ceiling, we would balance the budget in 10 years.

Here is another: The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday that because of these spending cuts, the discretionary part of the budget, which is about 39 percent of the entire Federal budget, will grow over the next 10 years at a little less than the rate of inflation. If we could control the rest

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

Printed on recycled paper.

of the budget so that it would grow to anything close to the rate of inflation, we would balance the budget in no time.

Balancing the budget is exactly what our goal ought to be. I did it every year as Governor of Tennessee. Families in America do it every day. It is time to balance the government's books and live within our means.

These spending reductions are an important step, but they are just one step, and no one should underestimate how difficult the next steps will be. These spending cuts do almost nothing to restructure Medicare and Social Security so that seniors can count on them and taxpayers can afford them.

The President's budget projections still double and triple the Federal debt. Under the President's budget, according to the CBO, in 10 years we will be spending more in interest on the debt than we now spend on national defense.

In January 2013, the very first thing the next President will have to do is to ask the Congress to increase the debt ceiling. This problem wasn't created overnight, and it will not be solved overnight. If I were sitting at Union Station trying to catch a train to New York and someone offered me a ticket to Philadelphia or Baltimore, I would take it, and I would find a way to get to New York from there.

Today's vote is an opportunity to take an important step in the right direction, toward stopping Washington from spending money it doesn't have. We should take it and then get ready to find ways to take the next steps.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is a historic vote. It is one that has involved a lot of emotion and soul searching and a lot of hard work. The leaders are on the Senate floor—the Democratic and Republican leaders of the Senate, Senators REID and MCCONNELL. I salute both of them for working so hard to bring us to this moment where we have an opportunity to vote.

The House has passed this legislation, the so-called Budget Control Act. The Senate will take it up shortly. It is my belief it will also pass in the Senate. But my vote for this legislation does not come without some pain.

We are told in life to follow our conscience. On this matter, my conscience is conflicted. If this bill should fail, we will default on our Nation's debt. That will be the first time that has ever happened. If we should default at midnight tonight on our Nation's debt, terrible consequences will ensue. We will find America's credit rating in the world diminished, the interest rates we pay as a nation increased, and the cost of money for businesses and families across the United States will increase—at exactly the wrong time, in the midst of recession.

If we fail to pass this legislation, tomorrow the Secretary of the Treasury will sit down with the President and decide in the month of August which Americans who were expecting a check will actually receive one. Will we pay Social Security recipients? Will we pay the members of our military? Will we pay the Central Intelligence Agency? It is an impossible choice that the President would face if we fail.

But there is another side to the story. If this bill passes, we will reduce spending on critical programs. We have to be honest about it. Fewer children from poor families will be enrolled in early childhood education. Working families and their children will face even more debt to pay for a college education. Medical research will likely be cut. And the list goes on. So from where I stand, it is not the clearest moral choice.

I spoke to our Chaplain before we started the session about a line in Shakespeare I have always struggled to understand. It is from Hamlet, and it is the line in his famous soliloquy, when he said: ''Conscience makes cowards of us all.''

This morning, I still cannot clearly articulate what it means, but I feel it—struggling with this conscience question of defaulting on our debt, with all of the consequences on innocent people across America, and passing this bill with all of the consequences on innocent people in America. I have spent the last year and a half focused on this debt situation as I have never been focused before. I understand it a little better today than I did when I started.

I have come to the conclusion that if we are going to be honest about our debt and about reducing it, we have to be honest about how it will happen. Sure, we must cut spending; that is where we have to start. But we also have to understand it goes beyond that.

We have to be prepared to raise revenue. In the Bowles-Simpson Commission and the Gang of 6, I thought we came up with an honest answer to that question. It was a balanced approach and put everything on the table. Well, this bill makes a serious and significant downpayment in spending cuts. Now a joint committee is created to take the next step.

I will say this: If the next step is to be fair, if the next step is to be serious, it has to go beyond spending cuts. It has to look at serious questions about how we can save money in entitlement programs without compromising our commitment, and how we can ask those who have profited so well in America, who live so comfortably, to join us in this effort by paying more in taxes. That is the stark reality.

If we continue to move toward more and more spending cuts, we will literally disadvantage the poor and working families of America to the advantage of those who are well off. That is not fair, and it is not right. Many people have criticized this, saying we don't even read these bills we vote on.

Yesterday, I sat down to read this bill—it is not that long. I have to say, the front end of the bill is almost unintelligible. A person needs someone from the Budget Committee sitting next to them to explain each paragraph. I basically understand that portion of it. I also understand the portion that Senator MCCONNELL proposed on how we will sequence requests for increases in the national debt. I certainly understand, and am puzzled in some ways, by the joint committee's basic charge to find in 10 weeks anywhere from $1.2 trillion to $1.5 trillion in savings over the next 10 years—in 10 weeks, these 12 members of the House and Senate are to reach an agreement. It is a daunting task.

There is one provision I want to call to the attention of the Senate. It troubles me greatly. It is a provision that requires that the Senate and House of Representatives, before December 31 of this year vote on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I searched this bill long and hard to find the language of that constitutional amendment because I thought, if we are going to have to face the prospect of amending the Constitution, I want to know what the language is. This is an awesome responsibility.

One can read this bill from top to bottom, and there is not one word of substance about that amendment. All it says is, the House and Senate shall consider a bill that is a ''joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to balance the budget.'' End of sentence, end of reference in this bill.

It gets better. Not only do they require us to take a balanced budget amendment and fail to include the language of that amendment—listen closely—this bill says there shall be no amendments to the proposed resolution in committee in the House or on the floor of the House, in the committees of the Senate nor on the floor of the Senate—take it or leave it.

As I say these words, I can imagine Robert C. Byrd descending from heaven, standing at that desk and waving this Constitution and reminding Members of the Senate that one of the few times in our lives when we have taken a solemn oath, Members of the Senate swore to uphold and defend this document, this writing. He would find it nothing short of outrageous that we are mandating a vote on a constitutional amendment that is not even written, that we are prohibiting the House and the Senate from even considering the change of one word in that proposed constitutional amendment.

Madam President, I think the language of this bill entirely discredits this effort toward a constitutional amendment. We cannot take it seriously if we take our oath seriously to uphold and defend this document.

At the end of the day, I will vote for this measure, obviously with a heavy heart. There are parts of it I will struggle to explain and defend, but I can't let this American economy descend into chaos if we fail to extend the debt

ceiling. The job ahead will be hard, but let's hope we will, in reducing this deficit further, do it in a balanced and fair way, with everything on the table.

At the end of the day, Members of Congress and people in higher income categories should feel they too are called to sacrifice. If we ask that of the poorest in America and of working families, we can ask no less of Members of Congress and those who are well off in this great Nation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The other Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, although this bill reflects a balanced approach, Americans also expect a balanced budget. We need to apply the common sense of the heartland to spend within our means, as each family does with their monthly budget.

The battle over this legislation was hard fought. We have finally started to change a 40-year culture of overspending and overborrowing in just 40 days. We hear the American people, and we respect their judgment. They tell us they are not undertaxed. They tell us Washington overspends.

We have a government that claims to support a strong economy but urges tax increases that will weaken it. We hear speeches from some who want to expand employment but then attack employers. They argue for more access to credit but then assail the banks that would provide it. They call for more American energy but decry the very explorers who would find it. We need more straight talk and accountability.

Small businesses provide the most jobs, and we should reward them. Inventors create new economies, and we should encourage them. Many government programs fail in their objectives, sometimes for decades, and we should cancel them. We face mounting government debt. The way to pay this debt is to generate more jobs, creating more taxpayers who will provide additional revenue, not new Federal job-killing taxes.

Given the views of our President and the economically liberal Members of this Senate, the legislation before us is the best deal we can get. This legislation caps regular appropriations of the Congress. It eliminates procedural impediments so that we will vote on how to cut automatic spending programs. We even installed automatic spending programs regardless of congressional gridlock as a backstop to ensure fiscal responsibility. This bill prevents a crisis from breaking out this week. It also begins to control automatic spending programs, many of which have run without much accountability since the 1960s. All of this is a downpayment on further ways to bring commonsense accountability and control to the spending of our government.

These basic values are the foundation of America's 200-year experiment in self-government. If we fail, we deliver a free people into the hands of a financial bondage. If we succeed, we honor the promise of limited government that offers greater and greater liberties to each generation of Americans so that they can reach their own potential.

I will vote for this legislation because it begins to make the hard choices to keep us free. But it is only a first step, and a crucial one, to increase the transparency, the performance, and results we should demand from America's government.

This bill sets an important precedent to reform automatic spending. If we use that precedent again, then I can imagine an America that once again becomes the best place on Earth for inventors and families to start and expand businesses that will provide for their children and, in a few cases, will span the globe with American exports to each market of the planet.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, over the past 2 years, our country has been struggling to recover from one of the worst economic recessions in our history. Democrats have worked to pass legislation that would create jobs. It has been our top priority. But at every turn, we faced resistance from ideologues who care more about winning political points and protecting the wealthy than doing what is right for hard-working American families.

That is exactly what happened during this debt-ceiling debate. Instead of passing a clean extension and getting to work on our economy, we have been forced to vote on a last-minute deal to prevent the economic catastrophe that would result in default.

I spent the last few weeks and months highlighting the real-life consequences of default for New Mexico families. At a time when families are already dealing with extremely tight budgets, a default would mean increased costs for just about everything, from food, to gas, to housing, to sending the kids to college. It would also jeopardize critical Federal benefits that veterans, seniors, and others depend on to pay the bills and stay healthy. It would mean more than 360,000 New Mexicans would be in danger of losing their Social Security benefits. It would mean another 300,000 who rely on Medicare seeing their health care disrupted. It would mean 174,000 New Mexico veterans may not receive their benefits, and more than 1,400 Active-Duty military personnel may not receive paychecks for their services.

But it wouldn't stop there. Even if you don't depend on a check from the Federal Government every month for health care or retirement or other benefits, you would still feel the financial pain of default. That is because mortgage payments would increase by more than $1,000 for the average family and credit card interest would go up by $250. Why is that, you ask. Because the interest you pay on just about every loan you have, whether it is a house or a car or college tuition, is based on the interest rates the Treasury pays, and if that interest rate rises, as it would in a default, so does the interest rate on just about everything else. New Mexicans can't afford that. America can't afford that. And it is to prevent New Mexico families from these repercussions that I will vote for this legislation. But that is the only reason because, to be frank, almost everything else about this deal stinks, and it stinks to high heaven.

As my friend the good Senator from Vermont said yesterday, this package is grotesquely unfair and bad economic policy. While I firmly believe we must take steps to rein in our deficit, this package is far from the ideal way to do so.

I hear every day from New Mexicans about the need to rebuild our economy. We should be investing in innovation and infrastructure and creating new jobs, but we don't do that with this deal. Instead of cutting excess and investing wisely in programs that create jobs, this package will mean fewer dollars for job training, education programs, and housing, hampering our ability to create a long-term recovery.

Poll after poll shows a majority of Americans support shared sacrifice in this recovery. Unfortunately, this package also falls woefully short on that count. While we did manage to protect important programs such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and nutrition assistance programs, there are still many important programs that will be on the chopping block, initiatives such as housing assistance, help for small businesses, and rural economic development programs, just to name a few—this all the while the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and large corporations remain untouched.

This package is what happens when ideologues bent on nationalizing their extreme agendas get their way. The fracture we have seen among Republicans in the House over the last few months has much broader effect than just in that Chamber. Their staunch refusal to compromise at the expense of struggling families has pushed this debate and our Nation to the brink.

Instead of having a frank conversation about how we can repair our economy and reach a simple compromise, we have been forced to vote today to avoid default. With this plan, we get nowhere near the heart of our economic problems. Instead, we kick the can down the road a couple of years, all the while the problem continues to grow, impeding our recovery and crippling our economic competitiveness.

Once this vote is taken and the immediate crisis is passed, it will be all too easy to stick our heads back in the sand and pretend everything is OK. I rise today to say this: Everything is not OK, and it won't be OK until we have the courage and leadership to institute tax reform—not just trimming

around the edges or rearranging the numbers to create the illusion of savings when, in fact, nothing has changed; I am talking about substantive tax reform that is the result of a national conversation about our priorities as a society. We have the opportunity to do just that with the commission being created by this plan, but it will take guts and leadership and hard choices.

Our national deficit is a burden that drags us down competitively and requires serious negotiations, not just concessions to those who see this as a political opportunity to push their personal agendas. We must all come to the table and do what is best for our Nation.

I see the Senator from Florida is here. I know he is a wise gentleman who has much to say to us.

So with that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, again I say to my colleague from New Mexico what a fine Senator he is, as is the Senator presiding. What a privilege it is to serve with the likes of the both of you. Indeed, the Members of this body are extraordinary individuals, and we have all anguished with what we have been through as the clock was constantly ticking down to midnight tonight and knowing the consequences.

This Senator always had the feeling that it was going to work out, that we were going to reach agreement. Interestingly, the financial markets had that same feeling as well because the financial markets never did go off a cliff. Even the Asian financial markets felt the same thing as we were coming out of the weekend. Even though we, in this capital city of our Nation, have gone back and forth over ways to cut this public debt, here we are, we have an agreement. Members of this body, as well as the other body down at the other end of the Capitol, clearly are sincere in their differences. But I think what we saw in the overwhelming vote yesterday in the House of Representatives was most of the Members agree that gridlock doesn't do anything to help the country, and especially the economy. So we have this compromise plan in front of us, and later today one of two things will be true: Either we will have done what is in the best interests of the American people or we will have failed. I think, overwhelmingly, what we will see when we vote at noon today is that there may be as many as 75 Members of this 100-Member Senate who will vote in favor of this package.

I think not only is it obvious this package is the way to avoid default, but it starts us on the path of getting serious about what we have to do. The plan contains more than $2 trillion to bring down the deficit over the course of the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, and it is going to cut about half of that now. It leaves the rest of it up to a supercommittee of 12 Members—half from the House of Representatives, half from the Senate—with each half appointed by its respective leaders of the Chambers.

It is possible this supercommittee will deadlock, but I think with the concern about the financial precipice we have been teetering on, that supercommittee is going to come up with a plan for significant deficit reduction. They have a target of an additional $1½ trillion over the next 10 years, but they are not limited to that, and everything is on the table. What they could do—and this is a moment, if we can seize it, that would be tremendous—is set us on the path to do major tax reform. No one is happy with the existing Tax Code. We talk about all these tax loopholes—the technical term is tax expenditures—and they are simply special interest tax preferences for individual special interests. It blows my mind to realize they will cost $14 trillion over the next 10 years. Why should this one special interest have a tax preference and this one have a tax preference, and yet we find it difficult, as we go through this harangue here in our debate, as to what is the level of the tax bracket for taxation on ordinary people?

What we could do—and the supercommittee can do this—is take a lot of those tax preferences—that $14 trillion worth of them—and by taking only 15 or 20 percent of those away and utilizing that revenue, we could simplify the Tax Code into three tax brackets for individuals and lower everybody's tax in that income bracket, and we could lower the corporate income tax. That is a real possibility for this supercommittee. They could give the instructions back to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate and then start to do reform, as well as bringing down the national annual deficit. The backup, if this supercommittee fails to agree, is a series of spending cuts that automatically happens.

This agreement also calls for a vote on a balanced budget amendment. I have voted for balanced budget constitutional amendments in the past, and we are going to have another opportunity to vote for one. I assume we are going to have a vote for two different versions. The version that is being offered by Senator UDALL is the one I intend to vote for.

So here we are with a plan that is not a perfect plan, although it clearly avoids default. But all of us agree on what it must do: Government spending must be cut, the public debt must be reduced; otherwise, our economy will not recover and America will no longer be in good standing around the world. That is the bottom line.

I often quote from the Book of Isaiah, in which the Lord is speaking to the people and he says:

Come now, let us reason together.

Isn't that so true here? And was it not avoided for so long, where reasonable people of good will—and every one of these Senators is a person of good will—could not get out of our ideological rigidity and out of our momentary excessive partisanship so that we could, as the Good Book says, ''Come now, let us reason together?'' But I think now that is what we have done.

So when we pass this legislation—and it will be an overwhelming vote—in about 2 hours, and the President then signs it into law, we can turn our attention back to the economy and creating jobs, which we so desperately need to bring us out of this recession that has been lingering far too long.

Madam President, I thank the Chair for this opportunity, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I understand we are alternating?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. I would request, after the Senator from Kentucky, who is here to speak—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. I am sorry, the Parliamentarian has corrected me. There is no agreement to alternate.

Mr. LEVIN. In that case, I believe I was here on the floor before the Senator from Kentucky, so I will proceed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, to say the legislation before us is not ideal is truly an understatement. The notion that our deficit problem can be solved solely by cutting spending flies in the face of our experience, when in fact unwise tax cuts for the wealthy and egregious tax loopholes are significant culprits in our fiscal crisis. I believe too many Republicans are influenced by an ideology so extreme that it promised to wreak economic havoc if they did not get their way. ''No additional revenues'' became the battle cry—an approach that prevents the balanced deficit reduction the American people rightly support. The result is that this legislation incorporates some policies that are profoundly unfair to middle-income Americans.

Seen in isolation, Madam President, this is not a good bill. But no public policy exists in a vacuum. Despite its many flaws, this legislation must pass. Let me explain why.

While there will be a number of negative consequences as a result of this bill's passage, there will be more dire consequences if it fails to pass. The choice here is between a faulty piece of legislation on the one hand and severe damage to our economy and even greater joblessness on the other. The choice we face with this vote today is whether to accept a flawed bill or to watch the United States—the globe's preeminent economic power—default on its obligations to senior citizens, students, and veterans, as well as to

those who have invested in our country by the purchase of our bonds and our Treasury notes. We have taken many steps in the past 3 years to try to restart job creation in this country. Those efforts would come undone in the crisis that would follow our failure to pass this bill.

One of the things that is right about this legislation is that it avoids a misguided demand that we have another round of crisis and negotiation over this issue in a few short months. A short-term increase in the debt limit, as House Republicans demanded, would surely have led to a damaging downgrade of the government's credit rating. It would have frozen financing for businesses and consumers. We simply cannot put the American people and the American economy through that again.

Despite this bill's imbalance in focusing solely on spending cuts, it does contain a mechanism that can force acceptance of what our Republican colleagues have refused to accept—the reality that revenue must be a part of real deficit reduction and that fair and effective deficit reduction efforts require shared sacrifice. The year 2011 is the year of unbalanced spending cuts, and 2012 must be a year of shared sacrifice, one in which the President uses the bully pulpit to lead the Nation to accept the notion that everyone—including, surely, the wealthy—must play a role in reducing deficits.

Democrats have repeatedly emphasized this point. It is a simple fact that among the largest factors contributing to our deficits is the Bush tax cuts—tax cuts that greatly increased the growth of the gap between the wealthiest among us and working families. Today, median household income—the income of the typical American household—is lower than it was in the mid-1990s, and yet the wealthiest Americans not only do extremely well, they are doing better and better all the time. A few decades ago, the wealthiest 1 percent of all Americans took in 10 percent of all income. Today it is 24 percent.

These numbers are not aberrations or actions of a free market. They reflect policy choices. Too often the choice has been to pay lip service to the middle class while driving income inequality to levels not seen in 80 years in this country. The failure to ask all Americans to join in the sacrifices required to reduce our deficit flies in the face of logic and fairness and threatens to increase the growing gap between upper income and middle-income families.

Democrats have proposed commonsense steps to address the failure to include more revenue and to promote shared sacrifice. We have proposed restoration of the 39.6-percent tax bracket for the wealthiest Americans who make nearly $400,000 a year or more. Most Democrats support the end of tax breaks for the massively profitable oil companies. We seek to close loopholes that now allow tax dodgers to hide income and assets in overseas tax havens to avoid the taxes they rightly owe and to end tax breaks that let highly-paid hedge fund managers enjoy a lower income tax rate than the rate their employees pay.

So far, too many have denied the need for these changes. But there is a chance at least that this legislation may finally force consideration of added revenues, added fairness in the Tax Code, and the shared sacrifice that is so missing from the cuts in the legislation before us.

Why is that? Under this legislation, we will face a stark choice. We must agree before the end of this year to deficit reduction of at least $1.2 trillion over 10 years, or stand by as an automatic budget cut kicks in to accomplish that goal. A bipartisan joint committee of 12 Members of Congress will meet and develop a deficit reduction plan that avoids those automatic cuts. That joint committee will have broad powers to review and propose changes to spending and to the Tax Code, and to add revenue. Revenues will finally be back on the table where they have always belonged.

Meeting that $1.2 trillion goal will not be easy, but it will be achievable—achievable, that is, if those who so far have been unwilling to compromise will recognize that revenue must be part of the equation. Nobody should be eager for the automatic cuts that would otherwise take effect. Many of those cuts would be unacceptably painful and damaging. But the very idea of those automatic cuts is that they are so unacceptable that few of us will want to see them enacted and most of us will be willing to compromise in order to avoid them.

Congress used this approach once before. In 1985 we passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which set forth specific deficit targets and required cuts if those targets were not met. The framework for today's legislation is based on that model. As one of the authors of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings act, Senator Gramm put it:

> It was never the objective of Gramm-Rudman to trigger the sequester; the objective of Gramm-Rudman was to have the threat of the sequester force compromise and action.

And it did. For example, in 1990, when facing the possibility of unacceptable cuts in defense and other important programs, President Bush and bipartisan leaders in Congress adopted a balanced deficit reduction plan that included significant new revenues. The Damocles sword of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction act was the reason for that outcome. I believe that any plan from the bipartisan committee that fails the test of balance will have no chance of passage in the Senate. That means members of the committee must truly be willing to lead, to put aside partisanship and rigid ideology, if we are to avoid triggering unacceptable cuts. Success also is going to require Presidential leadership and stronger use of his bully pulpit.

Democrats have demonstrated that we are willing to put forward serious deficit reduction proposals, plans that include painful cuts to important priorities. With a vote to approve this bill, which we must, it is my hope that we have reached the high tide of an ideological movement that has sought to hold tax cuts for the wealthy sacred while imposing increasingly Draconian cuts on programs for American families and threatened economic calamity if that movement did not get its way. The era of slashing programs that help middle-class Americans, with no shared sacrifice by the wealthiest among us, must end and give way to an era in which fairness and balance guide our efforts. Passing this legislation today hopefully will drive us to make that transition.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PAUL. I will.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to give my remarks immediately following the Senator.

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, America will not default on her debt today. In fact, there was never any doubt that America would pay her bills. But mark my words, America will default. America will default, not by not paying its bills, not by not raising the debt ceiling, but we will default in a more insidious way. America will default by increasingly paying our bills with money that is worth less and less each year.

A nation pays for its debt in three ways. We can either tax people, we can borrow the money, or we can simply print the money. They all have repercussions.

We are approaching our borrowing limit as a nation. We now owe China over $1 trillion. We owe Japan nearly $1 trillion. We even owe Mexico. As we reach our borrowing limit, interest rates will rise and the prices in the stores will rise. You are already seeing this in your grocery stores. You are already seeing this in your gas prices. They are not rising de novo, out of nothing. Your prices are rising because the value of your dollar is falling. The value of your dollar is falling because they are printing up money to pay for this exorbitant debt.

In 2008 we went through a banking crisis and we doubled the monetary supply in 4 months. We bought things. The Federal Reserve bought toxic assets. They bought bad car loans and bad home loans. Where once upon a time your dollar was backed by gold, your dollar is now backed by toxic assets—not a very comforting thought.

Many pundits are arguing that the tea party has won this battle. They misunderstand the debate. This battle is not about winners and losers, it is about the future of our country. It is

about saving ourselves from ourselves. We are headed toward ruin if we continue on this path of spending money we do not have.

For decades, America has lived beyond her means. A nation that lives beyond her means will eventually live beneath her means. That day is coming. A day of reckoning looms. That day was never August 2. That day is when the dollar teeters and falls from its perch. That day is when prices soar. That day is when unemployment and a declining standard of living foment discontent and unrest in the street.

As Erskine Bowles put it, there has been no more predictable crisis in our history. We have been given all the warning signs. It comes, and this deal will not escape the facts that are looming for us. The President thinks that we need a balanced approach. America thinks we need a balanced budget and that we should not spend money we do not have; that since American families have to balance their budgets, why in the world would we not require our Government to balance its budget? What America needs is a balanced budget in an economy that grows and thrives and creates jobs.

Yes, a malaise hangs in the air. America is a ship without a captain. Instead of the President chastising job creators and preaching class envy, we need a President who will show us leadership. The President needs to accept responsibility for an economy that has worsened under his failed leadership. Unemployment is up, gas prices have doubled, and this President will add more debt than all 43 Presidents combined.

America got a deal on August 2 but not a solution. What America wants is a solution, not a deal. I hope in the next 6 months the President will find it within himself to lead the Nation, the courage to lead and embrace reform, the reform that is necessary to get this great country going again.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I compliment the senior Senator from Kentucky for his good remarks on the floor and for allowing me that unanimous consent request.

We are coming down to the wire here. We will soon be voting on a proposal that would couple some deficit reduction with an increase in the statutory debt limit. There are some positive features in this legislation, and the Senate's minority leader, the Speaker of the House, and conservatives throughout the country should be commended for insisting on them.

First, the President asked for a clean debt limit increase, and conservatives refused. They held the line and made clear that any increase in the debt limit required matching deficit reduction.

Second, having lost the fight over a clean debt limit increase, the President insisted on a balanced approach to deficit reduction, by which he meant reducing the deficit by raising taxes. But conservatives again fought this back. They knew that the primary driver of our debt is spending. Regardless of the President's talking points, nondefense discretionary spending is at historic levels. We are set for our third straight trillion dollar deficit. We have a national debt of $14.5 trillion, and the President's budget would give us $13 trillion more in debt. The answer to this is not giving the government more money to spend.

And third, conservatives resisted the effort by the President's allies to push most of the deficit reduction in this package down the road.

So there are some achievements in this proposal that conservatives can hang their hat on.

But I regret to say that I will not be able to support it, because it does not sufficiently provide us with the solution to the debt crisis that the markets are demanding. Last week, Moody's made clear that the real threat to America's Triple A rating is not default, which even the administration now acknowledges was never going to happen. The real threat of a downgrade comes from a failure of will. It comes from a failure of presidential leadership in getting federal spending under control.

There is a solution to this spending crisis. It is cut, cap, balance, which I was an early supporter of. In addition to providing short term relief by cutting and capping spending, it provides for a long-term solution through passage of a strong balanced budget amendment.

This proposal falls well short of cut, cap, balance, and I cannot support it.

I would like to address a technical point about this package that raises concerns for me—whether the President is looking to the deficit reduction committee as an opportunity to raise taxes. He says that he is, as have some of my colleagues in the Senate.

I do believe that it will be very difficult, given the committee's charge to reduce the deficit, to raise marginal tax rates. However, I worry that some Democrats will be looking at tax expenditures in order to hit the committee's required deficit reduction targets.

This would be a mistake for a number of reasons. The President has referred to tax expenditures as ''spending through the Tax Code.'' But rhetoric aside, tax expenditures are an opportunity for individuals and businesses to keep more of the money that they earn. And getting rid of tax expenditures, without corresponding reductions in tax rates, will result in a net tax increase on the American people.

The President would have you believe that getting rid of tax expenditures is acceptable, because they only impact the rich. That is why he talks about bonus depreciation for jets and yachts used as second homes. Yet in a series of speeches, I have attempted to show that this rhetoric of class warfare might work politically, but as a description of tax reality it is lacking. The fact is, the largest tax expenditures, those that the President and Democrats would have to look to in order to raise revenue for deficit reduction, benefit middle class itemizers the most.

Consider the example of the home mortgage interest deduction. Since adoption of the 16th amendment to the Constitution in 1913—98 years ago—the United States has had an individual income tax. And for that entire time home mortgage interest has been deductible in calculating taxable income.

Most of our fellow Americans, when buying a home, do not pay cash for the entire purchase price. Rather, they typically pay a certain percentage in cash and borrow the rest. It is common that the money borrowed is repaid in monthly increments over the course of 15 or 30 years. Those payments from the homeowner to the lender to compensate for the borrowing of money are interest payments. If you itemize your deductions, you get to subtract home mortgage interest from adjusted gross income—or AGI—in arriving at taxable income.

The most significant of the itemized deductions available to taxpayers is the home mortgage interest deduction. The mortgage interest deduction is the second largest tax expenditure identified by the Joint Committee on Taxation, and it is not primarily a benefit for the wealthy. Thirty percent of the benefit of the mortgage interest tax expenditure goes to taxpayers over $200,000. Taxpayers with income below $200,000 receive 70 percent of the benefit of the mortgage interest deduction. By a ratio of almost 2 to 1, taxpayers under $200,000 benefit from the mortgage interest deduction. Since $200,000 basically fits the definition of rich used by my friends on the other side of the aisle, we can see that the nonrich or middle income group disproportionately benefit from the mortgage interest deduction.

There have been proposals over the decades to eliminate the home mortgage interest deduction, but none of them have succeeded. In 1986, during the last major tax reform effort, there were active proposals to get rid of the home mortgage interest deduction.

President Clinton attacked some of the tax benefits associated with home ownership back in the 1990s. Specifically, President Clinton proposed taxing the imputed income associated with home ownership. A homeowner by living in his home enjoys a certain benefit—the ability to live in his home. That is, he could have rented the home out for a certain amount of money, but he instead decided to live in the home. It is as if he received the rental money for the home, and then spent it on rent so that the owner himself could live in the home.

As policy this is somewhat convoluted. Generally, Congress has been reluctant to tax people when they have

received no cash. In addition, those on a fixed income would have found it difficult in many cases to get the cash to pay the tax. Finally, there would be significant administrative concerns—just what would the rental value of a home be? How would that be determined? It would be quite difficult. Thus, in a bipartisan fashion, Congress rejected the President's proposal to tax imputed income arising from owner-occupied housing.

Now President Obama is taking another crack at it because he wants to raise money to reduce the deficit. President Obama has proposed, reproposed, reproposed again, and reproposed yet again to reduce the benefit of the home mortgage interest deduction. I am speaking of President Obama's proposed 28 percent limitation on itemized deductions. President Obama has proposed to limit the tax rate at which high-income taxpayers can take itemized deductions to 28 percent. This is meant to lessen the benefit to higher income taxpayers of itemized deductions—the home mortgage interest deduction being the most significant of the itemized deductions. The Joint Committee on Taxation says that this provision would mean the Federal Government would collect an additional $293 billion in taxes over 10 years.

To understand this provision, allow me to tell you about two taxpayers: William and Spencer. Let's assume that William is in the 15 percent tax bracket, and that Spencer is in the 35 percent tax bracket. Under current law, an additional itemized deduction of $100 is worth $15 to William, and $35 to Spencer. That is, an additional itemized deduction of $100 will reduce William's tax bill by $15, but Spencer's tax bill would go down by $35. If the President's 28 percent limitation proposal were to go forward, however, although the itemized deduction would still be worth $15 to William, it would now be worth only $28 to Spencer.

Of course, one may think—well why should high-income Spencer get a more valuable tax benefit from an itemized deduction than low-income William? But that mischaracterizes things. First of all, high-income Spencer, even under current law, still pays significantly more tax than low-income William. That is not only true in absolute dollar terms, but also in terms as a percentage of their respective incomes. Furthermore, the 35 percent bracket was set by Congress with an understanding and realization that itemized deductions would allow a significant tax benefit. That is, had Congress known that higher income taxpayers would be disallowed some of their itemized deductions, as the President now proposes, undoubtedly Congress would have created a lower maximum tax rate bracket than the current 35 percent tax bracket. So, to take away some of the benefit of itemized deductions to higher-income taxpayers but leave the high-income tax rates at their current high levels is to upset the balance struck by prior Congresses. Obviously, Congress is allowed to do that. But let's not pretend that current law is somehow an oversight, or unintended consequence, from prior legislation.

Some of the President's advisers defend the proposed 28 percent limitation on the grounds that 28 percent was the tax benefit one would get during the later Reagan years. Yes, that is true. But it is only true because 28 percent was the highest tax bracket after the Reagan tax reform!

The larger point is this, however. To the extent that the home mortgage interest deduction, or any tax expenditure for that matter, should be addressed by Congress, it should be addressed through the context of a comprehensive, revenue neutral tax reform that lowers rates. These tax-expenditures should not be cherrypicked by the President and his liberal allies to pay for the checks that his administration has written.

I have made this point many times, but today, it is important to make it again. To the extent that any tax expenditures are taken away, tax rates should come down, so that the net effect to government revenues on a static-score basis is neutral. That's what tax reform is all about— getting rid of tax expenditures so as to reduce tax rates. By reducing tax rates, we will unleash the free-market. By unleashing the free market, we will grow the economy. By growing the economy, tax receipts will increase, even though on a static-scoring basis, tax reform would be revenue neutral. If we get rid of tax expenditures without an offsetting tax-rate reduction, then we have simply made the task of tax reform that much harder. We have squandered an important opportunity.

I would like to make a last procedural point about where we go from here. Even if Congress passes, and the President signs, this deficit reduction package, we are going to be back at this again before the year is out. The President will be asking Congress to raise the debt ceiling again. Given that, I would like once again to address the failure by the Treasury Department to respond to repeated requests I have made over the past week about Treasury's short-term cash position, and the failure by almost every member of the so-called Financial Stability Oversight Council—or, F-SOCK—to provide Congress with information about their contingency plans in the event there is a ratings downgrade on U.S. debt in the future.

Does Treasury still think it will run out of cash by midnight tonight? I have been given only limited information. Treasury continues to say we will run out of cash today and will not be able to pay our bills, the same date they estimated way back in May. But, Treasury won't show me how they are arriving at that estimate. I have not been informed, Congress has not been informed, and Americans counting on timely Social Security payments have not been informed. Almost every member of the F-SOCK, including Treasury and the Federal Reserve, has refused to provide me with any information about their contingency plans for ratings downgrades. Even if the debt limit is raised, there is no assurance that we won't face a downgrade. We need to know the government's plans.

As I have said repeatedly, this is unacceptable. I want to be clear about two things. First, Congress will have to look into this matter very carefully, and investigate whether Treasury and most of our major financial regulators have been deliberately withholding information from Congress, and if so for what purposes.

Second, assuming that down the road Treasury will present Congress with another default date, I want to put them on notice that this fall I will be demanding timely substantiation of Treasury's assessment and the government's cash position. Absent this cooperation, I will stand in the way of any debt limit increase demanded by an unsubstantiated Treasury-determined deadline.

In closing I want to be clear. I cannot support the outcome of these negotiations. But my opposition is not owing to the failure of conservatives or the Republican leadership in the House and Senate. It is owing to what is clearly amounting to the failed presidency of President Obama. He and his allies are ideologically committed to more spending. Fortunately, the American people will have the final verdict on this economic philosophy in 2012.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGAMAN). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address the Obama-Boehner debt deal. I must say it is an issue on which I have been immersed in wrestling to understand the impact on unemployment, the impact on investments that will strengthen our Nation down the road; certainly an impact on programs that strengthen our families. It is in that context we try to understand how do we build the strongest possible Nation for working families. How do we do that? Is the Obama-Boehner debt deal the right path? I must conclude that it is not the right path. I conclude that for four reasons.

The first is the impact on jobs. We are facing a gathering storm on the job front. We have 5 to 8 million additional foreclosures that are suppressing the success of our construction market, driving down the value of houses and having a devastating impact on the attempts at a recovery.

Second, the unemployment benefits. The extended unemployment benefits expire this year, and the rough estimate is that that will result in a reduction of around 500,000 jobs. That is a tremendous blow in 2012. Then we have the termination of a payroll tax holiday and the estimate is that may well produce losses of jobs of more than 900,000 across America. Add them and you are talking about nearly 1.5 million lost jobs that we will face in 2012.

So on top of this gathering storm comes the Obama-Boehner debt deal that is estimated to produce another job loss—and by varying estimates—from 100,000 to 300,000. Doesn't this deal take us in the wrong direction? Shouldn't we be on this floor working to create jobs, not to destroy jobs? The success of our families depends on it.

My second major reservation about the Obama-Boehner debt deal is its impact on working families through the concentration of cuts on the 18 percent of the budget that is the nondefense discretionary portion. This is the portion of the budget that involves Head Start and Pell grants—in other words, an opportunity for our children, our smallest children, success for university education for our college-bound students. It is the area of the budget that involves investments in clean energy. It involves our small business programs that support the success of our small businesses. It involves job training that helps families adjust to a changing dynamic in the economy, and so much more.

In this 18 percent of the budget is where the cuts will hit. What with the phase I required cuts, or title 1 cuts, in combination with the cuts under title 3, you have essentially 15 percent cuts from the 2011 March CBO baseline. Understand that baseline for 2011 is a very low baseline, much lower than 2010, much lower than 2009. It takes us back many years earlier. We have a very low baseline and we are going to cut 15 percent more out of the core programs supporting the success of our working families, supporting the success of our smallest children, supporting the success of our college-bound children. This is not the path that builds a stronger America.

The third factor is that while our children in Head Start and our children headed for college and our citizens seeking job training are going to take these blows, the wealthy and well-connected do not contribute one slim dime. As some of my colleagues have argued: Well, you know what, there are some of those programs embedded in the Tax Code that actually help the middle class. My colleague from Utah was just making that argument. Then the argument is extended: So don't touch any of those programs. Well, if we take that same attitude toward our spending programs, we would say some benefit the middle class, so don't touch any spending programs. Obviously, it is an absurd argument. Why is it made on the revenue side, to those programs there, but not in the programs that are on the appropriations bill? Why is the tax bill protected from not only that argument but the spending bills are not? One simple answer: The programs for the wealthy and well-connected are in the tax bill. So this false argument is used to defend the accumulation of wealth, the expansion of prosperity for the few—for the powerful few—at the expense of families across this Nation.

My fourth concern about the Obama-Boehner debt deal is that simply it was forged out of a process of extortion. If you look through the editorials, you see words such as ''hostage taking'' and ''extortion'' and ''lunacy.'' We only have to turn back to Ronald Reagan to remember what he had to say on this. He said: This brinksmanship threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on Social Security and veterans' benefits. Interest markets would skyrocket, instability would occur in the financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar. The United States has a special responsibility to itself and to the world to meet its obligations.

Those who have threatened, for the first time in U.S. history, for the United States not to meet its obligations, which would result in a devastating impact for families across this Nation, those who carried out that threat did so in the wrong spirit—not the spirit of America pulling together, but in the spirit of creating a situation of hostage taking and extortion designed to protect the most powerful and wealthy at the expense of families across this Nation.

Because this deal does damage to jobs and contributes to a gathering storm in 2012 that threatens to take us back to a double-dip recession, because the cuts are concentrated on the programs such as education and Head Start and Pell grants that support the success of our children and the success for our future economy, because it doesn't take one slim dime of contribution from those who are most able to contribute in our society, and because it was forged out of a fundamentally inappropriate use of extortion against the American family—for those four reasons I will oppose this deal.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill. I would say for the second time in about a week I have come to the floor to speak after one of my friends on the other side who is talking about what we ought to be talking about, and both times they were right. They said we should be talking about private sector job creation. I say where are the bills to do that?

We have been here the week of the Fourth of July. We were here and we had two votes that week. One was to compel the Senators who didn't show up to show up. The other one was on some motion to proceed to cloture on something that had nothing to do with job creation or any of the other issues we should be talking about. We could talk about what we ought to be talking about, and that would be one thing. Of course, what we are talking about today is the moment we have arrived at, the date that was set by the administration. Apparently they were right in speculating when we need to look at the borrowing limit again, and that is today.

I rise in support of the bill. I said for months the only thing worse than not raising the debt limit would be raising the debt limit and not changing behavior. In fact, I think that is what all the rating agencies that everybody is talking about now, whether they are going to and how they are going to rate our bond rating in the future—they have all said—and they said long before they talked about the debt limit—that we are spending more money than we can afford to spend as a Federal Government or as a society. We are spending $1 out of $4 that the society can produce, and that is about 25 percent more than we spent in 2008. It is 25 percent more than we spent on the average from the 40 years from 2008 going backward four decades, and that is important. I think this bill does begin the process of changing behavior. The way we approached the debt limit this time was everything but business as usual.

This is a totally different discussion than we have had before about the debt limit, and the country has almost always had debt. I think there have been only a couple of times in our history where Andrew Jackson paid off the debt and there was one other time we paid off the debt—only a couple of times in our history when we didn't have some kind of debt. In the tradition of that debt, we have always said: Okay, let's borrow more money because we need more money. This time, for the first time, we said: Why do we need more money? Why is it that we are increasing debt? Why is it we are increasing debt so rapidly? We had a $10 trillion debt in January of 2009, and 30 months later we have a $15 trillion debt. Obviously that trajectory cannot continue and the framework for the decision that is made in this bill says it won't continue.

Do we continue to add debt over the next decade? We wouldn't have to. There is a study out that says every time the debt ceiling comes up over the next 10 years, we make the same kind of determination that for every dollar we increase the debt ceiling, we are going to find a dollar in savings over the next decade. That study would indicate that in 10 years we balance the budget. Of course, that is what we should be doing, balancing the budget. This body, before I served here, before I served in the House, before I was in the Congress at all, in 1995 came within one vote of the balanced budget amendment, one vote of passing the amendment that had passed the House. In 1996 it came within two votes of passing that same amendment that had passed the House again. If that one vote would have changed in 1995 or the two votes would have changed in 1996, we would not be having this discussion today because we would have a balanced budget today and would be moving in the way that every State but one has to function and every family in America eventually has to come to grips with the fact that they cannot spend more than they have.

The truth is, this agreement, while it is a 10-year agreement, is only enforceable for a couple of years. I believe we will do what this agreement says this year and next year. I am hopeful and optimistic the select committee will do its job and come back with another $1½ trillion or more of cuts to spending, and that is going to happen—that select committee is going to report this year. The budget cap is set for this year and next year.

But elections matter, and who is elected in 2012 to the House and the Senate and the Presidency will finally and ultimately make a decision about whether this track we are on now gets better than it is now or, frankly, heads back in the other direction. I think the campaign pledges are important. While I support the bill, I am also fully appreciative of everyone who feels as though they can't.

Frankly, if some campaign pledges hadn't been made in 2010, we probably wouldn't be at this moment. And if that is somehow extraordinary—that people run for office and say that is what they are going to do and then they come here and do that—that is what the process is all about and how it is supposed to work.

Is this my sense of what would have been the best way to deal with these spending cuts? We would have more spending cuts if I were writing this bill. But the fact is, in Washington today no one party controls anything. My party, the Republican Party, controls one-third of what it takes to get a bill to become law, and the other party controls two-thirds. At the end of the day, by definition, nobody is going to be totally happy with this bill.

But as Senator PAT ROBERTS said yesterday in a meeting I was in, using an old legislative saying: This is not the best possible bill, but it is the best bill possible. It is the best we can do right now.

I think we take this victory and use it as a way to move forward to the future.

Mr. President, I rise, again, in support of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I come to the floor to express my support for the measure before us, as my colleague from Missouri who has just spoken, and as everyone else I have heard express their support for this proposal. No one seems perfectly satisfied with it, but that is inevitable. I think we have come to one of those classic moments of a very big challenge our Nation faces—this enormous debt—and whether in this agreement we see this glass half full or the glass half empty and whether what encourages us in the agreement outweighs what disappoints us.

For me, the positive outweighs the negative. I am going to vote for my hopes about what this agreement means as opposed to my fears that we are not doing enough in this agreement.

What makes me most happy about it is this is a bipartisan compromise that turns the corner, turns the ship of America's state away from greater and greater deficits and a greater national debt and in the direction of balancing our budget once more. It turns us in the direction of reestablishing classic American values of discipline and thrift and concern about our future and investment in our future, which we have lost in our Federal Government through the work of both parties in the executive and legislative branches of our government.

It is a bipartisan agreement at a time when this Chamber and this city have become reflexively and destructively partisan, and that is encouraging to me, that it is bipartisan. It is a compromise at a time when this city has become ideologically rigid, and it is clear, if we look at our history, that we only make progress when we compromise. That is because we are such a big, diverse country with so many different opinions and points of view. So this is a bipartisan compromise. It is the beginning of a long, hard march back to fiscal responsibility in our country—back to a balanced budget.

So what troubles me about it? What troubles me about it is that the bipartisan compromise also represents a kind of bipartisan agreement by each party to yield to the other party's most politically and ideologically sensitive priority. In the case of Democrats, it is to protect entitlement spending, and in the case of Republicans it is to not raise taxes. The reality is that we have to do some of both if we are going to get our country back into balance.

Because this agreement doesn't really touch the entitlement programs—particularly Medicare, which is growing faster, bigger than any other government program—it puts all the burden of getting back toward balance in our budget on the so-called discretionary spending part of the budget. That is about one-third of Federal spending. About 60 percent is the entitlement or mandatory programs. So we have the beginning of a system that forces cuts in the discretionary third of the budget—defense and nondefense—which they have to do, they have to cut—but it doesn't ask much of anything of the 60 percent that is growing so rapidly, which is entitlement spending.

As a result, if the special committee created in this agreement—which is the great hope of the agreement, I think—doesn't work its will and involve itself in entitlement reform and tax reform, and Congress doesn't accept it, then the trigger, the automatic spending cuts are also all from discretionary spending, asking that one-third of the budget to pay the way, even though it is a small part of the responsibility for the increase in government spending. That would have a devastating effect on our national security because it would dramatically undercut our defense, as well as some of the programs that are the great investment programs of our future: education, energy, et cetera, et cetera. So I hope the special committee will redeem our hopes and Congress will too by dealing with entitlement reform.

I wish to say here that Senator TOM COBURN of Oklahoma and I, in June, introduced a proposal that would take steps to save Medicare for the almost 70 million people who will be on Medicare in a decade and reduce the enormous costs it places on our taxpayers. I think a lot of people in our country think the payroll deductions and the premiums they pay, pay the total benefits of Medicare. Unfortunately, that is not so. The average Medicare beneficiary in their lifetime takes $3 or $4 out of the system for every $1 they put in, and we just can't run a program long term like that. Who picks up the rest? The taxpayers, the budget. That is a big part of why we are heading into deficit. So we can't save Medicare by leaving it as it is. We can only save Medicare—and I want to save Medicare because I believe in the program—if we change it.

Senator COBURN and I put forward this plan that will save over $600 billion in Medicare costs over the next decade. It will extend the solvency of Medicare by at least 30 years and reduce Medicare's 75-year unfunded liabilities by $10 trillion.

Now, I know our plan contains some strong medicine, but that is what it will take to keep Medicare alive, and we believe our plan administers this medicine in a fair way. Senator COBURN and I are going to forward our proposal, which is in legislative form, to the joint select committee for their consideration, and we hope they will include parts of it in their recommended legislation.

I also believe it is essential for the joint committee to act to bolster the solvency of Social Security. Many think Social Security is not contributing to the deficit because it has a positive balance in the Social Security trust fund. But what is in that trust fund? It is notes that the United States Government has given to the Social Security trust fund every time we have borrowed from it. Of course, we are bound to pay that money back.

The fact is, today Social Security is running a deficit on a cashflow basis. In other words, the payments into the system are not as great as the payments out, and they will continue to do that in increasing numbers for the foreseeable future.

What does that mean? It means the Social Security trust fund has to come to the Federal Government to redeem the bonds the government gave Social Security when it borrowed the money. How does our government pay back the Social Security trust fund? By borrowing over the next two decades $2.6 trillion, currently held in IOUs, plus interest. If we don't do something to save Social Security, when we hit the year of 2036, Social Security will only

be able to pay benefits to the extent that they are covered by incoming receipts, and that will mean a sudden, shocking, painful 23-percent cut in benefits for senior citizens.

We have to begin to enact reforms now to slowly save Social Security, and we can do it. I wish to indicate today to my colleagues that Senator COBURN and I are working again on a bipartisan proposal to secure Social Security for America's seniors for the long term, and we hope to have that done in time to also forward to the special committee for their consideration.

So the bottom line: We can't protect these entitlements as well as have the national defense we need to protect us in a dangerous world while we are at war against Islamic extremists who attacked us on 9/11, and will be for a long time to come. We can't not touch the entitlements or raise taxes and create a tax reform proposal and expect to protect all the programs of investment in our future that mean so much to America's families: education particularly, alternative energy, investments in our transportation system.

To be able to do all that in the right way, we need this special committee and Congress to take the next steps. But this is a significant beginning, as imperfect as it is.

If I may, finally, for all of us—and particularly for the President, the Speaker, the majority leader, the Republican leader in the House, and the Democratic leader in the Senate, and everybody who worked so hard, coming close to the kind of grand bargain I think we needed, that the Simpson-Bowles Commission adopted, that the Gang of 6, our 6 colleagues, recommended to us, which I support, and that the President and the Speaker, President Obama and Speaker BOEHNER, were close to but unfortunately fell apart—there is disappointment that a lot of us feel. But perhaps to put it in a broader context, I wish to quote from an op-ed piece in the Wall Street Journal today written by David Rivkin and Lee Casey, who are two lawyers whose work I have long admired. Here is what they say to take us back and perhaps remind us that we fill these seats for a short period of time. We act within the system created by our Framers, and we do our best. They wrote:

> The debt-ceiling crisis has prompted predictable media laments about how partisan and dysfunctional our political system has become. But if the process leading to the current deal was a ''spectacle'' and a ''three-ring circus,''

As someone put it—

> the show's impresarios are none other than James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. Our messy political system is working exactly the way our Founders intended it to.

Then I go toward the end of their op-ed piece:

> The key point has been made—

Excuse me. Let me start a paragraph ahead:

> Rarely in our system do the participants—

Whether in the White House, Senate, or House—

> achieve all or even most of their goals in a single political battle. . . . The key point has been made. Few now suggest that we can continue on our current spending binge. That is the beginning of a consensus, and a good start towards genuine change.

The Framers would be pleased at the spectacle.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is not a solution I would have preferred, but the compromise finally reached by the White House and congressional leaders has the potential to end this manufactured crisis. It is a solution that puts common sense and the national interest above partisanship and ideology.

The country has been pushed to the brink of catastrophe. The choice at hand is not this bill or something better. The choice is between the only bipartisan practical solution to the debt ceiling crisis, or a devastating default on the Nation's debts for the first time in our history. A default would send shock waves throughout our fragile economy. It would slap a credit rate tax on every household and every business in Vermont and across the country.

The solution before us includes $3 trillion in spending reductions reached through bipartisan negotiations that will yield the greatest overall budget savings ever. Just as Vermont families are having to make difficult financial decisions, we need to make long-term budget reforms, and the country should be spared the ordeal of having to go through this same kind of torment again just a few months from now.

The special congressional committee chartered by this legislation to recommend future deficit reduction can consider revenue measures, and I will continue to push for an end to outdated tax loopholes for giant oil firms and companies that ship American jobs overseas. I also continue to believe that the wealthiest Americans should pay their fair share in these solutions.

If the special congressional committee fails to make bipartisan recommendations, then the agreement calls for cuts in defense spending and protections for Social Security, Medicare benefits, Medicaid, veterans benefits and child nutrition. I strongly support these protections.

All along the American people have wanted this debt-limit crisis resolved promptly and fairly through the give-and-take of our representative government. It is extremely unfortunate that many who manufactured this crisis in the first place then stood in the way of a solution for weeks on end, threatening the first default on United States obligations in our history.

Many in this body recall, as I do, the period just two short decades ago when Congress and a Democratic President were able to balance the Federal budget and create budget surpluses that were on their way to paying off the national debt altogether. I remember also the key Senate vote to put us on that path, which had to be achieved without any support from the other side of the aisle. Those balanced budgets and surpluses also were achieved without any constitutional amendment requiring them. And those surpluses grew, until subsequent decisions were made by a new administration, and ratified by a new Congress, that squandered the surpluses and piled the debt up once again.

What the American people want, need, and deserve right now is a return to wise and disciplined leadership. We need the return of a willingness to cooperate and to forge solutions across partisan lines to solve the most pressing issues facing the country. The economic health of the Nation and the jobs of thousands of hardworking Americans should not be mired in politics.

The Senate throughout history has shown its remarkable ability to rise up in times of crisis to reflect the conscience of the Nation. Now is such a time, for the good of the country, for Democrats and Republicans in both chambers to rise to the occasion and put an end to this contrived crisis that has put our entire economy at risk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Connecticut on his remarks and, particularly, his closing. I associate myself with what he said. I will support this bill when it comes to the floor at 12 o'clock today.

On Saturday, I came to the floor at 2 o'clock out of frustration and made a speech critical of the negotiators as we were letting the clock run and had no deal. I was critical because we had pretty much had an agreement we were going to cut. We pretty much had an agreement we were going to establish a select committee to do the cutting. But we had not agreed to a balanced budget amendment. We had not agreed to an enforcement mechanism on the committee to make sure they did the cutting. Probably most importantly of all, we had not agreed to triggers on the debt ceiling increase for accountability.

I come to the floor today not frustrated but feeling somewhat rewarded because on the three solutions negotiated to those three component parts of this particular piece of legislation, the genie is out of the bottle, and history is about to be made.

No. 1, on the debt ceiling increase, when the trigger was finally established, it means from now on whenever this debt ceiling increase is asked for by a Republican or Democratic President, it will be demanded that there be spending cuts commensurate with any increase. That is historic. That is the first step in the right direction of sanity, accountability, and fiscal responsibility.

Secondly, they finally came together and agreed there would be a balanced

budget amendment vote in the House and the Senate before this year end, with incentives for us to vote for that balanced budget amendment. For the first time since 1995—the first time in 16 years—the Congress of the United States will be debating, forcing itself to do what every American family has to do. There is not a family within the sound of my voice who has not had to sit down in the last 3 years in this country—because of our recession and our economy and because of spending—and reprioritize how they spend their money to balance their budget, to live within their means. It is about time the Congress of the United States asked of itself what it imposes on every family in America.

As far as the select committee, there was a fear among many that it would only be a paper tiger; that it would not have the claws or the teeth to actually do what it needs to do on the cuts. While I would have done a different type of sequestration, I commend those who negotiated this sequestration on putting one in that has enough teeth and enough fear to force this select committee to do what it needs to do.

Today, when I vote in favor of this agreement, I will be voting for us to cut spending where we need to—not as much as I would have liked but a lot more than we have ever seen before—but, most importantly, voting for the assurance that never again will a debt ceiling go up without a debate for commensurate cuts in spending. That is important. I will be voting for this because we will have a balanced budget amendment on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives that we have long needed since the last one failed 16 years ago. And we finally have a sequestration mechanism or an enforcement mechanism to enforce the select committee to do what it is charged to do in this particular legislation.

My frustration I expressed on Saturday is gone. My pride in the Senate is restored, and I look forward to casting my vote in favor of this agreement at 12 o'clock today.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you for recognizing me.

I am honored to be, once again, on the Senate floor. I have spoken many times about the issue that is now before us for a vote in just a few minutes.

This is a significant point in our country's financial history—a time in which politics has played its course and decisions have to be made. I come here at this moment with no real joy. I think we have put the American people through a lot—certainly, over the last several months—as we asked them to follow along as we discussed this idea of raising the debt ceiling.

There was some thought by many of us that we could use this moment of raising the debt ceiling to make some significant changes in the way we do business in Washington, DC. In fact, on March 22 of this year, I wrote President Obama a letter indicating I could not vote to raise the debt ceiling unless I saw substantial reductions in spending and structural changes in the way we do business in the Congress and Washington, DC.

Why I say there is no joy for me to be here today, in my view, we have failed to do either one. There are no substantial reductions in spending, and there are no significant changes in the way Washington, DC, does business.

This country needs certainty, and I have said all along we need to raise the debt ceiling. There needs to be that certainty. I have said it would be irresponsible for us not to raise the debt ceiling, but I have said all along it would be equally as irresponsible if we raised the debt ceiling without meeting the criteria I have outlined.

While we will have a discussion among all of us that continues today—and we will probably play quarterback and Friday morning quarterback after this is over to figure out what we have accomplished—but, in my view, it is important to know there are no cuts in this bill. There is only a reduction in the growth of spending, and that reduction is so small—$21 billion reduced in the first year in the growth in spending.

In Kansas, when we hear the word ''billion,'' we think that is a lot of money, and it is. So I think Kansans will hear the words ''$21 billion'' and think: Oh, my, they are finally doing something significant. But the truth is, we spend $4 billion more each day than we take in, and that $21 billion, if realized, in the slowing of the growth of spending, will be gone in less than a week. This legislation does not cut spending.

While we promote a balanced budget amendment, which I think is so critical to our success in changing the structure of how we do things, there is no balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution in this agreement or one that will necessarily be sent to the States for ratification. Our national debt will continue to grow and, in fact, at the end of 10 years, if everything in this legislation is accomplished—and I think we have to be skeptical about that—our national debt will grow and reach $22 trillion. We are at $14.3 trillion or $14.4 trillion now. Ten years from now, with this legislation in place, $22 trillion. Over the next three decades, our debt will become three times the size of our entire economy.

We have talked about changing the way we look at things in Washington, DC. For the first time—and I agree with this—we are talking about reducing the growth of spending by the amount we are raising the debt ceiling. But can you imagine a family back in Kansas congratulating themselves for changing the topic without ever changing their spending patterns? Kansas families, when they are in trouble for spending too much money, cut the budget today. We are not doing that. They do not just slow the growth, and they do not wait for 10 years to see it realized.

The problem is today, and I think this is a significant problem. People will say we need to raise the debt ceiling today or our credit worthiness will be judged by the rating agencies and we will be downgraded. I worry that even with the passage of this bill, its effects are so minimal in spending that the downgrade will occur regardless.

So this is a time for us to make the tough choices as compared to kicking the can down the road one more time.

It is an honor to serve in the Senate. Nothing in my life, my background, would ever suggest I would have this opportunity. I am honored to serve Kansans, and I will do my best to make the right decisions on their behalf. But as I have listened to Kansans for the last 2 years on the topic of what is important to them, the economy matters, and the first thing we have to do is get our fiscal house in order so the economy can grow and people can find jobs and get better jobs.

While my assumption, based upon the news reports, is the legislation I oppose will pass today, I pledge myself to my Kansas constituents that I will work hard to see that every dime that is possible to be saved occurs, and I will redouble my efforts to see we grow the economy and put Americans back to work because the revenues we need to balance our books are not increases in taxes.

The revenue we need to balance our books is a strong and growing economy so every American can put food on their family's table, save for their children's education, and prepare for their own retirement, and that we are blessed with the opportunity in this country to see every American child be able to pursue the American dream.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, for weeks, Americans have watched the debate about raising our Nation's debt ceiling. I know it is has been difficult and often frustrating to watch what is happening, but the discussion could not have been more important for the future of America. We have been talking, again, about whether we would increase America's borrowing limit.

In doing so, we have rightly focused on how to prevent a default on America's credit, but also, just as important, rather than just reflexively continuing to borrow money we do not have from Chinese bankers, how we are going to confront the fundamental behavior in Congress that has led us to this culture of borrowing and overspending.

I have said from the beginning of this debate that we owe it to the American people, and I owe it to my constituents in New Hampshire, to confront both issues—to avoid default and, finally, to

confront our debt once and for all, and to change the direction in which we are headed as a country.

To address only default and to continue to kick the can down the road on making the tough decisions to fundamentally change the path we are on will surely lead to a downgrade of our credit rating. It will sap our economic strength and will lead to the insolvency of the greatest country on Earth.

While I appreciate the difficult work done by the Speaker of the House and our Senate leadership in coming up with an agreement that avoids default, I am unable to support a bill that delivers the largest debt ceiling increase in the history of our Nation but does very little to confront the underlying problems that have brought us here—problems that have led us to over a $14 trillion debt and which will increase in the next 2 years to over $16 trillion in debt.

I have not come to this decision lightly. I have had countless meetings over the last months and weeks with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to talk about this issue and how we can confront this crisis now. I have said from the beginning we need fundamental changes in the way we do business in Washington, including budget reforms, enacting a responsible budget.

I am a member of the Senate Budget Committee—the newest member of that committee—and it has been terribly disappointing to me that the Senate hasn't allowed the Budget Committee to do its work and come up with a budget for the United States of America.

So we do need fundamental budget reforms. I have said we need major spending reductions, and we need to reform our entitlement programs. I cannot in good conscience agree to a deal that continues to perpetuate the culture of overspending and borrowing in Washington.

In coming to this decision, I have asked myself several questions: The first question I have asked is, Does this agreement significantly reduce spending? Unfortunately, the answer is no. While it claims to reduce the deficit by $917 billion over the next 10 years, only in Washington would this be called a spending reduction. Because of baseline budgeting, a reduction of $917 billion in the deficit, as it is claimed, is no reduction at all. Over the next 10 years, under this agreement, we will spend over $830 billion more in discretionary spending.

So there is no reduction in spending. If you just look at the reduction from what we will spend in fiscal year 2012, it is really only a $7 billion reduction in spending between what we will spend in 2011 and 2012. We borrow $4 billion a day to sustain our government. So the spending reductions between what we spend in 2011 to 2012 is not even 2 days of borrowing for the United States of America.

Many of the cuts are in the outyears. And you know what happens in Washington when the cuts are in the outyears. Unfortunately, our history has been that they do not get done. That is why I am concerned about even the $917 billion claim in reductions, which is not a reduction in spending.

I have also asked myself, Does this agreement in any way reduce the size of government? We know this government has continued to grow even as State governments and families have made the tough decisions to downsize, to reduce, to live within their means. This deal does not cut or end one government program.

In March, the GAO came out with a report that identified hundreds of duplicative programs that happen here in Washington where we could save billions of dollars. My colleague from Oklahoma, Dr. TOM COBURN, has done the hard work of identifying hundreds and hundreds of duplicative programs where we could save billions of dollars. Yet this agreement does not reduce the size of government at all or end one of those programs.

Does it avoid a downgrading of our credit? Unfortunately, I think this agreement will also lead us to a downgrade. And why does that matter? Because it will hurt the economic strength of America and our economic growth, our borrowing costs. It will hurt our job creators when now more than ever we need to create jobs in this country and put people to work. Yet our failure to get our fiscal house in order here in Washington is hurting the hard-working people in New Hampshire and America.

The credit rating agencies and even the President's own fiscal commission have said that the minimum amount of debt reduction that we need over the next decade is $4 trillion just to stabilize our debt and to ensure our AAA credit rating is not downgraded. But with this agreement, even if everything happens and this congressional committee does all of its work, we will only see a maximum reduction of $2.4 trillion. And that is assuming everything in those outyears gets done, which we do not always have a good history of here in Washington.

Finally, does it change the trajectory of where we are going with our debt to preserve our country? No. Under this agreement, we will continue to about $1 trillion a year to our debt—a debt that is already $14 trillion.

It does nothing to strengthen our entitlement programs. We know from the trustees of Medicare that program is going bankrupt in 2024. We know from Social Security that program is going to be bankrupt in 2036. Yet we have not taken on that fundamental problem in this agreement. How do we reform those programs to preserve them for Americans that are relying on them and to sustain them for future beneficiaries?

While I appreciate that we are beginning to change the discussion here in Washington, I cannot support this agreement. I appreciate that it is very important that we avoid default, but I know we are better than this. I know we can do more to make sure we preserve the greatest country on Earth. We need to take on the fundamental problems, the chronic overspending in Washington. We cannot continue to say that a reduction is a reduction when it is not, when we are continuing to spend more money, because at home people look at that and say: Give me a break. That is not how I do my family budget.

We have to tell the truth to the American people and make the hard decisions. I know we can come together and get something done that will fundamentally change the direction in which we are headed. That is why I am disappointed about this agreement, because it does not do that.

We must do more than avoid default. We must save our country for the sake of our children. I have often come to this floor and talked about the fact that I am the mother of two children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Ms. AYOTTE. I am the mother of a 6-year-old and a 3-year-old. This discussion goes beyond those of us who are serving right here; it is about what kind of country are we going to leave for the next generation. And I know I will not look my children in the eye and have them say: Mom, what did you do about it?

We have to solve this crisis now. I know we can. I look forward to working with my colleagues on behalf of the people of New Hampshire, to really rolling up our sleeves, finally cutting spending, and saving the greatest country on Earth.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, during the past few weeks and months, Congress and the President have been involved in discussions to raise the debt ceiling, and reduce spending, deficits and debt. This discussion is a result of the elections last year. The voters sent a strong message that it was time for Washington to stop the spending spree. And it is because of that message that we are even having this debate. Even the President now agrees that to address our fiscal situation we need to reduce spending.

That has not always been the case, though. Just last year President Obama refused to endorse or advance the findings of his own National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform. On February 14, President Obama submitted his budget proposal to Congress that refused to address our looming deficits and debt. Over the next 10 years, his budget would have added another $13 trillion to our national debt. President Obama's budget was so out of touch that it was rejected in the Senate by a vote of 97–0. Then he delivered a speech in April that magically found $4 trillion in spending cuts.

In just a matter of weeks, President Obama found $4 trillion in spending that no longer needed to be spent.

The American people have to wonder how Washington can be serious about budgets and spending if the President, in a matter of weeks, can find $4 trillion of spending that was of national importance on February 14, but is no longer necessary on April 13. It is this type of behavior that leads people to be cynical of Washington and the Federal Government. It is little wonder that lofty commitments from Washington are received in Middle America as just more empty promises and political rhetoric.

Up until a few months ago, President Obama and members of his administration were calling for a clean debt limit increase with no spending cuts. He simply wanted Congress to provide him a blank check.

The debate has shifted. We are no longer discussing spending increases. The entire debate today is about cutting spending, how much and from where. The fact that we are here today in agreement on the need to cut spending is an enormously important development. I commend all of those who worked and insisted that spending cuts be included in this agreement, and I thank those who were involved in working out this hard fought agreement.

Unfortunately, this bill does too little to address our overspending, deficits and debt. Virtually none of these cuts in this bill come in the next few years. It is all back loaded with no guarantee that Congress won't reverse course, and undo these spending reductions. And, there is no guarantee that entitlement programs that are driving the long-term fiscal problems will be reformed. These programs need reform so they remain viable, affordable and available for generations to come. But this bill has too little to ensure those reforms take place.

The American people sent us to Washington to confront these problems. They want us to stop overspending. They want us to chart a path to fiscal responsibility, where Washington spends only what we take in, like the American people themselves must do. And, while this bill is a small step in the right direction, I believe the American people expect and deserve a giant leap in the right direction.

In addition to its timidity on spending reductions, I fear that this bill will set up a process to increase taxes on the American people in the belief that more tax revenue would lower deficits. This bill creates a bicameral, bipartisan committee that will be tasked with producing the second tranche of deficit savings. Despite the fact that our government has a spending problem and not a revenue problem, President Obama continues to insist that higher taxes must be a part of a major deficit reduction plan. It is his desire for bigger government, and higher levels of taxation that will likely prevent any serious follow-on deficit reduction or entitlement reform package.

I want to be clear. I do not wish for the government to be launched toward a threat of default. My vote against this bill is not a signal that I would prefer default. I would not. But, I am compelled to vote against this package because I see this as a missed opportunity. We are providing President Obama with the largest increase in the national debt ceiling in history. But, instead of using this opportunity to address our near term and long term spending and fiscal problems, we are cutting a little now, and kicking the can further down the road.

This bill grants a $2.4 trillion increase in our Nation's debt limit, the largest increase in our history. The challenge for Congress and President Obama was to sketch a deficit reduction plan to address deficits and debt in a significant way. The uncertainty about Washington's fiscal management gets in the way of private-sector job creation and economic recovery. But this bill is insufficient in putting us on a path to live within our means.

To me, this is also a moral issue. It's wrong for this generation to over-spend and leave the bills for the next generation to pay. The trajectory of our debt is alarming. It will soon undermine our economy and our economic growth. If we do nothing, our children and grandchildren will have fewer economic opportunities than we have had. Without a plan to put our fiscal situation on a better path, the next generations will have a lower quality of life than the one we've experienced. We can't let that happen. But, I am afraid this bill will accomplish too little in this regard.

Again, I recognize that this hard fought compromise is a step in the right direction, and I am pleased that Congress and the American people have recognized the terrible fiscal path our nation is on. I only wish that this plan was proportional to the size of the problems we face.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during any quorum call be equally divided.

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, 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. LEE. 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. LEE. Mr. President, I stand today to explain my reasons for voting against the debt limit increase we will be voting on in just about half an hour from now.

This is a crisis that America faces. It is an ongoing crisis that will neither be created nor eliminated with today's vote. It is a crisis that has been building gradually over the course of years—decades, in fact. It is a crisis that we certainly have known about ever since this Congress was sworn in in January of this year.

This is a crisis that threatens potentially every Federal program, from defense to entitlements, because as we continue to borrow more money as a nation, adding to the already almost $15 trillion we have accumulated in national debt—roughly $50,000 for every man, woman, and child in America; roughly $150,000 for every taxpayer in America—as we continue to add to that enormous debt, we get closer and closer to the unknown but nonetheless existing point at which we will no longer be able to borrow, at least not at interest rates that will make this kind of borrowing sustainable.

If interest rates were to go up even to their historically average levels, within just a few years we could be spending something closer to $1 trillion every single year. Just to pay the interest on our national debt, we could be paying more than we pay on Social Security in an entire year, more than Medicare and Medicaid combined, and more than national defense in an entire year. What happens when we get to that point? Where does that money come from? The reality is that every Federal program, from defense to entitlements, could see its coffers raided in an unfortunate Draconian display of fiscal irresponsibility if we continue to punt this problem and not to address it.

The legislation at issue today addresses this problem by perpetuating it. I am pleased, of course, that this legislation does certain things and has invigorated a new conversation on the sorts of strategies that need to be in place if we are ever going to address this problem on a long-term basis.

Some 7 or 8 months ago, there were still people in this town of Washington, DC, who were saying things along the lines of "we need another stimulus package" or "we need more Federal spending of one sort or another." They are no longer saying that. Now the discussion focuses not on whether to cut but how much.

There is, of course, renewed discussion about the need for a balanced budget amendment. But talk is different from outcomes. What we need are outcomes. What we need is a fundamental change to the way we spend money in Washington. What we need is to restrict Congress's authority, granted by clause 2 of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, to incur debt in the name of the United States. That power needs to be restricted. The only way we can restrict that on a permanent basis, one that will bind not only this Congress but future Congresses that come after us, is through an amendment to the Constitution.

This legislation raises the debt limit by about $2.5 trillion. This is a record-breaking sum. Not too many years ago,

when I was in high school, this was roughly equivalent to our entire national debt. Now, through one piece of legislation, we are increasing, expanding our already huge national debt by roughly that same sum, and it does not contain any permanent, binding structural spending reform mechanisms of the sort that would be necessary to make sure we get out of this problem, to make sure we end the problem we have created through Congress's reckless pattern of perpetual deficit spending.

That is why I have insisted since before I was even sworn into office that before we raise the debt limit, we need to pass a balanced budget amendment and submit it to States for ratification. Nearly every State balances its budget each and every year. It is not news when a State does this. I look forward to the time when it will no longer be news when Congress does the same.

There are significant cuts discussed in this legislation and proposed, but I want to be clear on one thing: Although these cuts are large on a long-term basis, on a short-term basis they are less so. On a short-term basis, within the next year, this proposes to cut about $7 billion out of the fiscal year 2012 discretionary spending budget. Some dispute this number and suggest, as some of my colleague have already, that, in fact, the fiscal year 2012 budget will spend $23 billion more. Others concede the point and say: OK, let's assume for purposes of this discussion that it does, in fact, cut $7 billion from what otherwise would be new deficit spending. Now, $7 billion is roughly equivalent to the amount of debt we have added to our total debt portfolio just in the last 30 hours or so, roughly the period of time that has elapsed since this legislation was announced late Sunday night until this very moment, because we are borrowing about $4 billion of new debt every single day. Stated differently, this amounts to less than two-tenths of 1 percent of a cut.

I do believe we have made progress. I commend our leadership for working so hard to focus the discussion on the need for cuts.

We have, unfortunately, had Democratic leadership in this body that has been bent on delaying the announcement of any deal as long as possible and preventing legislation such as the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act from coming to the floor, where it could have been subjected to an open debate, discussion, and amendment process, as well it should be. I regret the fact that it didn't come to that, the fact that that legislation, which could have solved this problem and would have put us on a path toward fiscal responsibility, toward ending this problem once and for all, was not even allowed its day in the Senate to be debated and discussed on the merits.

At the end of the day, we have to come to terms with the fact that the course we are on, from a fiscal standpoint, is utterly unsustainable, and adding more debt to our now-bursting portfolio of debt will only contribute to this problem—unless we adopt a balanced budget amendment. The time to do that is right now.

The American people overwhelmingly support a balanced budget amendment, to the tune of about 75 percent. To my great astonishment, some of my colleagues and even the President have suggested that a balanced budget amendment is somehow a radical idea—so radical as to be absurd and not worth considering—even though three out of four Americans believe we need a balanced budget amendment.

I will close by referring to a quote by a man named William Morris, who said this in the late 1800s:

> One man with an idea in his head is in danger of being considered a madman; two men with the same idea in common may be foolish, but can hardly be mad; ten men sharing an idea begin to act, a hundred draw attention as fanatics, a thousand and society begins to tremble, a hundred thousand and there is war abroad, and the cause has victories tangible and real; and why only a hundred thousand? Why not a hundred million and peace upon the earth? You and I who agree together, it is we who have to answer that question.

It is not just one or two of us who have this idea in our head that we need to restrict Congress's borrowing power because it has been so severely abused over such a prolonged period of time; it is three out of four Americans. I urge my colleagues in the Senate and our counterparts in the House of Representatives to join the American people in at least the same proportion in supporting the idea that never again should we raise the debt limit without a balanced budget amendment in place.

This is a permanent, long-term problem. It requires a permanent solution. The only permanent solution is that which involves an amendment to the Constitution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, through serious negotiation, leaders from both parties and the President have reached a bipartisan solution that will lift our debt ceiling and prevent a downgrade of our credit.

Make no mistake, this agreement is stark and stern but necessary. It includes cuts that I would have never voted for under different circumstances. However, if we fail to take action, the economy will be irrevocably fractured.

While it is far from perfect, the agreement meets my principles for avoiding default and downgrade. It provides a long-term extension of the debt ceiling, a significant downpayment on cuts, and a path forward to reform tax earmarks and entitlements.

The consequences of a default and downgrade would be significant and severe and would alter the course of the United States for a century. Default would have led to sky-high interest rates that would have created a new tax on every single American. It means if you have a variable rate mortgage, it would skyrocket. If you have a student loan, the interest would increase. And if you have a car loan, the payments would be greater.

Under default, the President would also have to prioritize what obligations to pay. First, we would have to pay our troops. Then we would have to meet our obligations to seniors and veterans. Federal funding for State and local governments would run out. This would affect infrastructure projects, funding for schools and teachers and firehouses and police stations. Contractors who work for the Federal Government would face layoffs without pay, and businesses would reduce hiring. The economy would be further weakened, and it would be a self-inflicted wound. I could not allow this to happen.

I took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution. The 14th amendment says that the validity of America's debt must not be questioned. While the lawyers made the interpretation complicated, the framers made it simple. America pays its debt with no exceptions. Failure to reach an agreement would be a violation of the American people and our creditors' trust. And it would have violated my oath to the Constitution.

America must meet its obligations to its creditors. We must also meet our obligations to each other. Throughout this debate, I have insisted on no benefit cuts to soldiers, seniors, and veterans, and I will continue to do so. Obligations made must be obligations kept.

I will also fight to fulfill our obligations to the next generation who will lead us through the 21st century. We can't cut our way to a new economy. We need to invest in it by rebuilding roads, bridges, and increasing access to broadband. This is what will lead to new jobs, new opportunity, and new prosperity.

We also need to invest in education, science, research and technology. These investments will lead to jobs of the future and prepare students and workers to compete in a global economy. This means making sure kids have access to higher or career education. It means supporting scientists who are finding cures for the most devastating diseases. And it means giving businesses the tools they need to develop new products. We can't afford not to make these investments.

After wrenching analysis, I will vote for this bipartisan agreement because it is an achievable and pragmatic solution to the crisis that would be caused by inaction. It will require tough action and strong medicine down the road, but it is necessary to honor our obligations to the greatest generation and the next generation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support the legislation before us today to raise the debt ceiling and at the same time curb government spending without raising taxes. The United States cannot default on our obligations, and this

bill prevents that from happening. This deal is not perfect. It is not what I would have written, and I have grave concerns about the cuts to our Nation's defense spending that may have to occur as a result of this bill's passage.

What this plan does represent is a fiscally sound path forward, and therefore I support its adoption. I applaud the courageous leadership of Senator MCCONNELL and Speaker BOEHNER. They have guided Republican members on both sides of the Capitol with tremendous skill and integrity and fought hard to ensure that our party's core principles were not negotiated away. I am proud of them, and I thank them. And I would be remiss if I did not also express my gratitude to Majority Leader REID. He has a very difficult job in this body, and he deserves a tremendous amount of credit for helping get us to this point. He fought hard for his caucus and their priorities, and I congratulate him on successfully negotiating a fair compromise on their behalf.

While I will support this bill, I have a great deal of concern about the direction this compromise takes defense spending. I have said many times, defense spending since 9/11—which was preceded by nearly a decade of drastic reductions in military personnel, equipment, and readiness—is not the cause of the economic dilemma in which we find ourselves. Cutting defense so deeply that long-term, catastrophic damage to our national security interests would result will not solve our deficit spending and debt problem.

Since this year began, the President has already asked the Defense Department to cut more than $178 billion by finding efficiencies and taking top-line reductions in proposed defense spending over the next 5 years. But this compromise deal before us will go much further, with initial defense cuts of about $350 billion over 10 years as part of the initial agreement to raise the debt limit by just over $900 billion.

The bigger threat of cuts to national security spending, however, will come not during this first round but through the actions of the joint committee this bill establishes to find another $1.2 to $1.5 trillion in cuts as an offset to the next increase in the debt limit that will be required to get us from early 2012 through the balance of the year and into 2013. If the joint committee cannot agree on a package of cuts that can be passed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed into law by the President, then a sequestration process would come into play that would automatically cut both defense and nondefense spending in order to pay for the next $1.2 trillion in debt ceiling increases. Such an across-the-board sequestration of defense funding levels could add another nearly $500 billion to the roughly $350 billion in cuts over the next 10 years.

At his confirmation hearing on July 26, GEN Martin Dempsey, who has been nominated to be the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that cuts above the $400 billion in defense spending that were already being studied would be ''extraordinarily difficult and very high risk.'' I agree. But what concerns me most about our current debate is not just the enormous size of the potential reductions but that the defense cuts being discussed have little to no strategic or military rationale to support them. They are essentially just numbers on a page. Our national defense planning and spending must be driven by considered strategy, not arbitrary arithmetic.

These defense cuts, initially about $350 billion over 10 years—but especially those that could result from sequestration that could amount to another $500 billion—reflect minimal, if any, understanding of how they will be applied or what impact they will have on our defense capabilities or our national security. While Secretary Panetta has made it clear that a comprehensive review will precede any decisions he makes on further defense cuts, the Congress currently has no specific indication of how the current debt compromise proposals would impact the size of our military forces, what changes they would require to our compensation system, what equipment and weapons would have to be cancelled as a result, or what additional risk to the readiness and modernization of our forces and their equipment we would have to accept. If Congress is to make informed decisions about our national defense spending, we need information like this, and it will have a crucial impact on how the joint committee created under this compromise goes about its work. And based on that sort of information, we must do everything we can to avoid an exercise in blind sequestration of defense funds that could come into play if the joint committee cannot find a way to find further cuts of $1.2 trillion or more that can be enacted into law.

For many months, we have been engaged in a political tug-of-war over whether we should raise the debt limit and allow the President greater borrowing authority. I joined my colleagues on this side of the aisle in our insistence that any increase in our debt ceiling be accompanied by meaningful, real cuts in spending, not just typical Washington-style smoke and mirrors. I believe we achieved our goal with this compromise. The deal before us provides at least one dollar of actual spending cuts, not gimmicks, for each dollar in debt limit increases. It doesn't raise a single dollar in taxes. By including upfront cuts, a joint committee, a balanced budget amendment, BBA, vote, the debt disapproval process and sequesters, it continues the pressure on the President and Congress to continue cutting spending through the next election and beyond.

Some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle have described the debate on this issue as a ''manufactured crisis.'' They cite the fact that, in the past, we routinely raised the debt ceiling with little or no debate, having done so at least 10 times in the last ten years. Well, I say to my friends, you are leaving out one very critical detail in your analysis—a detail that makes our current situation anything but ''routine''—and that is this: Never before in the history of this great nation has our debt been $14.6 trillion. Never before in our history have we faced the possibility of having our creditworthiness downgraded due to our inability to control our spiraling debt, which could very well decimate the good faith and credit of the United States, which would have a severe impact on our standing in the world.

This measure represents the beginning, not the end, of what I believe will be a sustained national focus on getting our fiscal house in order. We still have a very long way to go and a great deal of hard work to do. Americans are still hurting. Unemployment remains at unacceptable levels and is estimated to continue to grow. We need to cut spending, spur economic growth, and get people back to work. These goals cannot be achieved by raising taxes on individuals and small businesses, and they cannot be achieved by expanding the size of government and massively increasing federal spending. It is time we learned from the lessons of the past, and the past has taught us that we cannot spend and tax our way to prosperity. America has been driven down that road, and we nearly plunged off of a cliff into economic disaster. I believe that this measure will begin to put us on the right track.

I urge my colleagues to seize this opportunity to put America back on a path to fiscal solvency and vote in favor of this compromise.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to support the budget agreement that has been so painstakingly negotiated over these past several weeks. This is not a perfect bill, but it will start to get our budget deficit under control. Failing to reach an agreement and allowing our nation to default is not an option.

Failing to raise the debt ceiling would mean failing to honor the obligations we have already made. Previous Congresses and administrations have always recognized this duty, raising the debt ceiling over 70 times since 1962. This is not a partisan issue. President George W. Bush signed seven debt ceiling increases and President Clinton signed four. President Reagan raised the debt ceiling 18 times.

We have also agreed to reduce our Nation's debt by over $2 trillion, which will help to put us on a more sustainable fiscal path. Much of this budget savings will be found by a new joint congressional committee. Their recommendations will likely be similar to the Bowles-Simpson recommendations, the Gang of 6 proposal, and other bipartisan efforts.

I must say that I am disappointed we could not get a broader agreement to

reduce our deficit. We know what we need to do. Every bipartisan proposal works by putting everything on the table: domestic spending, defense, entitlements, and revenue. It is not a good sign that this bill would force only spending cuts if Congress fails to pass the joint committee's deficit reduction bill. Refusing to put everything on the table means refusing to truly solve our budget problem.

Our system of government is built on compromise. This deal shows that the Senate is still capable of governing, and now we need to return immediately to the most important job, getting our people back to work and getting the economy back on track.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, these are challenging economic times and Republicans have taken us to the edge of the cliff. In the limited time left to prevent government default for the first time in our Nation's history, I think we can all agree on at least one thing—the consequences of default benefit no one. That is why I made the necessary but difficult decision today to support an agreement to prevent our economy from being driven off the cliff.

Default and a downgrade of our credit have the potential to cause job loss, higher interest rates, and another economic recession or even a depression. Unfortunately, the legislation before us today only staves off potential default, while doing nothing to fuel job creation and spur economic growth. In fact, it could well increase recessionary pressures on the economy.

As the richest country in the world, we should never have reached this crisis point. The United States always pays its bills. And, let's be clear, the bills we are talking about are not new ones; they exist because of prior policy decisions.

Fault for the linking default on our debt and an ideological budget plan rests with my Republican colleagues. The President thought he could negotiate a grand bargain, but it turned out Republicans were not interested in compromise.

Since the onset of the debate surrounding the need to raise the debt ceiling, the American people have made their position clear: They want a fair and balanced approach to reducing the deficit. Like the majority of Americans, I understand the need to get our fiscal house in order, and I took tough votes in the 1990s to create a record budget surplus. On Sunday, I also voted for a plan that would have controlled spending to a greater extent than the bill before us today.

As in the 1990s, and so many other times in the past, reining in the budget deficit has meant spending cuts and revenue from closing loopholes in the Tax Code enjoyed by the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations.

Despite this precedent and the fact that such changes would not take effect in the short term, Republicans refused to accept a balanced approach.

Indeed, the price for averting the economic disaster of failing to raise the debt ceiling—a failure that some of my Republican colleagues were quite willing to see happen, to have our Nation go off the cliff—was a deal predicated on sacrifice by the middle class and no one else.

And so the agreement forged by the President and congressional leaders is by no measure ideal. It not only makes fundamental concessions, but ignores the No. 1 issue on the minds of Americans—which is how to address job creation and the unemployment situation.

In doing so, it also evades not only common sense but ignores economists who have warned that this trend toward drastic cuts threaten to choke off a faltering recovery. Former Labor Secretary Robert Reich expressed these sentiments in saying that the agreement: ''[. . .] hobbles the capacity of the government to respond to the jobs and growth crisis.''

This agreement doesn't extend unemployment insurance at a time when too many Americans remain out of work. It doesn't stave off automatic tax increases on employers in distressed States with outstanding loans from the UI trust fund. Nor does it include common sense measures to save jobs like work sharing, which has proved so effective in some of our states and abroad, nor infrastructure spending to create jobs.

Instead, the first part of this agreement includes spending cuts that could hurt the middle class and those in need—nearly $1 trillion—at a time when Americans can literally least afford it. While working men and women are coping with stagnant wages, 14 million other Americans are simply without a job in an economy that is still climbing out of a deep economic recession. In Rhode Island the jobs situation remains especially difficult and double-digit unemployment persists.

Rather than set in place a longer term debt reduction agreement that would bring much-needed certainty to the economy, this agreement brings unnecessary uncertainty by tasking a joint committee to come up with at least $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction. These recommendations would receive expedited consideration with no amendments before the end of the year. A failure of this committee to come up with the required level of cuts or a rejection by the Congress or a veto by the President of the committee's recommendations would mean sequestration—automatic across the board cuts, half to domestic and half to defense spending.

I support the need to make continued decisions to eliminate wasteful and duplicative spending, and I perhaps this committee could come to a fair and balanced approach. Yet there remains a real likelihood that Republicans could very well dig in again on the question of ending tax giveaways to very profitable corporations and millionaires and call for drastic changes to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid in order to meet targeted savings. The Joint Committee could also reverse the gains we made to reform health care.

In fact, Speaker BOEHNER, in presenting this legislation to his Republican conference, said that it would be effectively impossible for the joint committee to raise revenue. This means that the joint committee could recommend legislation even more austere and imbalanced than the $917 billion in cuts we are passing today. Republicans could again choose to balance the budget on the back of middle-class Americans. What should make us think that a few months down the road Washington Republicans will sing another tune and be willing to put revenue on the table?

Cuts are about more than just numbers. They are about priorities, and I worry that the cuts from the joint committee or from sequestration would continue to be based on Republicans' extreme ideological beliefs, and not on common sense priorities like jobs and the well-being of the middle class.

The bill before us has two outcomes as I see it. The unknowns of a joint committee that, depending on who you talk to, will either fail spectacularly or succeed spectacularly in producing a balanced proposal of shared sacrifice. The thought is that the threat of sequestration, which should be considered a meat cleaver approach to priorities, could produce an equitable compromise by the joint committee. Others believe sequestration will somehow be ameliorated or avoided altogether—that Congress will somehow pass legislation in the future to blunt its impact. I hope those positive predictions prevail, but I am dubious.

In this spirit, the agreement marks a turning point for our nation at an extraordinary time. Following the Great Depression, we faced another set of extenuating economic circumstances. And only after years of misguided cuts urged by fiscal conservatives, did the Congress finally listen to those who voiced the need for spending to buttress economic growth.

It is widely known that the best way to ensure economic recovery is to get people working—paying taxes and stimulating demand that has a multiplying effect on our economy.

Of course the irony of the situation lies in how we got here. President Bush was handed the biggest surplus on record, $236 billion—indeed, we had 3 straight years of budget surplus before he drowned our Nation in red ink as far as the eye can see.

In fact, Republicans at the time were concerned the budget surplus—which was projected to be $5.6 trillion over 10 years—was in itself a danger. Federal Reserve Chairmen Greenspan expressed this sentiment: ''The emerging key fiscal policy need is to address the implications of maintaining surpluses beyond the point at which publicly held debt is effectively eliminated.''

The resulting Bush policies—led by the $1.8 trillion tax cuts skewed to the

those making over $250,000—erased this record surplus, and replaced it with a $6.2 trillion deficit over this time period. This is an extraordinary swing of $11.8 trillion from fiscal year 2002 to 2011. To give some comparison, our current-dollar-GDP, the market value of the Nation's output of goods and services, is approximately $15 trillion.

While Americans are hard pressed to make ends meet and find work in an economy that isn't creating enough jobs, the largest corporations are doing extremely well.

We are seeing now corporations rack up huge profits. The nonfinancial members of the S&P 500 index are sitting on about $1.1 trillion in cash. The Federal Reserve indicated similarly that nonfinancial businesses have about $1.9 trillion in cash defined as liquid assets. We need policies that get businesses to make investments that put Americans back to work.

So a better approach would involve a serious commitment to deficit reduction that asks more from all Americans in the interest of our Nation's long-term economic wellbeing. It would be bigger than the bill before us, perhaps closer to $4 trillion in debt reduction, because it would be balanced and would call for shared sacrifice. It would ask the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations to pay their fair share instead of relying solely on spending cuts that will hurt programs that Americans depend on particularly when economic growth remains fragile. This view is in line with numerous economic experts who have voiced concern about how cutting back too soon could undermine our recovery.

A better bill would finally discard the perverse tax loopholes that reward companies that ship jobs overseas and end ethanol subsidy giveaways to profitable corporations. Put simply, a balanced approach wouldn't ask nursing home residents to sacrifice without asking the same of wealthy folks.

In fact, I have voted for plans that took this balanced approach in 1993 and 1997 and helped create a record surplus.

I have also voted against those proposals that have built up this mound of debt—including the unfunded Bush tax cuts skewed to the wealthy; an unpaid for war in Iraq for which we have paid dearly; and the unpaid for, costly, and ill-designed Medicare prescription drug plan.

We are also missing an opportunity to address the broader problems facing middle-class Americans. They are struggling in large part because we are going down a road of conservative ideology rather than common sense. We need to work on economic growth through education, infrastructure, currency exchange fairness, a trade policy that supports our manufacturers, and yes even tax reform to simplify our system but not as an excuse for more tax giveaways like the Bush tax cuts.

Just as I have taken tough votes in the past to ensure the long-term prosperity of our Nation, today's vote was another difficult choice.

However, this agreement is the only option left to prevent default and evade what would be the greatest artificial crisis in our Nation's history. It hopefully provides a powerful lever to achieve significant and smart deficit reduction in the future.

In the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt during his second inaugural address, ''Government is competent when all who compose it work as trustees for the whole people.''

Now is one of those pivotal times in our Nation's history, where we face a stark choice that requires us to make sacrifices that put nation ahead of self.

For over 200 years, this country has been known as a hallmark of economic stability. We have always paid our bills regardless of who was President and what party was in charge.

Now that this manufactured crisis that has distracted us for too long is over, we need to get to the business of putting Americans back to work.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I cannot support this plan because it fails to actually solve our debt problem, fails to diminish the risk of a credit rating downgrade and is not a long-term solution to avert a debt crisis. This plan still adds at least $7 trillion to our debt over 10 years. It fails to immediately start downsizing government, leaving 98 percent of deficit reduction until after the 2012 election. By not addressing the biggest driver of our debt, health care spending, this plan ensures Medicare's looming bankruptcy, while protecting ObamaCare's $2.6 trillion blank check.

It contains no real structural reforms to spending, such as a constitutional balanced budget amendment. It fails to reduce spending by what credit rating agencies say is at least $4 trillion to avert a downgrade. Worst of all is that at a time of 9.2 percent unemployment, this plan fails to include pro-growth measures to help get people back to work and create new taxpayers to help us pay down the debt. In fact, I fear that the new ''Supercommittee'' in this bill could lead to expedited consideration of big tax hikes on our struggling economy. And if Congress rejects new taxes, then up to $850 billion of devastating automatic defense spending cuts would be triggered at a time when the world is as dangerous as it has ever been.

Americans are looking at Washington with anger, disgust and concern that maybe America's problems are just too big for our leaders to solve. As I outlined in the Wall Street Journal on March 30, 2011, keeping America exceptional will require spending cuts and caps, saving Medicare and Social Security from bankruptcy, a constitutional balanced budget amendment, tax reform and regulatory reform. Above all, it will require courage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I will support this legislation but with very serious reservations.

I start with the premise that this debt limit extension is not the one piece of legislation that will change everything wrong in Washington. It is, at best, a reversal of previous tax-and-spend policies, with some movement down the road to fiscal responsibility.

The bill sets us on a course that, if we adhere to it, will eventually enable us to balance our budget, draw down our debt, put entitlement programs on a sustainable path, and create the conditions for strong economic growth. That it could have been better is absolutely true as a substantive matter, but politically, the White House and the tax-and-spend Democrats in Congress would not agree to more. They control this Chamber and the executive branch of government.

A second premise of Republican leadership was that the U.S. Government must pay its bills, not just to investors in U.S. bonds but to fulfill its commitments to the American people. From Social Security to national defense, we have obligations that Republicans insist must be met. So default was not an option. That meant agreeing to terms for a debt extension that satisfied neither party.

Another premise is to focus on job creation and restoring a healthy economy. That meant not only constraining Washington spending through greater accountability but preventing job-killing tax hikes. In this, we succeeded. Contrary to some public talk, there is nothing in this legislation that would cause future tax increases. If there were, I would not support this legislation.

With this legislation, we have prevented tax increases demanded by the President, cut spending over the next 10 years, and created a mechanism to address additional savings, especially in programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, all of which will eventually default on their commitments without reform, and we averted a credit crisis for the U.S. Government.

Here is why I have such serious reservations about the legislation. In an effort to extract a pound of flesh from Republicans, the White House, frustrated that it could not raise taxes, insisted on massive cuts in defense spending—some $350 billion, by White House reckoning, over the next 10 years, potentially $18 billion less than the President's own budget just for next year. Moreover, the White House insisted that defense suffer an additional $492 billion in cuts over the same period if the select committee set up by this bill fails to produce or Congress refuses to adopt recommendations on how to cut overall government spending to meet the goals of the bill.

Mind you, these cuts in defense were not the result of careful planning and analysis. They were just arbitrary percentages thrown out in negotiations, totally unconnected to actual defense requirements. Worse, the cuts that

would be triggered if the select committee recommendations fail were intentionally designed to be so large, so unimaginable, so irresponsible that Congress would be incented to approve the select committee's recommendations. The word ''Armageddon'' was used to characterize this scheme. Can you imagine anything more irresponsible, for the Commander in Chief of the military to promote—not just promote but insist on the knowing destruction of the U.S. military as a means to threaten Congress?

The theory was that the consequences of inaction by the Congress must be so severe that no responsible Senator or Representative could dare allow the result that we would be forced to accept the select committee recommendations on pain of seeing the U.S. military decimated. This should never have been agreed to by Members of Congress but most of all never promoted by the President. To me, it comes close to violating our oath of office and the President's responsibilities as Commander in Chief. But it is done. My vote will not change it.

The best way for me to avoid this Armageddon is to stay in the fight and, if necessary, urge my colleagues to disregard this provision. Sixty Senators would have to agree. But I cannot imagine Senators, and even the President, when faced with the actual versus the hypothetical choice of knowingly destroying our military capacity to protect the United States, would allow it to happen when we would have the ability to prevent it. As reckless as this President is to even contemplate, much less threaten, to incapacitate our military, I cannot imagine the American people would countenance such action.

As I evaluate the work of the committee, if anyone says to me, remember, the trigger is Armageddon for the U.S. military, my response will be, let's take that debate to the American people and let them decide. The thought that this trigger would force Senators to make unwise concessions underestimates the American people's commitment to their own security. The White House is miscalculating. It is so Draconian that it will not work. Even this President could not implement it.

So because we cannot default in our commitments, because we have to start somewhere on our new journey toward fiscal sanity—and this is a good start—because we have to focus on job creation, not more taxes that will kill job creation, we should adopt this legislation. But because of its irresponsible and dangerous, even cavalier treatment of national defense, we will need to work very hard to restore spending necessary for our national security and commit to reject the threat of Armageddon inserted into this bill by the White House.

(Mr. DURBIN assumed the Chair.)

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my friend the Republican leader, with whom I worked in drafting the provisions of this bill creating a joint committee to address deficit reduction. We wrote a number of deadlines in the bill to guide the work of the joint committee. I wanted to discuss with my colleague the consequences of missing these deadlines.

Section 402(g) of the amendment before us makes clear that if the joint committee fails to meet the November 23 deadline to vote on the report and proposed language, or if the Congress fails to meet the December 23 deadline to pass the joint committee bill, then the joint committee bill will lose its privilege. It would cease to benefit from expedited procedures under this amendment.

But I also want to make clear that if the joint committee or Congress fails to meet other deadlines in the title creating the joint committee, then that failure would not lead to a loss of privilege. We attached special importance to the deadlines for the committee to vote and the Congress ultimately to act.

And so, I would like to inquire whether the Republican leader agrees with that assessment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader. We did attach special importance to the deadlines for the committee to vote and the Congress ultimately to act. And we did not intend for failure to meet other deadlines in the title to cause the joint committee bill to lose its privilege.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my colleague the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator CONRAD, who worked with me as we drafted the joint committee language in this bill.

The compromise we are voting on today on the debt limit establishes the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to build on the more than $900 billion in up-front deficit reduction in the bill. The joint committee would work to achieve another $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction, for a total of $2.4 trillion. This important joint committee will be bicameral and bipartisan, with three members selected by each of the four congressional leaders, for a total of 12 members, evenly split between Democrats and Republicans. Importantly, their recommendations will be guaranteed an up-or-down vote on the floor of both the Senate and the House.

For this historic process to work, we felt it important that the joint committee be given maximum flexibility, with everything on the table—discretionary spending, entitlements and other mandatory spending, and tax reform. To accomplish this goal, the joint committee should similarly be given maximum flexibility in how it analyzes its work and how it determines that it has met the target of $1.5 trillion in deficit reduction.

Mr. President, over the past year, we have had three distinguished bipartisan groups provide us with comprehensive deficit reduction packages. We had the President's Fiscal Commission, led by former White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles and former Senator Alan Simpson. We had the Bipartisan Policy Center's Debt Reduction Task Force, led by former Senator Pete Domenici and former CBO and OMB Director Alice Rivlin. And we just had the so-called Group of 6, a bipartisan group of Senators, including Senator CONRAD, and Senators WARNER, CHAMBLISS, DURBIN, CRAPO, and COBURN. All three of these groups decided that given the comprehensive and complex nature of the work that they were doing, they needed to take advantage of the flexibility to measure the effects of their proposals against the most accurate benchmark possible. I believe that it is critical that the joint committee have the same flexibility to decide on and use the most appropriate baseline possible for its work.

I believe that the legislation that we will vote on today accomplishes that, most directly by mandating the joint committee to include a statement of deficit reduction as part of the legislation it must vote on. There are no conditions on that statement. But, obviously, the legislation will need to have bipartisan support to pass the House and Senate.

I wonder if the chairman of the Budget Committee would agree with my conclusion.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I think it is absolutely correct that the flexibility exists for the Joint Committee to determine the benchmark it wishes to use and that such flexibility is entirely appropriate given the circumstances.

The leader mentioned three bipartisan groups that came to a similar conclusion. I was a member of two of those groups, the President's Fiscal Commission and the so-called Group of 6. We devoted considerable time to considering the most appropriate baseline to use in our deliberations given our goals. In both cases, on a bipartisan basis, we decided what made the most sense was not a standard current law baseline, as CBO normally uses for the work we do around here, but a baseline that was adjusted for more realistic policies, such as more realistic war costs, more realistic tax policies, and more realistic health spending given the need to regularly provide the so-called doc fix. I can tell the leader that having that flexibility was critical to both groups reaching completion of its work. The joint committee should have that same flexibility, and I believe the bill provides it.

Mr. REID. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, who is the Senate's expert on such matters.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, over the past few weeks, Congress has been engaged in a very important debate. It may have been messy, it might have appeared to some as though their government wasn't working, but in fact the opposite was true. The push

and pull Americans saw in Washington these past few weeks was not gridlock, it was the will of the people working itself out in a political system that was never meant to be pretty.

You see, one reason America isn't already facing the kind of crisis we see in Europe is that Presidents and majority parties here can't just bring about change on a dime, as much as they might wish to from time to time. That is what checks and balances is all about, and that is the kind of balance Americans voted for in November. The American people sent a wave of new lawmakers to Congress in last November's election with a very clear mandate: Put our Nation's fiscal house in order. Those of us who had been fighting the big government policies of Democratic majorities in Congress welcomed them into our ranks. Together, we have held the line, and slowly but surely we have started turning things around. That is why those who think that no problem is too big or too small for government to solve are very worried right now. They are afraid the American people may actually win the larger debate we have been having around here about the size and the scope of government and that the spending spree may actually be coming to an end. They can't believe those who stood up for limited government and accountability have actually changed the terms of the debate here in Washington. But today, they have no choice but to admit it.

I know for some of our colleagues reform isn't coming as fast as they would wish, and I certainly understand their frustration. I too wish we could stand here today enacting something much more ambitious. But I am encouraged by the thought these new Senators will help lead this fight until we finish the job. I want to assure them that today, although they may not see it this way, they have actually won this debate.

In a few minutes, the Senate will vote on legislation that represents a new way of doing business in Washington. First, it creates an entirely new template for raising the Nation's debt limit. One of the most important aspects of this legislation is the fact that never again will any President, from either party, be allowed to raise the debt ceiling without being held accountable for it by the American people, and, in addition, without having to engage in the kind of debate we have just come through. Because, you see, whoever the next President is will be back asking to raise the debt ceiling again, and it will provide another opportunity for us to focus on the subject raised by the request to raise the debt ceiling.

So we will be back at it—probably in the early part of 2013—trying to continue to make progress toward reducing the size and scope of government and reducing our spending. This kind of discussion isn't something to dread, it is something to welcome. While the President may not have particularly enjoyed this debate we have been through, it is the debate Washington very much needed to have.

As for the particulars, this legislation caps spending over the next 10 years with a mechanism that ensures these cuts actually stick. It protects the American people from a government default that would have affected every single one of them in one way or another. It puts in place a powerful joint committee that will recommend further cuts and much-needed reforms. It doesn't include a dime, not a dime, in job-killing tax hikes at a moment when our economy can least afford them. Crucially, it ensures the debate over a balanced budget amendment continues and that it actually gets a vote.

This is no small feat when one considers that last week the President was still demanding tax hikes as part of any debt ceiling increase, and that as recently as May, the President's top economic adviser said it was ''insane'' for anybody to even consider tying the debt ceiling to spending cuts. It is worth noting that 2½ months later, that adviser is no longer working at the White House and the President is now agreeing, as a condition of raising the debt ceiling, to trillions of dollars in spending cuts.

Let me be clear: The legislation the Senate is about to vote on is just a first step. But it is a crucial step toward fiscal sanity and its potentially remarkable achievement given the lengths to which some in Washington have gone to ensure a status quo that is suffocating growth, crippling the economy, and imperiling entitlements.

We have had to settle for less than we wanted, but what we have achieved is in no way insignificant. We did it because we had something Democrats didn't have: Republicans may only control one-half of one-third of the government in Washington, but the American people agreed with us on the nature of the problem. They know government didn't accumulate $14.5 trillion in debt because it didn't tax enough. If someone is spending themselves into oblivion, the solution isn't to spend more; it is to spend less.

Neither side got everything it wanted in these negotiations, but I think it was the view of those in my party that we tried to get as much in spending cuts as we could from a government we didn't control. Our view was we would get as much in spending reduction as we could from a government we didn't control. That is what we have done with this bipartisan agreement.

This is not the deficit-reduction package I would have written. The fact that we are on a pace to add another $7 trillion to the debt over the next 10 years is certainly nothing to celebrate. But getting it there from more than $9 trillion the President continued to defend until recently is no defeat either. Slowing down the big government freight train from its current trajectory will give us the time we need to work toward a real solution or give the American people the time they need to have their voices heard.

So much work remains. To that end, our first step will be to make sure Republicans who sit on the powerful cost-cutting committee are serious people who put the best interests of the American people and the principles that we have fought for throughout this debate first. But before we move to the next steps, I would like to say a word about some of those who made today's vote possible, and I will start with Speaker BOEHNER.

It should be noted that he helped set the terms of this debate by insisting early on that we would oppose any debt limit that didn't include cuts that were greater than the amount the debt limit would be raised, and he stuck to his guns. The Speaker and I worked shoulder to shoulder over the past few months, and it certainly has been a pleasure. He has been a real partner, and I assure my colleagues we wouldn't be here without him.

So I want to thank the Speaker and the entire Republican leadership in the House for standing on principle, and I want to thank my Republican colleagues in the Senate for their determination, their ideas, and their support. We wouldn't be here without them either.

I thank my friend, the majority leader, for his work in getting this agreement over the finish line. We may disagree a lot, but I hope everyone realizes it is never ever personal. I think today we can prove that, when it comes down to it, we will get together when the greater good is at stake.

I also thank the President and the Vice President and everyone on their staffs who believed, as we did, that despite our many differences we could all agree that America would not default on its obligations. It is a testament to the goodwill of those on both sides that we were able to reach this agreement in time. Neither side wanted to see the government default, and I am pleased we were able to work together to avoid it.

This bill does not solve the problem, but it at least forces Washington to admit that it has one. The bill doesn't solve the problem, but it forces Washington to admit that it has one. It puts us on a path to recovery. We are nowhere near where we need to be in terms of restoring balance, but there should be absolutely no doubt about this: We have changed the debate, we are headed in the right direction, and people are wondering how it happened. Well, it happened because the American people demanded it.

So in the end, we are back to where we started. The only reason we are talking about passing legislation that reins in the size of Washington instead of growing it is because the American people believed they could have a real impact on the direction of their government. They spoke out and we heard them. It is only through their continued participation in this process, and

lawmakers who are willing to listen to them, that we will complete the work we have begun.

As Winston Churchill once said:

Courage is what it takes to stand up and speak. Courage is also what it takes to sit down and listen.

I can't think of a better way to sum up this last year and, in particular, these last few months right here in Washington than that.

The American people want to see accountability and cooperation in Washington, and they want to see that we are working together to get our fiscal house in order. This legislation doesn't get us there, but for the first time in a very long time I think we can say to the American people that we are finally facing in the right direction. For that, we have them to thank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader, the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the eyes of the American people and the world have been watching Washington very closely this past week. While they witnessed a lot of political wrangling, they also saw Congress make some historically important decisions and avert a default on our debt that has been so concerning to all of us for such a long period of time.

Our country was literally on the verge of a disaster. It was on the brink of a disaster. With 1 day left, we were able to get together and avert that disaster.

Now, this compromise that we have reached is not perfect.

Mr. President, could we have order, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

We welcome all our visitors, and we want to make it clear that any disturbance or manifestation of approval or disapproval is prohibited under the Senate rules.

The majority leader may proceed.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the kind words that my counterpart, Senator MCCONNELL, has stated. I have gotten to know him and Speaker BOEHNER a lot better this past month or two, especially the Speaker. Even though I disagree vehemently with the direction the Speaker's legislation took, with no bipartisan support at all, it is not the product we have here. The product we have here is one of compromise.

Without trying to outline who the winners are, there is principally one winner throughout all this, and that is the American people. We settled for less than we wanted; so did my friend, the leader of the Republicans, settle for less than he wanted. But that is the way legislation works. That is the way compromise works. But I can't let go without responding to my friend, who boasted in his own way about the new Senators and new Members of Congress who came here.

I welcome them all. But a result of the tea party direction of this Congress the last few months has been very disconcerting and very unfair to the American people. It stopped us from arriving at a conclusion much earlier, and we must go forward.

Also, I recognize we have to do more. Of course, we need to do more, and that is why we have the joint committee set up that I will talk about in just a minute. The American people are not impressed with the no new revenue. The vast majority of Democrats, Independents, and Republicans think this arrangement we have just done is unfair because the richest of the rich have contributed nothing. The burden of what has taken place is on the middle class and the poor.

My friend talks about no new taxes. Mr. President, if their theory was right, with these huge taxes that took place during the Bush 8 years, the economy should be thriving. These tax cuts have not helped the economy. The loss of 8 million jobs during the Bush 8 years, two wars started, unfunded, all on borrowed money, these tax cuts all on borrowed money; if the tax cuts were so good, the economy should be thriving.

If we go back to the prior 8 years during President Clinton's administration, 23 million new jobs were created. We had, when President Bush took office, a surplus over 10 years of $7 trillion. That has evaporated, and now we are talking about a $14 trillion debt.

The compromise we reached is imperfect, and we are going to send legislation to the President today that will not only avert the default but make significant desperate reduction. Is it enough? I repeat, no, it is not enough. This legislation will provide our economy with the stability it desperately needs.

To assure Congress that we will continue working—and I said this yesterday, I say it again. I appreciate my friend, the Republican leader, putting his arms around the idea that I came up with to have this joint committee. They have worked in decades past. There is no reason it can't work now. There is no supermajority. Each leader will appoint 3, a committee of 12.

We need to do something because the trigger that kicks in is very difficult. We need to do this, and it has to be one that is fair. The American people demand fairness. It can't be more cuts to programs that have made this country what it is. There must be a sharing of sacrifice. It is unfair for billionaires and multimillionaires not to contribute to the arrangement that we have just made, but they are not.

My friends, the Republicans, held firm on no revenue, which is too bad. We need to have a fair approach to this joint committee, and I am confident we will do that. The one reason we are going to do that is because the trigger mechanism kicks in.

To this committee that is going to be appointed, the Members must have open minds. We have had too much talk the last few days, as early as this morning, Republican leaders in the Senate saying there will be no revenue. That is not going to happen; otherwise, the trigger is going to kick in. The only way we can arrive at a fair arrangement for the American people with this joint committee is to have equal sharing.

It is going to be painful. For each party, if they do the right thing, it is going to be painful because, to be fair, we have to move forward. There has to be equal spending cuts. There has to be some revenue that matches that.

The legislation that is going to be sent to the President today ends the standoff that ground the work of Washington to a halt this summer. So Congress must now return to its most important job: creating jobs.

Mr. President, there are things we can do to create jobs and we know that. We passed out of here quickly the patent bill: 27,000 jobs we are told that legislation will create. So we will move to that; the first time we get back after the summer break, we are going to move to the patent legislation. It is important we do that. There is other work we can do. There is legislation out there that should be bipartisan in nature that we can do. We have a highway bill that is due.

I have spoken to the chairman of the Finance Committee today, and there are ways we can fund that that should be in keeping with the bipartisan approach.

The important thing we have, Mr. President, with these infrastructure jobs we need so very much, is that for every $1 billion we spend in infrastructure, we create 47,500 high-paying jobs. A lot of other jobs spin off from that. Now, this isn't where you have $1 billion and you have all these Federal Government jobs. These are moneys that go to the private sector to build roads and bridges and dams. We need to do that, and we can do that. Clean energy jobs are changing the face of this Nation. We need to do that.

I am optimistic and hopeful that the spirit of compromise that has taken root in Washington the last several days will endure. I hope my Republican colleagues will join forces with Democrats when we get back to work and not be looking for winners in political parties. Let's start looking for winners with the American people.

We have made progress toward our goal of cutting the deficit spending that we have around here. This Nation still faces a jobs deficit as well. There is no issue more important to the American people than job creation. Until every American who chooses to work can find a job, our job is undone. So we are going to continue making jobs our No. 1 priority. We ask the Republicans to join us in this regard.

Adlai Stevenson once called politics ''the people's business, the most important business there is.'' It is time for Congress to get back to doing the people's business, creating jobs. Nothing is more important than that.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—74

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Franken	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hagan	Portman
Bennet	Hoeven	Pryor
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reed
Blumenthal	Inouye	Reid
Blunt	Isakson	Risch
Boozman	Johanns	Roberts
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Kerry	Schumer
Brown (OH)	Kirk	Shaheen
Burr	Klobuchar	Snowe
Cantwell	Kohl	Stabenow
Cardin	Kyl	Tester
Carper	Landrieu	Thune
Casey	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Levin	Udall (NM)
Collins	Lieberman	Warner
Conrad	Lugar	Webb
Coons	Manchin	Whitehouse
Corker	McCain	Wicker
Cornyn	McCaskill	Wyden
Crapo	McConnell	

NAYS—26

Ayotte	Hatch	Nelson (NE)
Chambliss	Heller	Paul
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
DeMint	Lautenberg	Sessions
Gillibrand	Lee	Shelby
Graham	Menendez	Toomey
Grassley	Merkley	Vitter
Harkin	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 74 and the nays are 26. The motion to concur on the House amendment to S. 365 is agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, while this agreement to raise the debt ceiling and cut spending is far from perfect, it averts a financial catastrophe that would stifle job creation and stall our fragile economic growth. Default would have increased interest rates for every American with a mortgage, car loan, student debt or credit card. For these reasons, I voted to support this agreement.

Critically, the deal protects Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare and veterans from benefit cuts and leaves open future opportunities to fight tax loopholes, sweetheart deals and giveaways for special interests. I will certainly continue these fights and seek comprehensive tax reform to guarantee that there is a fair balance and truly shared sacrifice.

Now more than ever, we must move to focus on our number one priority—creating jobs and spurring economic growth. Americans are still hurting, seeking to find work, stay in their homes, pay tuition for schools and keep their families together. We must put Connecticut and America back to work and get our country moving in the right direction.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, debate over the fiscal future of our Nation has been at the center of the 112th Congress. With the passage today of the Budget Control Act of 2011, we have avoided a default on our national debt, we have made a significant downpayment on our deficit, and we are establishing a Joint Select Committee that provides a real opportunity to achieve even greater deficit reduction by the end of this year.

As chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I am privileged to have a staff of dedicated professionals who advise me on the complicated budget issues that have been before this body. My staff also shares its expertise with Members on both sides of the aisle. They are a credit to the Senate, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their hard work during the session.

Budget Committee staff director Mary Naylor deserves particular credit for putting together a team that regularly provides thorough and accurate analysis, often on incredibly short notice. Deputy staff director John Righter also deserves a special mention. Mr. Righter's mastery of baselines and scoring has been invaluable as we have developed and compared various plans to address our long-term fiscal issues. Deputy staff director Joel Friedman and committee chief counsel Joe Gaeta have also played a critical role in the committee's work this session.

The committee has a dedicated communications staff, including Stu Nagurka, Steve Posner, Adam Hughes, and Kobye Noel, that ensures that the committee's analysis is made available to Members and the general public in a clear, concise, and timely manner. In addition, committee analysts Steve Bailey, Jeannie Biniek, Amy Edwards, Jennifer Hanson-Kilbride, Robyn Hiestand, Mike Jones, Sarah Kuehl Egge, Matthew Levy, Jim Miller, Matt Mohning, Michael Obeiter, Miles Patrie, and Brandon Teachout each have expertise in specific policy areas that has proven invaluable to me as the committee has reviewed every aspect of the Federal budget. The committee's support staff and staff assistants, Anne Page, Josh Ryan, Ben Soskin, and Ronald Storhaug have worked late nights and weekends to make sure we all meet the demands placed on us. And finally, I would like to recognize committee's chief clerk Lynne Seymour and administrative staffers George Woodall, Letitia Fletcher, Cathey Dugan, and Kathleen Llewellyn-Butts, who provide support to both sides of the Budget Committee.

We as Senators place incredible demands on our staff, and they deserve to have their service to this institution and our country recognized. As we move to the next chapter of our debate over the federal budget, I offer my most sincere appreciation for their hard work.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, over the last several weeks, we have been debating the increase in the debt ceiling. For the time being, that debate is coming to an end. But I would like to address briefly some revisionist fiscal history that we have heard repeated during that debate.

We have heard this historical account often over the past decade. You hear it from our friends on the other side whenever the Senate discusses spending policy and tax policy. I have noticed that the arguments boil down to two points. My friend and colleague, the former chairman and ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator GRASSLEY, came up with this thumbnail description of this creative historical account.

First, all of the ''good'' fiscal history of the 1990s was derived from the partisan tax increase bill of 1993.

And second, all of the ''bad'' fiscal history taking place within the past 10 years is because of the bipartisan tax relief plans originally enacted during the last administration and continued under the present administration.

You could go one step further and, as a policy premise, refine that thumbnail description to two short sentences. First sentence—lower taxes are bad. Second sentence—higher taxes are good. Not surprisingly, these revisionist historians support higher taxes and higher government spending. And not surprisingly, the revisionists oppose cutting taxes and cutting government spending.

Since time is short today, I direct folks to Senate floor remarks I made on February 14, 2011. They are available on the Senate Finance Committee under the Ranking Members Newsroom tab for that date. But it is important to reiterate the main point of those remarks. Basically the assertion by our friends on the other side that raising taxes is the key to all good fiscal history can be summarily dismissed.

Let's take a quick view of the 1990s data. According to the Clinton administration's Office of Management and Budget—or OMB—the impact of the much-bragged about tax hike bill of 1993 was minimal. The Clinton administration's OMB concluded that the 1993 tax increase accounted for only 13 percent of deficit reduction between 1990 and 2000. Thirteen percent puts the 1993 tax increase behind other factors such as defense cuts, other revenue, and interest savings. The data show that tax increases did not drive deficit reduction.

So as a matter of fact, only 13 percent of the positive fiscal history of the 1990s is due to the partisan 1993 tax increase? That is it. Thirteen percent.

Well, what about the last decade? The period of 2001–2010 saw a lot of deficits. From what you hear from our friends on the other side, those deficits

are owing to the tax relief that benefitted virtually every American taxpayer. Yet CBO data tell us a different story.

On May 12, 2011, CBO released a recap of the changes over the past decade. At the start of 2001, as everyone agrees, CBO projected a surplus of $5.6 trillion. Over the decade, deficits of $6.2 trillion materialized. That's a swing of $11.8 trillion. What did CBO say were the causes? My friends on the other side might be surprised to learn.

Higher spending accounts for 44 percent of the change. Let me repeat that. Higher spending was the biggest driver of the deficits of the last decade. Economic and technical changes in the estimates accounted for 28 percent of the change. So all tax relief, including the tax relief passed by Democratic Congresses and tax relief signed into law by President Obama, accounts for 28 percent. The tax relief legislation, much maligned by our friends on the other side, accounts for less than half of the fiscal change attributable to tax relief. Specifically, the bipartisan tax relief bills of 2001 and 2003, including the AMT patches in those bills, accounted for 13.7 percent of the fiscal change of the last decade. That is not ORRIN HATCH speaking. It's the nonpartisan congressional scorekeeper, CBO.

So how much of the bad fiscal history of the last decade is attributable to tax relief? Twenty-eight percent. That is it. And that includes partisan bills like the stimulus. If you isolate the bipartisan bills that are the object of sharp criticism by our friends on the other side, the 2001 and 2003 legislation, you'll find that those bills account for only 13.7 percent of the fiscal change in the last decade.

Abnormally low levels of spending contributed significantly to the surpluses of the 1990s. Abnormally high spending drove the deficits of the past decade. Abnormally high spending is driving our current deficits, and it will drive our future deficits as well.

To my friends on the other side, if we focus instead on hiking taxes way above their historic average, we are misreading and mistreating the problem. The reason for our previous surpluses was low spending. And the reason for our current deficits is high spending. We cannot tax our way to fiscal health.

But that said, for those of my friends on the other side who think that raising taxes is the key to our economic recovery and deficit reduction, I urge them to come to the floor and tell us how high they want to raise rates. What will do the trick? If higher taxes are the cure to our economic woes, do we want to go back to the pre-1986 reform rates of 50 percent? Or how about the Carter era rates of 70 percent? Or maybe even the pre-Kennedy rates of 91 percent? How high should rates go in order to bring down the deficit and spur our economic recovery?

I want to know and America wants to know.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 365, the legislative vehicle for the debt limit increase. Given the $14.3 trillion national debt, the $1.6 trillion deficit for the current fiscal year, and the unrestrained and skyrocketing growth of Government programs and services, this vote commences the debate that will lead our Government to reevaluate priorities and examine its spending with a critical eye.

Today's vote was critical to maintaining our country's financial credibility, and it was the first step in what will be many to rein in the U.S. Government's out-of-control spending. This bill reduces current spending, caps future spending, and controls previously unrestrained Government budgets over the next decade, while also protecting critical Social Security benefits.

Just weeks ago, the United States was warned it would lose its stellar AAA credit rating on two grounds: if Washington did nothing to address its debt and deficit spending, and if Congress failed to raise the debt ceiling, thus triggering a default. This vote addresses both issues by, for the first time in history, requiring spending reductions equal or greater to the amount the debt ceiling is raised. That is indeed a first, positive step toward making our Government accountable to its people.

This action was critically important to every family in America. A default would have resulted in a downgrade in our Nation's credit rating and triggered higher interest rates for borrowing at all levels, from the Federal Government, to states and municipalities, to every American who has a mortgage, a car loan, a student loan, or a credit card. Failure to pass this bill would have put retirement funds at risk at a time when seniors are looking for financial stability and counting on predictability in their retirement income.

While no one can predict how the ratings agencies will react to this legislation, it at least signals that our country is serious about getting its financial situation in order. In addition, it requires Congress to vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which is a commonsense reform I have championed since I came to Congress. Mandating the Federal Government to do what nearly every State legislature is already required to achieve sends a message to every American and the world that Washington finally gets it, and at last understands the consequences of failing to control spending. Let there be no mistake—we can no longer accept budgets that compromise our economic growth, living standards, or opportunities that have been a hallmark of America's greatness.

Though this agreement is historic, I have grave concerns about the supercommittee established by this legislation. Creating a 12-person Washington commission to do the job of 535 elected representatives is another indication of a broken political system in dire need of repair. I will work tirelessly to bring accountability, reason, and transparency to the decisions this supercommittee makes and presents to Congress for an up-or-down vote.

This legislation initially exempts Social Security, Medicaid, and veterans programs from spending cuts. After the initial cuts are implemented, I am deeply concerned that the supercommittee could seek savings from Medicare, Medicaid, and defense spending. The committee has to recommend solid recommendations that Congress must act upon in order to avoid automatic cuts designed to incentivize Congress to fulfill this responsibility. Indeed, if the committee's recommendations are not adopted by Congress, automatic cuts to Medicare providers and defense spending could go into effect while Medicaid would be exempt. For these reasons, I will be especially vigilant about the work of the supercommittee to ensure that its recommendations achieve an equitable outcome.

Moreover, this bill should have included a pro-growth strategy for our economy to address our cumbersome Tax Code, overly onerous and inefficient regulatory scheme, and a mountain of new health care costs. I have long advocated for a major overhaul of our Tax Code, regulatory reform, and a pro-jobs agenda. Indeed, throughout this year I have repeatedly called on our President and this Congress to focus with laser-like precision on jobs and the economy. Once again, I call on the President and the Congress to immediately turn to focus on concrete measures that will actually put Americans back to work.

Indisputably, debt and deficits are a dangerous combination at a time when we are experiencing an unprecedented period of long-term unemployment with more than 22 million Americans unemployed or underemployed, and another 2.2 million who want a job, but are so discouraged they stopped looking for work altogether. In the 29 months since President Obama took office, unemployment has dipped below 9 percent for only 5 months, and actually increased to 9.2 percent in June. Manufacturing grew at the slowest pace in 2 years in July. The housing downturn is worsening, with no plausible end to foreclosures in sight. Home prices in March fell to their lowest level since 2002. Consumers, confronted with higher gas and food prices, are spending less on discretionary items.

And yet at a moment when every dollar Government spends should be wisely dedicated to job creation to return us on the path to prosperity, we are forced to commit an astounding $200 billion per year just to service our debt. The cost of net interest alone will more than double in the next 10 years to reach nearly $1 trillion per year in 2021. In fact, the CBO's most recent

long-term outlook states that by 2035 interest costs on our Nation's debt would reach 9 percent of GDP, more than the U.S. currently spends on Social Security or Medicare. And if interest rates were just 1 percentage point higher per year, over 10 years the deficit would balloon by $1.3 trillion from increased costs to pay interest on our debt alone.

It is abundantly clear that we can no longer afford to borrow money without a clear plan in place to rein in Federal spending and force the Government to live within its means. Today's legislation is the first step in that direction.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 365

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consideration of H. Con. Res. 70, the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to this measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 70) was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business until 4 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

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. MCCAIN. I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Arizona.

RECOGNIZING THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCCAIN. The Senate Armed Services Committee just met and approved the nominations of the Chairman and Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and other important nominations. I congratulate all of these nominees and appreciate their service to the Nation. I know that shortly the Senate will approve these positions of great responsibility.

I want to take one moment to mention one of the new Chiefs of Staff of the United States Army, GEN Ray Odierno, one of the finest military officers I have had the opportunity to know. He was responsible, along with David Petraeus, for implementing the surge in Iraq. All of us who have had the opportunity of knowing General Odierno are proud of his new position and know he will carry out his responsibilities with the same outstanding leadership and efficiency he has displayed in the past.

I congratulate all of the nominees. These are going to be very challenging times. General Dempsey will now be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I believe he is highly qualified, as are the nominees for the Vice Chairman as well as the Chief of Naval Operations. I congratulate them all. A special congratulations and word of praise for General Odierno, who is a great and outstanding leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—H.R. 2553

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise because we have a crisis on our hands with the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration. I know exactly why we have this crisis. It is another made-up crisis by the Republicans. This is a Republican shutdown.

We just got past the most, well, I feel made-up crisis we have ever seen. Eighty-nine times we have passed a debt limit extension, and it took us weeks and months of wrangling to get it done. We finally got it done. I am glad we got it done. Unnecessary, people in my State panicking that they wouldn't get a Social Security check, small businesses saying they couldn't get a decent loan—all that for nothing.

We can do our work. We can take the ideas of the Presiding Officer's Gang of 6, Senator COBURN's ideas. We have the ideas on the table. We can do this. We did it when Bill Clinton was President. We worked together, and we solved the problem. We had a deficit and debt. We balanced the budget and created surpluses. We don't have to have this taking government hostage.

So we just got done with holding the full faith and credit of the United States of America hostage, and now we are seeing an extension of the hostage-taking of the Federal Aviation Administration by the Republicans. We need to end it. How do we end it? We end it simply by saying we have our disagreements. On this bill, there are a couple of broad disagreements. They are important disagreements. I honor both sides of the argument. The Republicans want to overturn a ruling by the National Mediation Board. This is what they said. They said that rather than count votes by an employee who stays home on a union vote as a ''no'' vote, only the votes that are cast should be counted. Well, I ask rhetorically, doesn't that make sense? If you don't vote in an election, your vote shouldn't count. If the people didn't vote for me and they didn't vote for my opponent, how can anyone ascertain for whom they would have voted? Only the people who show up should be counted. That is what the mediation board did.

This affects the airlines and the rails. There is such a desire to stop that and overturn it by my Republican friends—and it is going on all over the country, this hostility to working men and women, and now it is coming here. It is like a contagion. We see what is happening in Wisconsin. There are recall elections and everything is in turmoil because they want to go after organized working people. It is sad.

But guess what. It is a legitimate issue for the conference committee to deal with. It is a legitimate issue for the Senate—by the way, the Senate already had a vote on it, and we said: No, we are not going to overturn the mediation board. The vote was well over—I think 56 votes said: No. Leave it alone. It is not our business. Let it go.

But, no, the House wants this. So when they sent over the original extension, it had that attached, this overturning of the mediation board, and we said: That is not right. We want a clean extension. So they sent it back to us, and they took up another controversial issue, which is to shut down essential air service in some of our rural communities in our country—shut down essential air service.

Now, I can tell my colleagues that I know for a fact there is room for negotiation in this area. We can work together and resolve it, but it doesn't belong in an extension of the FAA bill. This is too important. We have thousands of people who have been furloughed who are not getting work. I have a situation in my home county of Riverside where we have a new airport tower being put up, and unexpectedly there was a rainstorm the day before yesterday, and because nobody was working there, they couldn't do anything about it to protect the facility, and we have damage.

We are losing money because of this terrible shutdown. Four thousand FAA employees have been furloughed without their pay. Hundreds of them happen to live and work in my State. I wonder how these colleagues in the House who went home to take their break would feel if they stopped getting their pay. Many of the FAA's engineers, scientists, research analysts, computer specialists, program managers and analysts, environmental protection specialists, and community planners are furloughed because of this take-government-hostage approach by the Republican Party.

I have been here a while. I am a person with many opinions, and I have no problem battling out with my esteemed colleagues who is right, who is wrong, who is hurt, who is not hurt. But I know there is no question that people

are getting hurt and jobs are being lost.

Mr. President, $130 million in investments in California airport construction will be delayed. The Associated General Contractors of America is already hurting and businesses are hurting. There are 70,000 construction workers and workers in related fields who have already been affected by the shutdown. The FAA has issued stop-work orders at 241 airports across the country.

In Oakland, CA, I have 60 construction workers building an air traffic control tower. They were told to stay home. They won't get paid until an agreement is reached. Well, if we ask most Americans, they really do live pretty much paycheck to paycheck. They have some savings.

This is ridiculous. According to the San Francisco Chronicle, the project contractor from Oakland, Devcon Construction, ''is eating $6,000 a day in operating costs'' and ''should the delay stretch much past the summer, [we are in trouble because] inclement weather would disrupt the installation.''

I am telling you, this is another man-made, Republican-made crisis. What are we trying to prove? That we are tough guys? Let's get a clean extension of the FAA. Let's take our battles into the conference committee.

I want to compliment Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON. She is working, and she is on our side. She is a Republican Senator from Texas who is working with Senator ROCKEFELLER, the chairman of our committee. We all know the House sent over not a clean extension but an extension that cuts this essential air service to some of our rural communities. This needs to be worked on, not agreed to in a ''gotcha'' kind of situation.

In Sacramento, maintenance at the air traffic control facility has come to a halt. Seismic modernizations at air traffic control towers in Livermore, Palo Alto, and Santa Maria have stopped. At LAX, the biggest airport in Los Angeles, and at Carlsbad, power and electrical upgrade projects have stalled.

What is going on? Can't we just get over these differences in the proper forum? It is wrong. I am not going to be personally hurt by this. The Senator from Oklahoma is not going to be personally hit by this. The Presiding Officer, the Senator from Virginia, is not personally hit by this. It is the people we represent or are supposed to represent. It is the American family. It is the construction workers. It is the construction businesses. It is safety. These are safety projects.

At the end of the day, are we saving money? We are losing money because we are not collecting the ticket tax that goes to this construction fund. And some of the airlines are pocketing it, and that is outrageous in and of itself in not reducing the fares.

I want to compliment a couple of the airlines that are, in fact, reducing the fares. Virgin America is one, and I will put in the RECORD the other one. Good for them. Good for you.

So what I am about to do is ask for a clean extension of the FAA authorization bill. My anticipation is the Senator from Oklahoma will object, and then he will offer his idea of an extension that does, in fact, make the cuts in the rural communities, and we are back to square one.

Why not just clear the decks, extend the FAA? We have never added anything to the extension in all the times we have done it unless there was unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. CARDIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be happy to.

Mr. CARDIN. I want to thank Senator BOXER for raising this issue. I cannot tell you how many people I have heard from in Maryland, not just the workers at the FAA who have been furloughed but small business owners who are not getting their contracts who are going to have to lay off workers through no fault of their own. So I think it would be absolutely wrong for us to go home on this recess, for this district work period, and not extend the FAA.

For those who think it will save the government on the budget deficit, let me remind you that if we do not extend the FAA authorization, we do not collect the revenues on the passenger tax, which, by the way, is currently being charged by the airlines in extra ticket prices to the passengers. So the passengers are not even getting the break of lower prices, but we are not getting the revenue. It is $30 million a day we are adding to the deficit problems because we are not collecting the revenue associated with the FAA reauthorization.

For all those reasons, for the sake of those 4,000 furloughed workers, who are really not at fault here, who are currently on furlough, and that is hurting our economy; for the sake of the contractors, who are depending upon the government funds in order to pay their workers, many of which are small companies; for the sake of the construction work that needs to be done at our airports, including work being done at our own airport, BWI; and for the importance to moving forward with modernization of the FAA itself, I would urge us to find a way to extend the FAA authorization until we come back. I would hope we could get a conference committee together, a reauthorization, but at a minimum we should extend the current provisions during those negotiations.

I say to Senator BOXER, she is absolutely right. I strongly urge the Senate to allow a short-term, clean extension of the FAA. That is the best way to proceed. I hope we can find a way to get this done now so the damage that is being done no longer will take place.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time——

Mrs. BOXER. Well, I take that as a question, and I will just wrap up with my unanimous consent request because I agree with everything that was said.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 109, H.R. 2553, that a Rockefeller-Hutchison substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I would make note there is nothing we can do now new because the House has adjourned. So even if we were to pass this, nothing would happen with it. I have been assured that from the majority leader's office.

I agree with the Senator from California that any action on the mediation board is probably inappropriate for this bill. I would not disagree with that. But my reservation—and I plan on objecting, and I think the good Senator from California knows that—is both in the House and the Senate, by significant votes, we passed limitations on essential air services by majorities that said we could no longer afford to spend thousands of dollars on individual seats, on subsidies for people who live 110 miles from an airport or 140 miles from an airport. But what we could do is make sure—to major airports—that those under 90, those above 90, we could still do that.

So I understand we have placed people in difficult positions, but it is us as a body, not individual Senators or parties, that has done that because we have failed to do our work.

So I object to this unanimous consent request, and then I offer one of my own, noting that if this unanimous consent request is agreed to, it will go directly to the President, not to the House. So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2553, which was received from the House, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

There was objection to the original request.

Mr. COBURN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Objection was heard.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, so there we are. There was objection to a clean extension of the FAA, and as a result of Republican objection, people are hurting all over this country. Safety projects are being delayed. And this is

just part of what we have seen since the Republicans took over the House.

Now, my friend said that everything they have put in this has been voted on by the Senate. It is just not true. It is not true. Not everything in this extension was voted on by the Senate, so let's get our facts straight.

My friend also said that the House has gone; too bad; give it up. Not true. I served there for 10 years. If you can hotline it over there and get everyone to agree, they are going to be able to pass it over there. So do not give the American people misinformation on this. It can be done. It just takes a will to be done.

House Members have taken off, gone home. Whatever they are doing, God bless them. But I have to tell you, I hope when they go home they hear from the people who are hurting in their States because of this. I hope they hear from the workers. Construction workers are at the highest unemployment rate we have seen in generations—15 percent—and now this is going to make it worse. Construction businesses are crying for a highway bill, and I am working on that with Senator INHOFE in our committee. We are almost there.

But I want to put this obstructionism, I want to put this hostage-taking into plain view. You just saw everything come to a halt for at least 3, 4 weeks because the full faith and credit of America was taken hostage by the Republicans. And they said to the President—it has never happened before, OK, never. Mr. President, 89 times we have seen an increase in the debt limit. We have never ever seen this hostage-taking. They would not allow the President to raise the debt ceiling for things on which they voted to spend money.

When you raise the debt ceiling, you are paying your past bills. They voted for two wars on the credit card. They voted for tax breaks to the wealthiest among us, the billionaires and the millionaires. They voted for tax breaks for the biggest multinational corporations, including Big Oil. Oh, they were happy. They even voted for a prescription drug benefit without paying for it. Then the bill comes due, and they say to President Obama: Sorry, Mr. President, we are not going to cooperate with you. They walked out on him at least three times.

We finally got a deal because some of us—and I say HARRY REID, strong; Vice President BIDEN, strong; MITCH MCCONNELL, strong; NANCY PELOSI, strong. The President made sure that at the end of the day we did not default. But what a spectacle in the world. The world cannot even believe this. And I know of the Presiding Officer's hard work to get what we called a big deal, a major deal, a $4 trillion deficit reduction that was fair, that asked the millionaires and the billionaires and the multinational corporations to do something. But, no, that was not to be. We wasted time—a lot of time. And what happened? We almost brought the country to its knees. Thank God it did not happen is all I can say. And I felt strongly, if we had not gotten an agreement, the President would have had to invoke the 14th amendment in order to save our country from this hostage-taking.

So that was a made-up crisis. It never happened before. Do you know that the most the debt ceiling was raised was under Ronald Reagan? Eighteen times. Under George Bush, 9 times. I never heard anything like this before, and I have been around here since the days of Ronald Reagan, dare I say. I was in the House for 10 years.

Ronald Reagan said very clearly—and I am paraphrasing—he was very strong—do not play games with the debt ceiling. It is dangerous. He said that even the thought of it is dangerous. So we just came out of that mess.

Now let's look at what else they have done since they took power—how many months ago? Five months? Is that all it has been? It feels like an eternity, OK, since they took over the House. They stopped the patent bill, which Senator LEAHY says would result in hundreds of thousands of jobs—stopped it cold. Why? Because the Patent Office does not have any money to work on those brilliant ideas that are coming out of our people. They needed more funding. That bill took care of it. The House stopped it cold. Hundreds of thousands of jobs.

The Economic Development Administration—I know about that because I brought the bill here. It is a beautiful program. It has been in place for generations. It gives a little seed money in areas that have had high unemployment, and that seed money attracts private sector money, public sector money, nonprofit money, and jobs are created. They build office parks. We have great examples in California of shopping malls. I am sure my friend, the Presiding Officer, has many examples of the EDA at work. They stopped it. They filibustered it. It never got a vote. That is the small business innovation bill my friend MARY LANDRIEU brought to the floor. The last time we counted, those bills have created 19,000 new businesses. Shut that one down. Then the House passed a budget that cut into the highway fund. I want to give you specifically what that would mean. If we wind up cutting the transportation program at the level they cut it in the House—one-third—and that is exactly what Chairman MICA's bill does—we know, because CBO has told us, we lose 620,000 jobs, construction jobs.

Then they played with the FAA. They object to a clean reauthorization. Projects are shut down and workers are furloughed and small businesses do not know if they can hang on.

OK. I thought this election in 2010 was about jobs. I tell you, I was up in 2010. I know it was about jobs. I committed to the people I would go back here and fight for jobs, private sector jobs, public sector jobs. Jobs. Jobs. Everything the House has done since the Republicans took over is to stop our progress—screeching halt. You can hear the brakes go onto this economy. It is not just one thing now, it is five things I have told you. This is not rhetoric. They have stopped the FAA—partial shutdown; they stopped the EPA authorization; they stopped the patent bill; they stopped the small innovation bill; they have cut transportation in their budget by one-third. That is just the tip of the iceberg of what I am telling you.

I think it is very sad right now that we had a Republican objection to a bipartisan request to allow FAA to be reauthorized. It is very sad. I want to again thank KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, my friend from Texas, for saying that she stands with Chairman ROCKEFELLER, and she believes we should do a clean reauthorization. With that, I think I have made my points. But I am going to make sure I continue to make them throughout this recess. I would suggest that Senators go home and look at the projects in their States that have been stopped due to this Republican hostage taking. They are against working men and women having decent rights. They are holding this bill hostage. That is what it is all about. It is a very sad day.

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

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to take a moment and add my voice to the voices who spoke earlier—the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from California—about this situation with the FAA.

I would imagine if you are a visitor to our Nation's Capitol and have come to see a little Senate debate, it is a pretty interesting day to be here. It was great news that the country avoided default today. Although it was an imperfect compromise, I was glad to vote for that. We still have obviously a long way to go on debt and deficits.

There is another issue that has not gotten as much attention as the debt ceiling debate, although it is clear that at almost any other time in our history this issue would be on the front page of every newspaper around the country and on every nightly TV newscast. I am talking about the fact that the Federal Aviation Administration—the entity that ensures the safety of our skies, the safety of our airplanes, the maintenance of our airports—has been in partial shutdown mode for over a week.

Close to 4,000 FAA employees, many from the Virginia/DC area, have been

furloughed. These folks do not know when they are going to get a paycheck or when they are going to be able to go back to work. And they have not been furloughed as a result of anything they have done. This situation is not the result of complaints about the quality of service or about safety of the FAA. In fact this shutdown is the result of a dispute over a small FAA program that protects rural airports.

Only in Washington would a dispute over service to small rural airports force the shut down of all ''nonessential services'' in the Federal Aviation Administration. Only in Washington would we would put 4,000 people out of work, and affect the lives of tens of thousands of other folks who are depending upon FAA funding for needed improvement projects at airports around the country.

We have a number of airports in Virginia where construction has basically stopped as a result of this political standoff. With the FAA partially shut down, the airlines, which traditionally charge passengers a small tax to help fund the FAA to build, maintain, and keep airports safe, are no longer required to collect the tax. So, during this shutdown, especially if we go through the next month and do not enact an extension, the U.S. Government would lose $1.2 billion as a result of political back and forth about a program to support rural airports—a program that, in total, costs $14 million.

If people are scratching theirs head with this math, they have a right to scratch their heads. Only in Washington can not collecting over a billion dollars in airport ticket taxes because of a dispute about a program that costs $14 million make any sense.

The overwhelming majority of Senate Democrats and Republicans alike say we have to go ahead with an extension. We are saying if we have issues to dispute let's work those out. But let's not put nearly 4,000 FAA employees out of work and let's not, as the Senator from California said, halt the projects of tens of thousands of construction workers.

So it is my hope that, once again, cooler heads will prevail. I thank the chairman of the committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and the ranking member, Senator HUTCHISON, and both Democrats and Republicans for working together to try and get this resolved. I know the American people have looked at Congress—understandably—in the last few weeks and have scratched their heads and said, what are these guys doing? Why can't they get their act together and negotiate a compromise, so they don't put our country into default?

We managed to dodge that bullet in a way that is a fixed but not a long-term solution. We will continue that discussion. As everybody heads back to their home States, dodging the debt and deficit bullet, how are we going to look as we leave town with 4,000 workers furloughed, tens of thousands of construction workers without the ability to continue projects that are needed, and the U.S. Government $1.2 billion deeper in debt—not because of a dispute over of too much tax or whether to collect but because we could not reach an agreement over a rural airport program?

I have cosponsored legislation—and I am sure the Presiding Officer supports it—to make sure that when the furloughed workers get back, they have to get paid. How can we leave town for a few weeks and leave this issue hanging out there?

I hope those folks in the House—and the chairman and the ranking member of the committee are working on this issue—will get this done. As the Senator from California said—and this is some of the technical process stuff that people scratch their head about—the House is in pro forma session, so there is a path here to resolve the issue.

We have to make sure we do our job not only for the public to make sure their airlines and airports stay safe, but also for the furloughed workers who need to get back to work. We've got to do our job so that airports all over the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania can implement their much-needed airport improvements. The money has already been appropriated. It is not as though it is new dollars. Anybody who can read a balance sheet knows we shouldn't end up blowing $1.2 billion over a dispute for a program that costs $14 million total.

I hope we get this resolved this afternoon in a way that shows this Congress is more up to the task than we have been, unfortunately, over the last few weeks.

A closing comment. I know the Presiding Officer has worked hard on the debt and deficit issue as well. I will close with the statement that my hope is that we did take a step today, with about $1 trillion in cuts over the next 10 years, and we need to make sure those cuts don't slow down the economic recovery the Nation is still struggling with. But we have to recognize that even with this new supercommittee being created—and the Presiding Officer would be a great member of that committee when it is chosen—but even if that committee meets its goal of $1.5 trillion in additional cuts, that still doesn't get our country's balance sheet back in order. We didn't create this debt overnight. We will not get out of it overnight. It is not one party's fault. Both parties have unclean hands on this.

Candidly, a lot of our debt and deficit problems are due to the fact that we are all getting older and we are living longer through advanced medicine. The challenge we have before us is that we have to urge the supercommittee to look at something that will get us all out of our comfort zones. We have to recognize how do we make sure our entitlement promises we made to seniors with Social Security and Medicare and the least fortunate in terms of Medicaid—I know two-thirds of the seniors in nursing homes are on Medicaid. How do we preserve those programs? These programs need some reforms, because with an aging population—for example, in Social Security, there used to be 17 workers for 1 retiree. Now there are three. It is nobody's fault, but that is a fact. How do we make sure that promise exists?

We have to deal with entitlement reform, and we also need to deal with tax reform. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out if we are spending 25 percent of GDP in Federal spending, that has to be brought down. If we are collecting revenues at only 15 percent, which is a 70-year low, we are never going to get that 10-percent differential, unless we find some way to generate more revenues and make cuts in spending. Along with entitlement spending, which is the fastest growing part of the budget, we have to do tax reform in a way that will generate more revenue. There are ways we can do that which will lower rates and cut back on some of the tax expenditures. It will take some hard choices.

My hope is that while this step of avoiding default was important—and it is a good day when America doesn't default, but we have much more work to do—the work of all the previous commissions that have been set up—and they have all kind of come out in basically the same scope of the problem—and, frankly, with about the same kinds of recommendations. A lot of that work of the so-called Simpson-Bowles commission, the President's deficit commission, the Gang of 6—or my hope would be the ''mob of 60,'' at some point in the not too-distant future—that was the framework we worked on, and we put everything on the table.

I say to the Presiding Officer and any other colleagues who may be still around, I urge them to join this effort. We have to make sure this supercommittee actually takes on the big issues and that we don't default back to a series of cuts come next year that, frankly, are not well thought through, or well planned, across the board, without regard to effectiveness. The only way is, yes, by additional cutting but doing entitlement reform and tax reform.

With that, I yield the floor, and with the hopes that we will see not only the hard work on the debt and deficit, but also the resolution of the FAA issue in the coming hours. I yield the floor and 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. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT OMAR A. JONES

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I rise today to remember a fallen hero, Nebraska Army National Guard Sergeant Omar A. Jones of Maywood, NE.

Sergeant Jones served as an electrician in the 623rd Engineer Company, Nebraska Army National Guard, out of Wahoo, Nebraska. Sergeant Jones died at Forward Operating Base Deh Dadi in Balkh Province, Afghanistan, on July 18, 2011.

Omar grew up in Mississippi and lived in Bogota, Colombia for many years. He graduated from high school in Colorado and chose to enter the Army instead of pursuing a college athletic scholarship. He served two tours in Iraq. One as an infantryman in the active duty Army, and one with the Nebraska Army National Guard. His love of country compelled him to seek an assignment in Afghanistan. He volunteered and even changed units and developed new skills for this opportunity.

In October 2010, he deployed to Afghanistan with the 623rd Engineering Company. It was a tough decision to deploy again because his wife Ava and two children had become the center of his life. But, it was for their freedom he chose to serve again overseas.

His commanders and fellow Soldiers recall Sergeant Jones as kind, friendly, and helpful. They say they counted on Sergeant Jones for a big smile and a willingness to listen. He loved being a soldier. A former commander put it this way:

> He had the biggest heart of any soldier I knew.

His decorations and badges earned during a distinguished career over three combat tours speak to his dedication and bravery. He received the Combat Infantry Badge, Combat Action Badge, Marksmanship Qualification Badge (Expert), Driver and Mechanic Badge, Overseas Service Bar (2), Army Commendation Medal (2), Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Star, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal with ''M'' device (2), Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, and the NATO Medal.

I cannot put into words how the death of Sergeant Jones will impact the lives of those closest to him. Nebraska is honored to call him one of our own, and I know Nebraskans in Maywood and Wellfleet will provide his family with care and love during this difficult time.

Today I join the family and friends of Sergeant Jones in mourning the death of their husband, son, father, and friend. I ask that God be with all those serving in uniform, especially the brave men and women on the front lines of battle. May God bless them and their families and bring them home to us safely.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). The Senator from Utah.

TRIBUTE TO COLLEEN MONSON BANGERTER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand to address this body to honor the life of one of Utah's great citizens.

A good friend of mine is former Utah Governor Norman Bangerter, who announced on Saturday that his beloved wife of 58 years had passed away after a long-time battle with Alzheimer's disease.

Colleen Monson Bangerter, having been born in 1935, was the mother of six children, the mother also of one foster son, and in many respects was a friend to all of Utah's 3 million residents.

She served faithfully in many capacities, including as PTA president and other offices within the PTA. She also served faithfully in a variety of positions as a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.

Just a few years ago, she and her husband, former Governor Bangerter, served as they presided over the mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in South Africa. They worked hand in hand throughout their entire lives—in raising their children, in running Governor Bangerter's campaigns, and in running the State throughout his time as Governor, which wasn't an easy time for our State.

During Governor Bangerter's two terms in office, our State faced significant financial difficulties, faced significant flooding challenges, and the Bangerters weathered these adverse conditions well, serving as standing examples to all the citizens of Utah for what it means to rise to the challenge of adversity.

Colleen Bangerter was someone who had friends in many corners, and she also had many talents, some of which are not known by everyone, including the fact that she was the State hopscotch champion in the State of Utah in 1947. There are not many First Ladies in the United States who can claim that distinction, and she definitely did. She was also pleased to have been the recipient of the highest award that can be granted by the Boy Scouts of America, which she received just a few years ago. But of all the honors, including the honors that went along with being the First Lady of the State of Utah and serving with someone who, in my opinion, was one of the great Governors ever to serve our State, her greatest honor, her greatest prize was that of her family.

She loved being a mother, loved each of her 6 children, their 30 grandchildren and 18 great grandchildren. We as Utahns mourn the loss of this great citizen of our State. We mourn the loss of this friend. Our thoughts and our prayers go out to former Governor Bangerter and his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

REMEMBERING COLLEEN MONSON BANGERTER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to pay tribute today to a remarkable woman, quintessential wife and mother, and superb first lady for the State of Utah—Colleen Monson Bangerter. Sadly she passed away on the evening of Friday, July 29, 2011, from the effects of Alzheimer's disease. She was at home, the place she loved to be with her husband former Utah Governor Norman H. Bangerter.

Colleen was a wonderful human being who was always willing to serve others. She served as Utah's first lady from 1985–1993, while her husband Norman H. Bangerter was the Governor. During her years as first lady she undertook many causes close to her heart, including teenage drug use, and challenges facing women and families. She hosted a yearly drug awareness conference for teens and took First Lady Nancy Reagan's Just Say No Program to every corner of the State. Additionally she hosted an annual conference on strengthening families to address the important challenges affecting the health and well-being of families across our great State.

She stood by her husband's side as he led Utah through a very important time in our State's history. They advocated for economic development and she was a tremendous ambassador for Utah as they met with leaders throughout the Nation and even overseas encouraging new business development.

Colleen not only excelled at the initiatives she undertook for our state, she also served in many capacities as she raised her children including the PTA, and in many important positions for her church—The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Colleen and Norm presided over the Johannesburg, South Africa Mission from 1996–1999. In this role she was a kind, and loving asset to the many missionaries who joined them in the work in South Africa.

Colleen and Norm raised six children and one foster son. They now have 30 grandchildren and 18 great grandchildren. She was the light of her family and could always be found in the middle of the fun. She enjoyed spending time at their cabin in beautiful Utah, as well as their second home in St. George. She always made people feel welcome and embraced many who crossed their paths.

Colleen Bangerter will be very missed by her wonderful husband Norm and their family. There was a special warmth and goodness about this lady and I will never forget her twinkling eyes and bright smile. She was kind to all she met, and was a partner in every sense of the word to her husband. Elaine and I love Norm and Colleen very much, and hope that Norm and his

family will find some peace and comfort in the wonderful memories they share with this remarkable woman. Her life's work touched many lives and she will be forever remembered as someone who truly cared about others, and in doing good for her family and community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to speak just momentarily about the legislation that was just passed.

I, for the last 14 months traveling my State in almost every nook and cranny, have talked about the situation our country is in, talked about possible solutions, and offered legislation—the only bipartisan, bicameral legislation offered until this point—to deal with our country's deficits and debt.

I had hoped that we would figure out a way to deal with $5 trillion to $7 trillion worth of spending and/or savings over the next 10 years, and finally decided that $4 trillion was the magic number. I know the markets had looked at that, the rating agencies looked at that, the people who buy our Treasurys had looked at that number. Over the course of the last few weeks, it became apparent that $3 trillion was probably the most that was going to be achieved, and then now we have ended up with this bill that passed today, and I supported that hoping to achieve $2.1 trillion to $2.4 trillion in savings over the next decade.

Mr. President, obviously, like many of us in this body on both sides of the aisle who know our country is in dire straits and we have a lot of work to do, I am disappointed at the magnitude of this legislation. But I am hopeful and thankful that we have taken the first step. I think this is going to be a decade of us having to focus on our country's irresponsibility over the past many years. Both parties, no doubt, have been responsible for putting us in this situation. It is going to take both parties to move us away from where we are. But I think everyone in this body fully understands that on the present course our country's best days are behind us. I think all of us want to ensure that this country's greatness continues; that we can continue to display American exceptionalism not only here but around the world.

I look at this solely as the first step. I know we are going to have an appropriations opportunity to look at even more savings at the end of September. I know we are going to have a committee that is going to be looking at this during the months of November and December. I know we are going to have a series of opportunities for us to deal with this. Again, today was just a first step.

I learned through a lifetime of business, starting with doing very, very small projects at the age of 25 when I first went in business, that as a company, you can never go broke taking a profit. What I have learned in the Senate is you should never say no to spending cuts.

So while these spending cuts are not of the magnitude that I would like to have seen, I think this is a very good first step and is something that we can all build upon. I look forward to working with people on both sides of the aisle to ensure that this is just the first step and that our country continues to have the discipline, the fortitude, the courage, and the will to make the tough decisions that all of us know we are going to need to make over the course of the next many years.

That is what we owe these young pages who are getting ready to leave after service to this country over the last month; that is what we owe future generations; that is what we owe Americans; and, candidly, that is what we owe the world as citizens of this world; that is, for us to be disciplined and to know that we have to live within our means and to know the best thing we can possibly do as a country at this moment in time is to show we have that courage and that will.

Mr. President, I thank you for the time to speak on this topic. I know all of us leave here and go home to recess. I know many of us will be talking about the vast amount of work that needs to be done as it relates to making sure we rein in this out-of-control spending that has been taking place for many years. I look forward to that. I look forward to talking to citizens back in Tennessee, and I look forward to coming back in September and dealing with folks on both sides of the aisle to make sure we put that thought into action.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. CORKER, for what he just said. I want to affirm the extraordinary amount of effort he has made to not only inform this Senate body of the crisis that we face financially, but also to come forward with some very constructive solutions on how to deal with this crisis.

I know he is disappointed that we were not able to reach a better solution than the one voted on today. I know he struggled to decide what was the best course to follow moving forward. In the end, he decided to support the bill as a first step; but, as he said, this is the first step of what probably will be a decade-long challenge facing all of us to successfully address this deep hole of debt we have dug for ourselves as a nation.

I rise today to speak, sharing all those concerns, certainly believing that our work has just started and there is much more to do. But also as someone who decided to vote against the bill that we just had before us. I have not taken this vote lightly.

For the past 1½ years, as a candidate I traveled the State of Indiana, to just about every town and city in the State, talking to thousands and thousands of Hoosiers on a day-after-day basis hearing what they had to say. If, frankly, I could categorize their thoughts into one statement, it would be a deep concern about the future of our country and a deep desire to have their elected representatives go to Washington and do everything they can to address this situation.

I have spent the last 7 months in the Senate hearing from hundreds, if not thousands, of Hoosiers who have written, called, visited, and talked with me back at home. Nothing has changed except the urgency of these concerns, and the deep worries that they have expressed have simply grown.

We saw, in 2010, Americans across the country express their desire for Congress to get hold of our fiscal situation; that the era of spending, of promising beyond our means, was over, and that we had to take major steps to reverse that. That is why I decided to return to the Senate, to come back to work to help repair our country's economic future. I came back to work on the things that many consider politically toxic: entitlement reform, tax reform, passing a balanced budget amendment to make sure that we would never end up in this situation again; that if there was a legacy that we could pass on to our children, if there was something that we could do for the future of our country, something that we could do for our children and grandchildren, and everyone's children and grandchildren, it would be to never have them have to go through what we are going through now because we had taken fiscal responsibility, passing a balanced budget amendment that would, as we are sworn in, require each of us to come here and put our left hand on the Bible and our right hand in the air, to repeat the oath to honor the Constitution, and that Constitution would attain a balanced budget amendment as a requirement.

So before taking this vote, I pondered for days and nights about the many Hoosiers who had put their faith and confidence in me and sent me back to the Senate to do everything I could to accomplish this goal. Some of those Hoosiers had tears in their eyes, worried about the future for themselves and for their children. Some had fingers in my chest, saying: Don't let me down. Don't go and settle for too little. Do everything you can. That is what I have tried to do.

After giving it consideration, I decided not to support this bill because I could not come to grips with having to come back and tell Hoosiers that this is the best we could do.

I do wish to recognize the work and leadership, the strategy and the efforts of our minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and whip, Senator KYL, those in leadership and others—JOHN BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR in the House and the people who represented Republicans at the White House.

I, like most of us who serve here, appreciate their hard work and understand their frustration at Washington's inability to accomplish a meaningful goal, a grand bargain or at least a big plan that would put us significantly on the way to fiscal reform. I don't hold them liable at all or anybody who voted for this bill. As Senator CORKER just said and as others have said and can say: Look, this is the best we could do. We will keep going.

I applaud that. It is just that I thought we could have done so much more when the crisis we face is so severe, when the consequences are so great and imminent. It is not 2013. It is not even 2012. It is now. I don't know what the rating agencies are going to do because of our debt. Many were saying that this vote would not result in a debt downgrade. I think already we have heard information to the contrary, that that is not the case. That means the full faith and confidence in the United States of America as being that last safe haven of safety is put at risk.

We have taken a step in the right direction. It is a small step. It is a marathon we have to run, and we do need to go much further. I believe the bill we just passed is significantly short of what is needed to address the severity of the crisis.

Senator CORKER said there has been a consensus that a minimum of $4 trillion of cuts are needed over the next 10 years, with true enforcement mechanisms to lock those cuts in place. We achieved just half of that in the bill we passed.

I have been stating over and over that the reality is if we do not address health care spending and the entitlements that provide benefits through Medicaid and Medicare, the virtual consensus is, no matter what else we do, we will not be able to solve the problem. This is an area that people do not want to talk about. It is supposedly the third rail of politics. It is suicide to bring it up, and there have been a lot of efforts to avoid these tough choices. But that is what we are going to have to do.

It has been avoided in this bill, pushed off to the selection of a special committee of six Senators, six Congressmen; balanced, six and six from each party, to come up with an additional $1 trillion of savings or perhaps a little more. I have some real reservations about whether this committee should have to do this in the first place because that is the job of Congress, all of us. That is what we were elected to do and we were not able to do it. We have turned it over to 12 Members of Congress. I am not sure how they are going to accomplish what we were not able to. Nevertheless, I hope and pray they are successful, and I hope they will address, in whatever recommendation they make to us later this year, entitlement reform and make a commitment to tax reform: entitlement reform because that spending is bankrupting this country and is denying future seniors benefits they are counting on—who are dependent on Social Security and Medicare—denying them the opportunity to rest easy that their benefits will remain the same or increase with the cost of living.

The situation the trustees have reported regarding the future of the Medicare Part A is that serious cuts will have to be made unless we take measures now to reform the system in a way that preserves those benefits for those currently on it and those within, say, 10 years of retirement. We all know we have to do this. We all know, if we do not do this, we simply will not be able to accomplish what we need to, no matter what else we do.

The real work is ahead. Congress must commit to address the root causes of our problem and our debt. We have to make the difficult choices necessary to restore economic growth and good-paying jobs for the American people. That is where tax reform comes in.

On a bipartisan basis, Senator RON WYDEN of Oregon, a Democrat, and myself have joined together to put together a comprehensive tax reform bill. I give Senator Judd Gregg credit for the 2 years he spent with Senator WYDEN putting this together. Senator WYDEN and I worked together for the last 7 months, making additional changes and improvements to that product. If we are going to have a growth component to grow our way—through a more prosperous economy—out of the debt problem we have, that has to include not only spending cuts, but it has to include real tax reform.

Those special interests out there that are receiving exemptions and special breaks, credits, subsidies—those are going to have to be closed out on a rational basis. We can retain some of the legitimate deductions, such as mortgage interest and charitable deductions, but most have to be eliminated. Those funds and revenues generated from elimination of those special interests have to be used to reduce rates to make our businesses more competitive, to give them a rate that is competitive with businesses around the world.

We are literally at the highest tax rate of all 36 of our worldwide competitors. That has to be adjusted. In doing so, we can stimulate our economy to grow, and we can bring in revenue on the basis of that growth. More companies will be making more money and therefore paying more taxes and more people will be at work and getting paychecks and therefore contributing what they are not contributing now.

Past tax reform efforts, on a comprehensive basis, have proven the best stimulus we can provide for an economy and the best thing we can do to get an economy thriving and moving again is getting people back to work. So entitlement reform—absolutely necessary to preserve those programs for future retirees and benefits that current retirees are receiving—and tax reform to move our economy forward need to be the core of what this special 12-member committee deals with and recommends.

My litmus test for this next tranche is that there be a commitment to move forward in these two critical areas that will have more impact on our future than anything else we do or have done so far to date.

I know we have committed, through this bill that just passed, to take up, debate, and vote on a balanced budget amendment. Clearly, if we want to ensure and guarantee the future solvency of our country and the future confidence of our citizens, we need to impose upon the Constitution an amendment that balances the budget or we will find ourselves back in this situation as the propensity of Congress to spend and not say no to anyone will continue. It seems to be almost part of who we are. It is so hard to say no to someone. It is easier now, first, because we don't have the money and, second, we have expanded this government beyond its ability to fulfill its responsibilities correctly.

The work is ahead. We have to address the root causes. My sleeves are rolled up. I will continue to push forward to rein in spending. I will continue to work to reform the Tax Code so businesses can provide more jobs and be more competitive. I will not back away from addressing the need for entitlement reform. We need to restructure those programs to keep them from becoming bankrupt and denying important retirement benefits for our citizens.

Now is the time for us in the Congress, whether we voted for this bill or against this bill—I am not criticizing anyone who voted for it because many of those believed it is the first of many steps. It was not adequate, in my opinion, but at least it was a first step. I do not believe we should be criticizing those who made that decision.

It also addressed the question of default. I did not support default, which is why I suggested a short-term plan. I believed this initial bill being presented to us was woefully inadequate for what we need to do right now to send the right signals that we are on a serious path to reform. I was willing to allow for a debt increase of a limited period of time, 6 to 8 weeks, cancel our recess, work to find a better solution that could achieve more support and gain confidence in the investment industry that we have taken a serious step forward.

That obviously did not go forward. But, nevertheless, when we return from recess, all of us, whether we voted yes or no, must make a commitment to engage, plunge into the problem, to do whatever is necessary—not political necessary, whatever is necessary for the future of our country. That is our challenge, and I hope we will rise to that challenge.

I have not given up on our ability to respond to the will of the people and to respond to the crisis we face. So, yea or

nay, let's all agree to come back with a focus on where we need to go, what we need to do, and the courage to make the tough choices for the future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD LEVINE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure but also a sad moment for members of the Foreign Relations Committee to take this time to celebrate the service of and also to salute the retirement of one of the Senate's great staffers: Ed Levine.

Ed is retiring this week after a remarkable 35 years of service to the Senate—a lot longer than most Senators get to serve and that most staff up here have the courage to hang in there and serve.

In his decades of service, Ed has provided wise and perceptive counsel to two committees, to many Members, and most recently to the Foreign Relations Committee. His deep knowledge of foreign policy and his remarkable sense of this institution are truly going to be missed and I mean missed enormously.

He grew up and he went to school here in Washington, DC, before he headed off to Berkeley and then later to Yale. When he was a young man here in this community, he used to ride the streetcar down to Georgia Avenue, where he would watch the Senators play at Griffith Stadium. For those who are too young to remember, there actually was a baseball team called the Senators once upon a time. He did not watch folks here playing at Griffith Stadium. But when the Washington Senators left for good to become the Texas Rangers, I have to reckon that Ed just decided that the U.S. Senators were the only game left in town, and he has been here ever since.

He first came to the Senate in 1976. He joined the Select Committee on Intelligence back then—literally right after it was established. It was a historic moment. Those who remember their history of the 1970s remember that was a time of great consternation about the covert activities of the CIA. The activities and the oversight of the CIA became a major national issue and concern. So it was a historic moment when the Senate was reasserting its constitutional responsibility to provide oversight.

Ed spent the next 20 years overseeing some of the Nation's most sensitive programs and some of its most closely guarded secrets. He was trusted with some of the most secret information of our country because he never had anything but the interests of our country and the security of the Nation foremost in his mind.

I think that is also borne out in the fact that through the course of his career, he worked for Members of both sides of the aisle while he was on the Intelligence Committee. He served on that committee as the personal representative of Republican Senator Clifford Case and then Republican Senator David Durenberger, and then later for Democratic Senators Howard Metzenbaum and Chuck Robb. His work for the Intelligence Committee exemplified a standard of public service that puts the fulfillment of the Senate's constitutional duties above any other partisan concerns.

For him, there never was a party issue, Republican or Democrat, or an ideological issue, liberal or conservative. It was: What are the best interests of the United States of America and how do we protect its security? He has applied that very same approach to his work on the Foreign Relations Committee, where I have had the privilege of watching him work over the course of the 26 years I have been here.

He worked mostly previously for now-Vice President BIDEN. A few days ago, we held a business meeting at the Foreign Relations Committee, and it was characteristic of Ed's diligence in representing the interests of country above party that Senator LUGAR, the ranking member of the committee, and who has served with him for a long time, took time to acknowledge his service and to note how constructively he had worked with the Republican counterparts on the committee over these many years.

We saw that in large measure last year when we considered the New START treaty, in which Ed played an integral role. You know, I might mention to colleagues, when Vice President BIDEN was Senator BIDEN and chairman of the committee, he coined a nickname for Ed. He called him ''Fast Eddie.'' And the irony of that for all of us who know him is that Ed does not do ''fast.'' He is one of the most careful and deliberate thinkers on our staff, and that is one of the things people valued in him the most. It was never a hip shot. It was always based on thinking, research, experience, and knowledge.

His knowledge of arms control, I may say, is encyclopedic. During the New START debate, we had a war room set up one floor below this in the Foreign Relations Committee room, with dozens of experts from the various departments of our government, and stacks of briefing books, and instant computer linkage to the State Department, to the Defense Department, Intelligence, and so forth, but often when we had a question, all we had to do was turn to Ed and he would know the answer from right up here in his head, from his experience.

That is not surprising, given how many treaties Ed has helped this body to consider during his career. He worked on the INF Treaty, on the START I treaty, on the START II treaty, on the Chemical Weapons Convention, on the Convention on Conventional Weapons.

I went up to him a moment ago. I saw he was wearing a tie with a sword being beaten into plowshares, and he reminded me that came from the mutual and balanced force reduction treaty, which he said was the only thing they could agree on, but he is proudly wearing it today.

What all of this adds up to is that Ed spent a great chunk of his life doing his best to help the Senate protect our Nation from the most dangerous weapons that ever existed. He did it with such professionalism, even, I might add, when faced with personal loss, as when his father died last year right during the consideration of the treaty, but it did not stop Ed from doing his duty.

All of his Senate service is a real testament to his character. That he earned the respect from the Members he served and the staff he worked with is a testament to his great skill and knowledge. And that he has done so for so many years is a testament to his sense of public citizenship and his love of country.

So, Ed, we thank you, all the Members of the Senate, for your service. We will miss you in the Senate. I wish you personally the best in all of your future endeavors.

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

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

BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we just passed legislation that would raise the debt ceiling. Part of that was an effort to reverse the debt trajectory we are on, but it can only be called, at best, a first step. We can all agree on that.

Indeed, there is an article in the Financial Times, written by Professors Rogoff and Reinhart, who wrote a book that has gotten a great deal of attention and is widely respected, describing and analyzing sovereign debt and countries that have gone bankrupt around the world. They commented that much of what occurred in our debate occurred in those other nations. The other nations scramble around when the pressure is on with something like a debt ceiling, and they don't really change anything significantly, but they meet the crisis and tell everybody everything is OK.

They say in this article in the Financial Times that everything is not OK. Indeed, the debt will increase over the

next 10 years by approximately $13 trillion, and this package would reduce the increase in our debt by $2.1 trillion to $2.4 trillion. That is not much.

In addition to that, Larry Lindsey, a former economic adviser to President Bush, has done some analysis of the Congressional Budget Office score of what the budget would look like over 10 years. He points out that they were predicting nearly 3 percent growth the first and second quarter of this year.

So now we have re-analyzed first quarter growth. Economic growth wasn't 3 percent, it was 2.4 percent. And the second quarter initially was scored at 1.3—not 3 percent or 2.7 but 1.3 percent. Dr. Lindsey said that loss in GDP alone will mean less economic growth, less tax revenue for the government, and over 10 years it puts the government on a trajectory to lose $750 billion—it would collect $750 billion less, which is about one-third of the savings that were to occur in the bill. Dr. Lindsey says the second, third, and fourth quarters of this year will also be well below that. We may be looking at, in this year alone, enough decline in GDP to wipe out half—maybe more—of the savings estimated in the bill we just passed.

I wanted to point out that I believe many in Congress and in the Senate are in denial about how serious the debt threat is and that we are too often, as Rogoff and Reinhart noted, saying the same things other nations said before their economic crises hit. Indeed, the name of their book, ''This Time Is Different,'' refers to what government leaders said in those countries—those other countries that went into default and into debt crises—up until the last minute. They were saying: We have it under control. It is not so bad. This time, they say, it is different.

Immediately, there was a crisis, which resulted in a loss of confidence, and they had a serious problem—similar to when people lost confidence in the housing market several years ago, which helped put us in this recession.

This is worrisome. We are not facing a little problem; we are facing a problem that will require our steadfast attention for a decade to get this country on the right course.

I note that the President had a press conference today. In a way, it rejected everything we have been talking about in this debate. It really did not talk about the nature of the crisis as Rogoff and Reinhart described. He didn't tell the American people that the real problem is spending that is surging out of control. He didn't say we can't continue, as a nation, borrowing 42 cents of every dollar we spend or that we can't continue spending $3.7 trillion when we take in $2.2 trillion. He did not talk to us honestly about that. He did not send a signal; he has not sounded the alarm. Therefore, I think a lot of people—even some in Congress and some outside of Congress—sort of think it must not be so bad. The President hasn't told us it is.

More and more people are expressing concerns. There is a growing unease nationwide, as demonstrated in consumer confidence and business investment, and in some bad manufacturing numbers we received yesterday. So things are not looking good. We have to be honest with ourselves that this is a difficult time.

He did, however, make repeated statements in his press conference about raising taxes. I don't think that is a good thing to do when the economy is in a fix the way it is. He flatly—and erroneously, I believe—stated that you can't balance the budget with spending cuts. Well, you certainly can. You can argue that you would rather have tax increases and fewer spending cuts, but we can and must balance our budget. It can be done with spending reductions. Quite a number of plans are out there proposing to do just that.

The President continues to talk as if the problem was the debt ceiling, but the debt ceiling is really a signal that we have spent too much, and we borrowed all Congress has allowed the President to borrow, and you can't borrow any more unless Congress agrees to raise the debt ceiling. But that is not the problem. The problem, as Rogoff and Reinhart said, is our debt. That is the real problem. It is not going to be easy to fix. I wish it was. If we work together as a nation, we can do it. This country can rise to meet the challenge. I am totally convinced of that.

The President said:

> And since you can't close the deficits with just spending cuts, we'll need a balanced approach.

That means we need to balance a cut with tax increases. That is what that means.

He went on to say:

> We can't make it tougher for young people to go to college or ask seniors to pay more for health care.

But at some point, when you don't have the money, we might not be able to be as generous as we were just a few years ago when we were in better financial condition. Isn't that common sense? What do you mean you can't make any changes in how we do business? We are going to have to make changes in how we do business.

He goes on to talk about investments, as he has often done. This is a quote from the press conference:

> Yet, it also allows us to keep making key investments in things like education and research. . . .

Continuing to make investments in education? Does that mean we will continue our current level in education and that we will try not to cut it if we have to make reductions in spending? Is that what the President means? No.

Just last week we saw the spectacle of the Secretary of Education appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee asking for a 13.5-percent increase in education funding. Also last week, the President talked about investments—more, more, more—including 13.5 percent more for education. You know, 90 percent of education is funded by States, cities, and counties anyway. It is not the Federal Government. It is not our primary role and never has been. We only provide approximately 10 percent of the money that gets spent on education in America.

We can't have double-digit increases when we are borrowing 42 cents of every dollar. Every penny of that increase will be borrowed money—every penny. Doesn't common sense tell us we might not be able to increase spending this year even if we would like to?

I point out that before the Budget Committee, on which I am the ranking Republican, we had the Secretary of Energy testify that he wanted a 9.5-percent increase for the Department of Energy—the Department that does more to block energy than create energy. The State Department was asking for 10.5 percent increase in the President's budget, the President's request to us. The Department of Transportation was to get a 60-percent increase in spending in the President's Budget. Last year, it was about $40 billion.

I note that this year, interest on our debt will be $240 billion.

I say to my colleagues that we are not dealing with reality. Americans know—maybe they are lucky enough to have two wage earners in the family when one loses their job, but do they not change the way they do business? Do they just think they can continue to spend twice as much as their income as if they were both still working? People don't do that. All over, Americans are making tough decisions. No wonder they are upset at us for pursuing this idea that we don't have to make any changes in what we do. It is very, very distressing to me.

The President said this about employment:

> That's part of the reason that people are so frustrated with what's been going on in this town. In the last few months, the economy has already had to absorb an earthquake in Japan, the economic headwinds coming from Europe, the Arab spring, and the [increases] in oil prices, all of which have been very challenging to the recovery. But these are things we couldn't control.

I don't know that those are the big problems here. Rising oil prices are. Today, oil prices are just about double—a little more—than what they were when President Obama took office. We have shut down new exploration in the gulf, and we are blocking the production of natural gas and shale formations, which has so much promise for us. We are doing a lot of things to drive up the cost of energy.

Then he goes on to say this, which is surprising. He is the one who said the crisis was so large, it was a national problem.

> Our economy didn't need Washington to come along with a manufactured crisis to make things worse.

We had a serious debate over what to do about the debt ceiling that we have

reached, and Congress—the Republican House—yielded from $6 trillion in cuts over 10 years, as they proposed in their budget, to taking $1 trillion in cuts up front as part of this debt deal. The President wanted less cuts than that, apparently, and that is not enough. Of course, it could be $2.4 trillion, if the committee functions correctly, and we hope it will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, Senators are limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. What I wanted to point out is in this chart. It gives some indication of how we are operating in the Senate and the Congress, driven in substantial part by the President's desires. It is a chart showing the growth in certain programs that are exempt from the automatic cuts that would occur if a budget agreement is not reached as part of the legislation we just passed.

These are all programs that we like and wish we could continue to allow to grow every year. Unfortunately, we are not going to have the money to do that. We are going to have to deal with these programs and all spending—Defense and non-Defense programs, no doubt about it.

We have first over here the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. The average annual percentage increase of that fund's cost has been 4.9 percent. The average annual increase in that fund each year—2005 through 2010—was 4.9 percent. The average inflation rate during this time was 2.5 percent. So that is about twice the inflation rate.

The next fund here—a fund all of us value—is the Military Retirement Fund. It has increased at the average annual rate of 5.4 percent. Inflation is 2.5. Medicaid—a program that is administered by States but has recently been as much as 66 percent funded by the Federal Government—has been increasing at 8.5 percent each year.

I think most of us know the rule of seven, where if you have money in the bank and it draws 7 percent interest, that money will double in 10 years. So this means in about 8 or 9 years the entire Medicaid Program will double at that kind of rate of increase. And, remember, inflation is 2.5 percent.

The Children's Health Insurance Program—the CHIP program—has been increasing at 9 percent a year, and the SNAP program—the food stamp program—has been increasing at 16.6 percent a year for the last 5 years. It has been increasing at 16.6 percent.

So I ask, is this sustainable? We are borrowing 42 cents out of every dollar. The economy is not growing as much as we hoped and expected, and it is not going to bail us out of this so we can sustain these kinds of spending levels.

We look at all these programs we value—and we hate to talk about it; we don't want to mention it—and the odd thing about the agreement that was passed earlier today, at the insistence of our Democratic colleagues, is that these programs would receive no reductions if an agreement to cut spending is not reached by the committee. Under the rule, if the committee can't reach an agreement, there will be automatic across the board cuts, except it is not evenly cut across the board because these programs are untouched. They are untouchable because our Democratic colleagues say we can't deal with them.

Well, it is time for us to look under the hood of the food stamps program, I have to tell you. How could it be increasing at 16.6 percent a year for 5 years? How could that happen? Don't we need to examine it, take a good look at it? We have had no hearings. We have done nothing this year to confront the surging cost. And what about Medicaid and CHIP? Those are also surging. Maybe we could even save a little on some of those programs that are growing faster than inflation.

I would point out that the military is in line, under the bill that passed, if an agreement isn't reached, to take a 10-percent cut. That is from the baseline military budget. It does not include Iraq and Afghanistan, which are coming down and projected to come down dramatically.

Forgive me if I am a little bit taken aback here about our priorities and about the unwillingness of Congress to deal with out-of-control spending. That is a good deal of money we are talking about—the Medicaid Program at $270 billion a year. Food stamps have more than doubled. It is now $78 billion a year. By comparison, Alabama's general fund budget is about $2 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. As I notice no one else is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is here.

Mr. SESSIONS. Oh, I am sorry. I didn't see that. Well, I should long ago have yielded the floor, because he has something worthwhile to say, I am sure.

I close by saying we are not dealing honestly with the crisis we are in. The President is in denial. He is not looking the American people in the eye and telling us what a serious fix we are in, or challenging us all to deal with the reality that we are going to have to change the way we do business. I hate to say it, but I believe that it is true. We have to do better.

I thank the Chair and I would be pleased to yield the floor to one of our more talented, insightful new Members, Senator RUBIO of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

SPENDING AND DEFICITS

Mr. RUBIO. I thank my colleague from Alabama. He does a phenomenal job always in outlining the economic realities. I enjoyed listening, and I could have sat here longer. According to some, I may be one of the last speakers today, so I don't want to keep the Senate open any longer than it should be. We have done a lot of work here over the last few days.

I went back and forth over whether I wanted to speak, because I think almost everything that can be said has been said regarding the events of the last few days. But I did ultimately want to share my thoughts for a moment as we head into the August recess, as they call it here in Washington, and many of us here in the Senate will be returning to our home States to explain to the people we represent what we did or did not do in the last few days.

I will start by pointing out that our Republic is an amazing thing. As heated as the rhetoric may have been over the last few days, I think all of us should stop for a moment and understand that all around the world there are countries that solve the problems we solved through debate with civil war and conflict, armed and otherwise. Our Republic is amazing. It isn't always pretty. Quite frankly, more often than not, it is very messy. But it has withstood 230-some-odd years of pressures and choices, and it continues to do so. Even if ultimately what it gives us is not always solutions to our problems, we are blessed to have it.

I would remind many, such as like myself, who were elected in the last election cycle, tightly embracing the principles of our Constitution, that our Constitution is not just a set of words that outline our principles. It gives us a system of government. It gives us this Republic. This Republic is valid, and it matters even when the people who are running it may not be people with whom you agree. We should always remember that. What we have here is special and unique, and we should embrace it and be thankful to our God each night that we have the opportunity and the blessing of living in a nation such as this.

Moving aside from that, however, the facts still remain that this coming month, and every month to come, more or less, this government will spend $300 billion a month. That is a lot of money. It is more than any government has ever spent in the history of man. And $180 billion of that $300 billion is money we collect from the people of our country through taxes and fees and other ways. But we borrow $120 billion a month to pay our $300 billion a month bill. That is too much money. That is too much money for Republicans, it is too much money for Democrats. It is too much money. Although we should be happy that tomorrow and in the days to come, we are not facing a default and an inability to meet our bills, the truth is—an undeniable one that I

don't think anyone here would disagree with me when I say it—we can't keep borrowing $120 billion every month or more, because the point and the day will come when the people who lend us that money will stop lending us that money. If we keep doing this for long, we will one day reach a day in this country where we will face a debt crisis, but it won't be because of the debt limit or because of gridlock in Washington. It will be because folks are no longer willing to buy America's debt because they seriously doubt our ability to pay it back.

That is not hyperbole. It is not an exaggeration. It is a mathematical, indisputable fact that no Member of either party would dispute. There is general agreement on this. And there is general agreement the only way to solve this problem is a combination of two things: No. 1, this government needs to generate more revenue; and No. 2, this government needs to restrict its growth and spending. Because as bad as the $300 billion a month looks, it only gets worse from here on out, in ways I don't have time to explain in the next 10 minutes. Suffice it to say our economy isn't growing. It is not producing enough revenue moving forward. Meanwhile, all the programs we fund are about to explode in their growth because more people than ever are going to retire, they will live longer than they have ever lived, and the math doesn't add up. These are facts. No one disputes that.

The debate in Washington is not about that fact but about how do we solve it. How do we generate more money and reduce the spending at the same time? I will tell you this is not a debate we will solve in the month of August. In fact, I believe it will characterize the rest of this Congress, the 2012 elections, and the years that lie ahead. The division on how to solve it goes to the root of the dispute we face in America between two very different visions of America's future—by the way, one not more or less patriotic than the other. Patriotic, country-loving Americans can disagree on their future vision of what kind of country we should be. But this division—this difference of opinion—is the reason why even though this bill passed, this debate we have had is going to move forward for some time to come.

On the one hand, there are those who believe the job of government is to deliver us economic justice—which basically means an economy where everyone does well or as well as possibly can be done. There is another group who believes in the concept of economic opportunity—where it is not the government's job to guarantee an outcome but to guarantee the opportunity to fulfill your dreams and hopes. One is not more moral than the other. They are two very different visions of the role of government in America. But it lies at the heart of the debate we are having as a nation. Washington is divided because America is divided on this point, so we have to decide what every generation of America before us has decided, and that is what kind of government do we want and what role do we want it to have in America's future.

The fault lines emerge from that. The solutions emerge from those two visions. For those who want to see economic justice, their solution is to raise more taxes. They believe there are some in America who make too much money and should pay more in taxes. They believe our government programs can stimulate economic growth. They believe that perhaps America no longer needs to fund or can no longer afford to fund our national defense and our military at certain levels.

Another group believes that, in fact, our revenues should come not from more taxes but from more taxpayers; that what we need is more people being employed, more businesses being created that will pursue tax reform, that will pursue regulatory reform. But, ultimately, we look for more revenue for government from economic growth, not from growth in taxes. We believe the private sector creates these jobs, not government and not politicians; that jobs in America are created when everyday people from all walks of life start a business or expand an existing business.

I believe and we believe in a safety net program, programs that exist to help those who cannot help themselves, and to help those who have tried but failed to stand up and try again but not safety net programs that function as a way of life, and believe that America's national defense and our role in the world with the strongest military that man has ever known is still indispensable.

These are two very different visions of America and two very different types of solutions. Ultimately, we may find that between these two points there may not be a middle ground; that, in fact, as a nation and as a people we must decide what we want the role of government to be in America moving forward.

Let me close by saying this has been a unique week for me in a couple ways. One has been, of course, the debate that has happened. The other is my family has been here for the better part of a week, young children. We had an opportunity today after the vote to walk around a little bit and look at all the statues and the monuments that pay tribute to our heritage as a people. It reminds us that we are not the first Americans who have been asked to choose what kind of country we want or what role of government we want in our country. It is a choice every generation before us has had to make.

Even in this Chamber, as I stand here, you can sit back and absorb the history of some of the extraordinary debates that took place on this very floor, debates that went to the core and to the heart of what kind of country we wanted to be moving forward. The voices of those ancients call to us even now to remind us that every generation of America has been called to choose clearly what kind of country they want moving forward. And that debate will continue. It will define the service of this Congress and for most of us who are here now. I pray we choose wisely. I look forward to the months that lie ahead that we will choose and make the right choice for our future and for our people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 6:00 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Minnesota being willing to stay in the chair for a few more minutes before I have to preside so I can take this time to express my concern about what has happened with the failure to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration.

The authorization for that administration has expired, and it has led to a partial shutdown of that agency and to 4,000 workers being placed on unpaid furlough. A number of those workers are from New Hampshire. While I know all of us here are glad we were able to come together to reach a bipartisan agreement on raising the debt ceiling and avoiding a financial crisis, I am deeply disappointed that bipartisanship has failed us when it comes to reauthorizing the FAA.

I understand the House may head home for recess today and for the rest of August, stranding 4,000 FAA workers and as many as 70,000—that is right, 70,000—airport construction workers around the country who are out of work until we can get an agreement. So let me review for a minute how we got here.

Since the FAA's authorization expired in 2007, Congress has passed 20 short-term extensions of the FAA. All of those bills, every single one of them, were clean bills intended to keep the FAA running while Congress decided how to deal with the complicated policy issues of a long-term reauthorization. Unfortunately, the 21st time around—that is the time that we are in—the House decided it was no longer important to keep the FAA operating, and 4,000 people are out of work while the House of Representatives may head home for recess.

I appreciate that there are some significant differences between the two long-term FAA authorization bills

passed by the House and the Senate, the most controversial of which centered around the ruling by the National Mediation Board on unionization rules. But that is why Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Ranking Member HUTCHISON appointed Members to a conference committee where the House and Senate could work out our policy differences. So far, the House has refused to appoint conferees. Instead, they have decided to stop negotiating and, unfortunately, to play politics with 4,000 FAA workers and their families.

Right now the FAA has been shut down for 11 days and as long as that shutdown continues, the government will continue to lose $200 million a week, about $30 million a day, that would pay for airport maintenance and safety and for the replacement of our country's outdated air traffic control system. If the shutdown continues through the August recess, we are going to lose over $1 billion in revenue that could be used to upgrade our air transportation system. That is waste of the worst kind, and it makes our deficit problems worse at a time when everybody says they are so focused on the deficits.

Every day the shutdown continues has a very real, very painful impact on people all around the country who have been furloughed. I hope the House, in leaving for recess, has left open the opportunity to continue to address this dispute and resolve it in a way that will bring everybody back to work.

The FAA has issued stop-work orders for 241 airport construction projects worth nearly $11 billion that support 70,000 jobs. Again, these are real people who are being forced to make real sacrifices.

In my State of New Hampshire, a $16 million project to rebuild the runway of Boire Field in Nashua will be delayed if we don't pass an extension. Boire Field is the busiest general aviation airport in New England, and breaking ground this fall on the runway reconstruction project would have created 50 jobs. Instead, because of this delay, construction likely won't begin until spring and those 50 people are going to have to wait, something that shouldn't have to happen. The tragedy is they won't have jobs, not because they don't have the skills or that the project isn't needed but because the House is playing politics with the FAA. Forty-two employees at the FAA's air traffic control center in Nashua have been furloughed and this shutdown is taking a terrible toll on them. I want to tell you about one, Steve Finnerty from Bedford.

I talked to Steve earlier today. He is a civil engineer and he has worked for the FAA for the last 15 years. He is the sole breadwinner for his family of five. He has a young daughter and a pair of 1-year-old twins who are struggling with medical issues. He has already lost nearly 2 weeks of pay, and he is not sure that he is going to get that pay back even when he does go back to work. He is concerned, understandably, about how he is going to pay his mortgage and his doctor bills and the grocery bills and all the other needs his family has. Now he is facing the possibility of an entire month without pay.

There are thousands of people all across the country who are stuck in the same circumstance who want to get back to work, who we need to get back to work. We need them to get back to work so they can pay their mortgages and their children's college tuitions and their medical bills. We need them to get back to work so they can continue to build a GPS-based air traffic control system like every other industrialized country has. We need to get this economy moving again. That means we need to be serious about our responsibilities here in Washington. Let's pass a clean extension of the FAA. Let's get these people back to work, and let's go about the business of rebuilding a modern air traffic control system like we should have in the United States.

I yield the floor, and I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant parliamentarian proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I ask consent to speak as in morning business.

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

RECOGNIZING THOM RUMBERGER

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I rise to recognize the important contributions of a special Floridian for his unrelenting determination to protect one of our Nation's unique natural resources; that is, the Florida Everglades. He is a prestigious attorney. He is a commanding litigator. This individual, Thom Rumberger, has dedicated much of his personal and professional life to advancing the restoration and protection of the river of grass. His brilliant, incisive mind, his creativity, and his fearlessness combine to make Thom one of Florida's most influential Everglades leaders.

He has been a man proud to serve his country and his community. It goes back to the time he interrupted his college career to volunteer for the Marines. He served in the Korean war. Over the course of his life, he has continued this service as a dedicated public servant, a respected judge, and a respected prosecutor.

In his family, he is a dedicated father and grandfather who obviously has always found great happiness with that ever-expanding family of his, and the relentless efforts he undertakes to preserve Florida's natural heritage is a legacy gift, certainly to his family and to his colleagues but to all us Floridians—indeed, to us as residents of planet Earth.

He served 2 years in the Marines, earned his degree with honors, a law degree, and was associate editor of the Florida Law Review. He became the youngest circuit judge serving in a district in central Florida. He was the Brevard County solicitor, he was special assistant State attorney, he was county attorney for Seminole County, he was Assistant to the Florida Governor, and he served as a member of the Florida Land Sales Board.

I knew Thom back in those early days in Melbourne and Brevard County as we were experiencing the explosive growth, at the time, of the Nation's attempt to catch up with the Soviet Union since they had surprised us by putting up Sputnik and then later beat us into orbit with Yuri Gagarin before we could get Alan Shepard into suborbit and then John Glenn into orbit.

Those were exciting times. I will never forget I heard Thom, as we were sitting around one day, saying I am impatient having to sleep because I am so excited about getting up in the morning and going out and doing all these things. Of course, I just listed all those important positions of public service.

Along the way, Thom became a good friend of another Brevard County man, George Barley. Actually, I think George was from Orange County. George was married to Mary. Both of them dedicated their lives to restoration of the Everglades. George and Mary established the Everglades Trust and the Everglades Foundation and then, when George died a very tragic death back in 1995, Thom joined with Mary to make sure George Barley's dream of a restored Everglades became a reality.

Thom was an active member of the Republican Party, but I can tell you that in the friendship between us, partisan membership did not mean anything. We had a personal friendship, and one could often see that as he engaged in public service, but that was especially so when it came to the preservation and the restoration of the Everglades. His success extends, other than his community and country service, to a career in private practice. He was one of the founding partners of Rumberger, Kirk & Caldwell, and under Thom's leadership the firm's modest beginnings were quickly surpassed as it moved to all kinds of new legal successes. Today, that firm includes 75 trial attorneys in 5 offices all across several southern States. Of course, he has been listed as one of Florida's superlawyers every year for the last several years.

Legend has it Thom Rumberger once convinced a Federal judge to allow a real automobile in the courtroom as

evidence. He convinced the judge to have a window in the courtroom enlarged—in a historic courthouse, nonetheless—to accommodate a crane that lifted the car right into the courtroom. He has been known throughout his life for his infectious sense of humor, often referred to—because he had so many different careers—somewhat derisively as a career chameleon. Thom worked his way all the way through college, all the way up to these present successes.

Let me tell you what he did to support himself and to pay for his college education. A lot of people do not remember Ross Allen's Reptile Institute in Ocala, at Silver Springs. Guess what the main attraction was: the eastern diamondback rattlesnake. Thom's job, at which he earned enough money to put himself through school, was to milk those rattlesnakes.

Clearly, that is a tourist attraction because that is a fascinating thing, to see that snake coiled up, ready to strike, and they stick a stick down there and pin his head and then reach down behind the head and pick him up and they have this 6-foot rattlesnake. But there is a purpose to this other than charming their guests. They squeeze behind that head and the mouth opens and those two fangs come out and they put those fangs down into a glass and they milk that rattlesnake. The poisonous venom that was then collected and stored becomes the basis for the anti-snake bite serum that has saved so many lives. I remember one time he actually went back after he had been judge and prosecutor and all these things. He told me he was invited to come back to the Ross Allen Reptile Institute. He said when he walked into that cage with all those rattlesnakes, the snakes looked so big. He didn't remember the snakes looking that big when he was a college kid earning his way through college. Thom promises that it was right there in that snakepit that he learned the skills of public speaking and working with the public because he had to explain how he was milking the rattlesnake to all of the guests who were there, and obviously he had their attention.

He even enjoyed a brief acting career as a stuntman for the movie ''The Creature of the Black Lagoon.'' Remember that one that scared the wits out of all of us when we were children, ''The Creature of the Black Lagoon''? He has had quite a few varieties in his life.

He has generously committed himself to public service. Beyond the positions I have already mentioned, he was appointed to Florida's Federal Judicial Advisory Commission and the Board of Supervisors of the Spaceport Florida Authority. Presently, he is chairman of the Everglades Trust. He has served as chairman of the Collins Center for Public Policy, which was named after one of our great Governors of Florida—former Governor, now deceased—Gov. Leroy Collins. He has been a member of the Board of Visitors of Florida State College of Law and Board of Trustees for the Law Center Association of the University of Florida. He has represented about every environmental organization, including Save the Manatee, the Everglades Trust, and Save Our Everglades. He has been the lead counsel for the Everglades Foundation well past two decades.

Notably, Thom was instrumental in the passage of two Everglades-related Florida constitutional amendments, the Federal Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, and in obtaining several billion dollars in funding for Everglades restoration. That has been one of my primary duties as the senior Senator from Florida, and I have worked with him over the years on this Everglades restoration.

He has been primarily responsible for Florida's acquisition of one of our natural resources, the 75,000-acre Babcock Ranch in the southwest part of Florida, which now provides necessary corridors for wildlife, especially the endangered Florida panther. In the late 1980s, Thom worked to implement some of the first manatee protection laws.

Throughout his four decades in public service, he has demonstrated the importance of looking out for the common good.

I just did an interview today in the aftermath of our vote on what started out to be highly contentious on what we were going to resolve in debt reduction and deficit reduction with the pending guillotine hanging over our head, the default that would occur at 12 tonight, which has now been averted. The reporter who was asking me the questions in the interview said: Well, why is it that everything is so contentious and people are all so wrapped up in themselves that they talk past each other and they are only looking out for their own interests and don't respect the other fellow's point of view?

Thom Rumberger represents that kind of person who always respected the other person's point of view. So when it was time to draw up the solution to whatever the problem was, then the parties could come together and find that consensus. That has been sorely lacking in Washington and around this country. We saw a shining little moment yesterday and today—yesterday in the House of Representatives with an overwhelming vote and today on the floor of the Senate with an overwhelming vote—to start the process of deficit reduction. It is folks such as Thom Rumberger whom we ought to be looking to in how they have demonstrated their community service instead of what we have seen play out over the last several months.

Thanks to the selfless commitment of folks such as Thom, America's Everglades will be restored for the benefit of future generations. It is not just Florida, it is America that owes Thom a great deal of gratitude. My bride of 40 years, Grace, who has known Thom almost as long as I have, joins me in thanking him and his wife Debbie for their many contributions to Florida's treasured landscapes.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER JANE LANHAM TAFOYA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to a young woman from Owensboro, KY, who lost her life while in service to her country. U.S. Navy LCDR Jane Lanham Tafoya was assigned to the Naval Branch Health Clinic in Manama, Bahrain, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. She died from non-combat related causes on September 19, 2006. She was 43 years old.

For her heroic service, Lieutenant Commander Tafoya received many awards, medals and decorations, including the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with Gold Star, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Star, the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Armed Forces Reserve Medal, and the Navy Pistol Shot Medal with Sharpshooter Device.

Lieutenant Commander Tafoya had served for 18 years in the Navy. Before her assignment in Bahrain she had served at the Naval Hospital and Naval Reserve Center in Philadelphia, the Bureau of Medicine here in Washington, DC, the Naval Hospital at Camp Lejeune, NC, aboard the U.S.S. Ronald Reagan, and at Navy Environmental Preventive Medicine Unit 2 in Norfolk, VA. In Bahrain she was working as an industrial hygienist.

Born in Daviess County, KY, Jane was a graduate of Owensboro Catholic High School, Murray State University and Temple University. Her mother, Avis Lanham, remembers Jane as a smart student who enjoyed learning, got all As in school, and loved to read. In high school Jane played softball and volleyball, and she was on the Murray State intramural bowling team.

Avis says that Jane loved to travel, and she loved being in the Navy. And Jane ''could always see the good in people,'' Avis says of her daughter. Whenever something negative was said about a person, Jane would just respond with, ''Well, nobody's perfect.''

We are thinking of Jane's loved ones today, including her husband John Tafoya; her daughters Rachel and Natalie Tafoya; her mother Avis Lanham; her brother and sister-in-law Brad and Kathy; her sister and brother-in-law

Phyllis and Kenny; and many other beloved family members and friends. Jane was preceded in death by her father Marvin Bill Lanham.

Today the Senate honors this loving wife, mother, and daughter for her long career of service. And we salute the sacrifice that LCDR Jane Lanham Tafoya made, half a world away from her native Owensboro home, on behalf of a very grateful Nation.

I yield the floor.

H.R. 2715

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues, Senators DURBIN and PRYOR, over the passage of H.R. 2715, a bill that passed on the House suspension calendar by a vote of 421–2 and the Senate by unanimous consent. Due to the fact that this bill bypassed regular order and failed to receive consideration in the Commerce Committee, I believe it is important to explain our intent in passing this bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I am frustrated that the Consumer Product Safety Commission has taken too long to promulgate rules required by the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, CPSIA, including the rules on third-party testing obligations and the component part testing rule. I did not oppose H.R. 2715, because it does not delay or impede the Commission's ability to implement those rules—although it may place some increased costs on the Commission due to actions required as a result of new CPSC mandates and authorities—and I urge the Commission to complete its work expeditiously.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I share the Senator's concerns about the CPSC's delay in promulgating its regulations in accordance with the mandates of CPSIA. While I sympathize with the CPSC over its resource constraints, the Commission must accelerate its efforts and complete the important regulations required under CPSIA. The provisions in section 2 of H.R. 2715 were not intended to delay or stop the Commission's current rulemaking under section 102 (d)(2) of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act to implement the critical provision related to the third-party testing of children's products. I fully expect the Commission to go forward with these important rulemakings with no disruption from the passage of this bill.

Given the limited resources of the Commission and recognizing the length of time it has taken to implement the provisions of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, it is intended that most of H.R. 2715's new mandates on the CPSC are not rulemakings. Some of the new authority, such as the functional purpose exemption and the authority to restrict the scope of the used products exemption, are subject to a notice and hearing requirement, but not to a rulemaking. Others, such as the creation of a new public registry for small batch manufacturers, can be implemented without notice and comment or even a hearing. As such, the Commission should act to effectuate the new mandates of this bill in a most expeditious manner.

Mr. PRYOR. I also share the Senator's view that nothing in H.R. 2715 is intended to delay the Commission's rulemaking with respect to third party testing and believe that Commission should conclude its testing rulemakings in the next 2 months. I supported H.R. 2715 because it made minor modifications to an important consumer product safety law and supported implementation of important aspect of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act such as the consumer product database. This bill will require the CPSC to extend the deadline for posting reports on defective products by 5 days if a business asserts that the information in the report is not accurate. However, this change does not alter the fact that the Commission still must post the report in the database after those 5 days even if it is still reviewing the merits of the complaint.

COTE D'IVOIRE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I spoke about the situation in Cote d'Ivoire just last Friday and pointed out that the person responsible for the chaos and killing—a rebel named Alassane Ouattara—met last Friday with President Obama in our Nation's White House. I said then and say now again that this was an unwise and grossly misguided decision by Obama. It is in fact an outrage that our President would welcome, with open arms, a potential war criminal who is responsible for the death of at least 3,000 people and displacement of half a million refugees in the African country of Cote d'Ivoire. Ouattara is an illegitimate usurper who has scandalized Cote d'Ivoire's electoral system, and unlawfully ousted the democratically elected incumbent President Laurent Gbagbo.

Now the Associated Press reports just yesterday that the violence in Cote d'Ivoire remains uncontrolled. The title of the AP story says is all. It reads: ''Warlords in Ivory Coast continue to reign, national reconciliation difficult 3 months later.''

The AP story highlights the just released Amnesty International report that I spoke about last week that pointed out that ''Ouattara's rebel Army continues to carry out violence and intimidation against ethnicities perceived as having supported President Gbagbo, and that almost 700,000 people remain in refugee camps for displaced people in the country's remote far west.''

The AP highlights the fact that although Ouattara is telling the world that he is seeking reconciliation; in fact Ouattara is allowing ''a pervading culture of criminality to continue.''

For example, in the financial capital of Abidjan, warlords have taken over parts of the city and death squads roam the streets looking for Gbagbo supporters. In addition, they are committing ''armed robberies, kidnapping and killings almost daily'' without any sign of ceasing. At the very least rebel leader Ouattara has no control over his rebel troops, which in the recent past committed atrocities and massacres on their march to Abidjan, and at the worst he is tacitly approving their actions by not intervening.

AP also reports that ''even the French Embassy sent a security message to its citizens warning that 'incidents of unequal gravity are still being reported.' '' And this is 3 months after the French themselves militarily overthrew President Gbagbo and installed Ouattara! The French are indeed now reaping what they have sown.

I point out again that Amnesty International alleges that these forces under Ouattara's command are continuing to engage in ''documented crimes under international law and human rights violations and abuses, including extrajudicial executions and other unlawful killings, rape and other sexual violence, torture, other ill-treatment and arbitrary arrest and detention; as well as the consequences of high levels of displacement, pervasive insecurity, and intentional destruction of homes and other buildings not justified by military necessity.''

The AP story summarizes the current situation by quoting the conclusion of the Amnesty International report which states that ''if [this situation is] not addressed quickly, the very serious consequences of the recent wave of insecurity and displacement will have further repercussions during the coming years and may fuel growing discontent and unrest, undermining efforts to promote reconciliation in a country torn apart by a decade of ethnic strife and violent conflict.''

This is my ninth time speaking on the Senate floor about the ongoing bloodbath of unspeakable acts of violence that are occurring in the once beautiful and prosperous country of Cote d'Ivoire. I again call for the intervention of the African Union—and not the French—to bring an end to the violence there, and call for new elections that will this time prevent the electoral fraud by Ouattara that allowed him to claim victory. I also call for the release of President Gbagbo and his wife Simone who are being held incommunicado by Ouattara, and either allow President Gbagbo to seek reelection for President or be allowed to go into exile. I have been in communication with a sub-Saharan African country which has agreed to grant asylum to the Gbagbos, and I call upon our State Department to facilitate such a move as it did for former Haitian President Duvalier in 1986.

The killing must stop. My recommendations are a path to stop the killing.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT LEX L. LEWIS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and heroic service of SSG Lex L. Lewis. Staff Sergeant Lewis died on July 15, 2011, when his dismounted patrol received small arms fire in Farah Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Lewis was serving in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. He was 40 years old.

Staff Sergeant Lewis was assigned to B Troop, 1st Squadron, 10th Cavalry Regiment, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Carson, CO. Friends and family members remember Staff Sergeant Lewis as a soldier who truly loved the Army. His mother Betty said, ''He just liked being a soldier . . . this is what he wanted to do.''

After graduating from high school, Staff Sergeant Lewis joined the Navy and was first stationed in Japan. He joined the Army later, in 1999, and bravely served three combat tours—two in Iraq and one in Afghanistan.

Staff Sergeant Lewis's commanders and company-mates alike remember him as a soldier who exemplifies the proudest traditions of the U.S. Army. They often came to him for counsel and advice during difficult times. His decorations include the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, two Army Commendation Medals, five Army Achievement Medals, and two Army Good Conduct 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.'' Staff Sergeant Lewis'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.

Mr. President, I stand with Colorado and people nationwide in profound gratitude for Staff Sergeant Lewis's tremendous sacrifice. He served proudly and honorably in Iraq and Afghanistan when his country needed him most. We are humbled by his service and his sacrifice. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending heartfelt sympathy and condolences to Staff Sergeant Lewis's family.

OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to submit for the RECORD a report on the activity of a congressional delegation I led to Belgrade, Serbia, from July 7 to 10, to represent the United States at the 20th Annual Session of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. I did so in my capacity as cochairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commission.

I was joined by our colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN, who also traveled to Sarajevo, Bosnia. Senator SHAHEEN is also a member of the Helsinki Commission. Our colleague from Alaska, Senator BEGICH, also participated on the delegation but was in Dubrovnik, Croatia, as part of the official U.S. Delegation to the 6th annual Croatian Summit of regional political leaders and European officials.

As the report details, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, or OSCE PA, has been an excellent opportunity for the U.S. Congress to engage our European friends and allies, and to make clear to less friendly countries that our ties to the continent will not be diminished.

U.S. engagement also provides a means for us to advance U.S. interests by encouraging Europe to focus more on policy issues of concern to us, from democratic shortcomings within Europe such as Belarus to the new challenges and opportunities coming from North Africa and the Middle East and other parts of the world.

The revised Senate schedule made us miss the opening days of the Belgrade meeting, but we made up for that with an intensive schedule from Friday to Sunday. All three U.S. resolutions and most of our delegation's amendments to resolutions were adopted, including a resolution I submitted on political transition in the Mediterranean region and amendments welcoming the arrest of at-large war crimes indictee Ratko Mladic and calling for Turkey to allow the Ecumenical Patriarch to open a theological school in Halki.

Senator SHAHEEN and I also used the opportunity of visiting Belgrade to encourage progress in Serbia's democratic transition. We met with President Tadic as well as the Speaker of the Serbian National Assembly, the chief negotiator in the technical talks on Kosovo-related issues, representatives of civil society, and of Serbia's Romani and Jewish communities.

We came away from our visit impressed with the progress Serbia has made thus far. While there are lingering manifestations of the extreme and violent nationalism from the Milosevic era of the 1990s, I believe there is a genuine commitment to overcome them. We should support those in and out of government in Serbia who turn this commitment into action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Report to which I referred.

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

REPORT OF THE US. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION (CODEL CARDIN) TO BELGRADE, SERBIA; SARAJEVO, BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA; AND DUBROVNIK, CROATIA JULY 7–10, 2011

Senator Benjamin L. Cardin (D–MD), Helsinki Commission Co-Chairman, and fellow Senator and Commissioner Jeanne Shaheen (D–NH) traveled to the 20th Annual Session of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Parliamentary Assembly (OSCE PA), held in Belgrade, Serbia, from July 6–10, 2011. The senators were able to do this despite a US. congressional schedule that precluded House Members from traveling to the meeting and curtailed Senate attendance to only three of the session's five days. Three resolutions and more than one dozen amendments to various resolutions initiated by the United States Delegation were nevertheless considered and passed by the Assembly. Senator Shaheen was also able to make a one-day visit to neighboring Bosnia-Herzegovina, and both Senators were able to link with their colleague, Senator Mark Begich (D–AK), attending the Croatian Summit of regional political leaders held in Dubrovnik, Croatia.

THE OSCE PA

The Parliamentary Assembly was created within the framework of the OSCE as an independent, consultative body consisting of 320 parliamentarians from the 56 participating States, stretching from Central Asia and Russia across Europe and including the United States and Canada. Annual Sessions are the chief venue for debating international issues and voting on a declaration addressing human rights, democratic development, rule-of-law, economic, environmental and security concerns among the participating States and the international community.

The Parliamentary Assembly adopts its declaration by majority voting for resolutions coming from three committees dealing with political/security, economic/environmental and democracy/human rights issues respectively, in addition to other resolutions introduced by delegations to supplement these texts. Following the amendment of these resolutions also by majority voting, this generally allows for considerable verbiage to be accepted each year but also for franker language addressing controversial or new issues to be included than the OSCE itself can achieve on the basis of consensus among the 56 participating States. The heavy focus of OSCE diplomats on issues like trafficking in persons and combating intolerance in society is rooted in initiatives originally undertaken by the parliamentarians in the Assembly.

Having the largest delegation with 17 members, the United States historically has played a key role in OSCE PA proceedings, and there has been robust congressional participation since the Assembly's inception two decades ago. This engagement is reassuring to friends and allies in Europe while ensuring that issues of interest or concern to U.S. foreign policy are raised and discussed. In addition to representing the United States as delegates, members of the Helsinki Commission have served as OSCE PA special representatives on specific issues of concern, committee officers, vice presidents and the Assembly president.

THE TWENTIETH ANNUAL SESSION

This year's Annual Session was hosted by the National Assembly of Serbia and held in Belgrade's Sava Center, the 1977–78 venue for the first follow-up meeting of the diplomatic process that was initiated by the 1975 signing of the Helsinki Final Act and is the OSCE today. During various interventions at the session, note was made not only of the vast changes in Europe since that time but also in Serbia, which was then a constituent republic of the former Yugoslavia but is today an independent state making progress in democratic development after overcoming more than a decade of authoritarian rule and extreme nationalist sentiment.

A meeting of the Standing Committee—composed of OSCE PA officers plus the heads of all delegations—met prior to the opening of the Annual Session. Chaired by OSCE PA President Petros Efthymiou of Greece, the committee heard numerous reports on the activities of the past year, endorsed a budget that has remained frozen for a fourth consecutive fiscal year, and approved for consideration at the Annual Session 25 of the 26

items introduced by various delegations to supplement the committee resolutions. Only an Italian draft on Asbestos Contamination failed to achieve a 2/3 vote approving its consideration.

With approximately 230 parliamentarians in attendance, the opening plenary of the Annual Session featured a welcome by Serbian Prime Minister Mirko Cvetkovic and National Assembly Speaker Slavica Djukic-Dejanovic and reports by the OSCE Chair-in Office, Lithuanian Foreign Minister Audronius Ažubalis, and the newly appointed OSCE Secretary General, Lamberto Zannier of Italy. Zannier welcomed the OSCE PA's interest in fostering closer cooperation with the OSCE Permanent Council in Vienna and committed himself to facilitating greater PA engagement through his leadership of the OSCE Secretariat and coordination with its institutions.

In his own remarks, PA President Efthymiou noted the ''spirit of Helsinki'' which developed at the Belgrade meeting more than three decades ago and lamented the crisis in which the OSCE finds itself today. He called for significant changes to the operations of the Vienna-based organization to make it more effective and relevant in addressing the political and security issues of today. The theme for the Annual Session—Strengthening the OSCE'S Effectiveness and Efficiency, a New Start after the Astana Summit—was chosen to address this matter in light of last December's summit meeting in Astana, Kazakhstan, which had heightened the political attention paid to the OSCE's work.

The following three days were devoted to committee consideration and amendment of the three resolutions and 21 supplementary items, and plenary consideration of the four additional supplementary items. Two additional resolutions were defeated in the process. The first was another initiative of an Italian delegate focusing on crimes causing serious social alarm, which lacked significant support. The second originated with the Belgian delegation on enlarging the OSCE's Mediterranean Partners for Cooperation to include Lebanon and the Palestinian National Authority (PNA). The latter was lost in a close vote after being heavily debated by those who advocate wider engagement in the long-term and those who questioned the timing of taking such an initiative. A number of parliamentarians felt it inappropriate for the OSCE to solicit interest by the Lebanese Government and the PNA while they are both under leadership that does not embrace OSCE principles. Some of the resolutions which did pass examined the deplorable human rights situation in Belarus, the unresolved conflict in Moldova, gender issues in the OSCE and the participating States, national minority concerns including the plight of Roma, cyber security, as well as combating violent extremism, transnational organized crime, and human trafficking for labor and organs.

U.S. INITIATIVES IN BELGRADE

Despite its small size, the U.S. Delegation remained very active in the deliberations, introducing three resolutions of its own, working closely with the delegation of the Netherlands on a fourth, and suggesting over a dozen amendments to various texts. All four of these resolutions were adopted, as were all but two of the U.S. amendments.

Co-Chairman Cardin's major initiative was a resolution on Mediterranean Political Transition, which directs the OSCE and its participating States to make their expertise in building democratic institutions available to Mediterranean Partner States: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Morocco and Tunisia. The resolution specifically encouraged the interim governments of Egypt and Tunisia to make a formal request for OSCE support following their consultations with the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR). It also called for an OSCE civil society forum to be hosted by a Mediterranean Partner State later this year. The Senator collaborated with the head of the Spanish delegation on numerous additional amendments to demonstrate the real priority this should be for the organization, and the initiative received widespread praise among the delegates. ''We have all been inspired by the movements for freedom and change sweeping across the Middle East and North Africa,'' Senator Cardin noted while introducing the resolution, ''and we support the citizens of the countries in the region as they demand respect for their basic human rights, economic opportunity, and open and responsive government . . . The OSCE and our Parliamentary Assembly have substantial capacity to assist our Mediterranean Partners . . . We also must condemn in the strongest terms the unbridled violence unleashed by the governments of Libya and Syria against their own citizens.''

Though not in attendance, Commission Chairman Christopher H. Smith (R–NJ) introduced two resolutions for the Assembly's consideration that also were adopted. The first dealt with Combating Labor Trafficking in Supply Chains, urging governments to ensure that all goods they procure are free from raw materials and finished products produced by trafficked labor and to press corporations to independently verify that their supply chains are free of exploitation. The resolution also sought to raise consumer awareness about industries more likely to use trafficked labor. Two strengthening amendments authored by Co-Chairman Cardin were adopted. The amendments welcomed a recent OSCE meeting on the issue and urged diplomats to pass a declaration on the matter during a meeting of OSCE foreign ministers later this year.

The second Smith Resolution focused on International Parental Child Abductions and passed without amendment. Its core focus was to press OSCE States to become parties to the 1983 Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and to implement its provisions. The resolution also urged that parental child abduction be considered at the 2011 OSCE Ministerial Council in Vilnius this December.

Ranking House Commissioner Alcee L. Hastings (D–FL), who serves as the Parliamentary Assembly's Special Representative on Mediterranean Affairs, collaborated with OSCE PA Special Representative on Migration Kathleen Ferrier of the Netherlands on countering racism and xenophobia in Europe with measures to foster inclusion of affected communities. Noting that 2011 has been designated the International Year for People of African Descent, the resolution included a focus on racial bias against citizens and migrants of African descent, and called for specific measures to be taken by OSCE institutions to address reported increases of racial and ethnic discrimination in the OSCE region. The resolution also emphasized the importance of integrating ethnic minorities into economic and political life through capacity building partnerships between the public and private sector. The resolution passed with widespread support.

Supported by Senator Shaheen, Co-Chairman Cardin covered several smaller and more detailed issues with amendments, such as one welcoming the arrest in Serbia of at-large war crimes indictee Ratko Mladic, another urging Turkey to allow the reopening of the Ecumenical Orthodox Patriarchate's Theological School of Halki without condition or further delay, and another supporting greater transparency in the energy sector. Working with a German delegate, Senator Cardin also succeeded in removing language from a Serbian resolution which politicized the issue of investigating an organ-trafficking case that originated in neighboring Kosovo during the 1999 conflict. Serbian officials lobbied the PA Assembly directly and through the media to accept the resolution's call for the United Nations to conduct the investigation, contrary to the efforts being undertaken by the U.S. and EU to proceed through an already established EU rule-of-law mission. The U.S.-supported amendment was successful in designating the EU entity and the U.N. Mission in Kosovo as responsible for the investigation. There was insufficient support, however, for a U.S. amendment welcoming EU efforts thus far.

During the course of debate, Co-Chairman Cardin also suggested granting Mediterranean Partner countries a greater ability to participate in OSCE PA sessions through changes to Assembly rules. He also highlighted U.S. policy on cyber security in the vigorous debate of a resolution which in some respects diverged from the U.S. approach. In his capacity as an OSCE Vice President, the Senator, as an urgent matter, also supported consideration of a resolution focused on the lack of transparency in the OSCE during the recent selection of a new Secretary General. Language on this matter was also included in the final declaration.

SELECTING THE OSCE PA LEADERSHIP FOR THE COMING YEAR

In addition to hearing closing comments from Serbian Foreign Minister Vuk Jeremic and adopting the final declaration, the parliamentarians attending the Annual Session voted for contested seats in the Assembly's leadership. President Efthymiou was unopposed, as was Treasurer Roberto Battelli of Slovenia, and both were re-elected by acclamation. In a race among six candidates for three of the nine Vice President positions, Wolfgang Grossruck of Austria was re-elected, with Walburga Habsburg-Douglas of Sweden and Tonino Picula of Croatia elected for the first time. Senator Cardin has one additional year in his term as Vice President and is not eligible for another re-election.

Committee officers saw more dramatic changes, with only one officer retaining his position as committee chair. Others moved to higher positions within the committees or ran for the three Vice President seats. Unfortunately for the U.S. Delegation, Representative Robert B. Aderholt (R–AL), a Helsinki Commissioner, did not win his second re-election bid as a committee Vice Chair due to his inability to be in Belgrade. He was unsuccessful in fighting off a challenge by a French delegate who entered the race at the last minute.

SIDE EVENTS IN BELGRADE

In addition to the formal proceedings, OSCE PA meetings often offer the possibility for delegations to sponsor side-events on issues needing additional attention. A luncheon focusing on gender issues in the OSCE is held annually, including in Belgrade. Nongovernmental organizations may also hold their own events and invite the delegates to participate. In Belgrade, a coalition held a session on continued use of torture in OSCE States, with a focus particularly on the situation in Kyrgyzstan following the ethnic violence in 2009. Delegation-sponsored events in Belgrade included one on human rights abuses in Belarus, one on cases of alleged trafficking in human organs in Kosovo and elsewhere, and one featuring a film on two Jewish sisters in Serbia who escaped the Holocaust during World War II. With Senator Shaheen and U.S. Ambassador to Serbia Mary Burce Warlick in attendance, Senator

Cardin participated in the latter event with opening comments on the work of the Vienna-based organization Centropa, which prepared the -film. Delegation staff attended most of the other side events as well.

BILATERAL MEETINGS WITH SERBIA AND A SIDE-TRIP TO BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

While the delegation travelled to Belgrade principally to represent the United States at the OSCE PA Annual Session, the Helsinki Commission leadership regularly uses this travel to discuss bilateral issues with the host country and to visit nearby countries of concern. In Serbia, the delegation met with President Boris Tadic, National Assembly Speaker Slavica Djukic-Dejanovic, and chief negotiator for technical talks on Kosovo Boris Stefanovic. Ambassador Warlick briefed the Senators and attended the meetings.

Evident in the bilateral meetings was the progress Serbia was making in its internal political transition and attainment of European integration. Serbian officials made clear they were committed to overcoming the nationalist legacy of the Milosevic era, strengthening Serbia's democratic institutions and encouraging greater respect for the rule of law. While there are clear differences between the United States and Serbia regarding Kosovo, the officials asked for an expression of congressional support for agreements being reached in technical talks between Belgrade and Pristina that were of direct benefit to the people and brought an increased sense of regional stability, as well. They also stressed their support for Bosnia-Herzegovina's unity and territorial integrity. The U.S. Delegation welcomed Serbia's approach and encouraged Belgrade to curtail the activity of parallel Serbian institutions in northern Kosovo which are currently the greatest source of instability in the region. The message was amplified throughout the region by a VOA interview conducted with Senator Cardin.

The U.S. Delegation also met with representatives of Serbia's civil society and Romani communities. The Senators expressed support for civil society efforts to promote greater tolerance in society, to monitor the extent to which laws and policies adopted were actually implemented, and to tackle issues—such as corruption—that impede prosperity. They learned that the Romani communities in Serbia, similar to those in other countries, have difficulties in obtaining adequate housing, education for their children and personal documentation necessary to exercise their rights and privileges as citizens. In a meeting with Serbia's Chief Rabbi, which also included the President of the Jewish Federation of Serbia, the discussion focused on religious tolerance in the region, cooperation with the other religious groups in Belgrade, and property restitution legislation pending in the Serbian parliament.

On July 9, Senator Shaheen left the proceedings of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly to make a one-day visit to neighboring Bosnia-Herzegovina, where ethnically based political differences continue to hamper government formation and the political and economic reforms necessary for progress on European integration. Visiting two days prior to the 16th anniversary of the genocide at Srebrenica, the Senator met with Kathryne Bomberger of the International Commission on Missing Persons and stood next to Bosniak member of the collective state presidency Bakir Izetbegovic and U.S. Ambassador to Bosnia-Herzegovina Patrick S. Moon to pay her respects as the procession of 613 victims to be buried during the July 11 Srebrenica memorial service passed by. She expressed U.S. condolences to the families of those mourning in a media interview that received wide and favorable coverage.

Senator Shaheen also met with Social Democratic Party Chairman Zlatko Lagumdzija and several officials at the entity and local levels of government to discuss ways to overcome the country's current political impasse and to find a solution in particular on forming a state-level coalition government. She also met with several women entrepreneurs and leaders of nongovernmental organizations to discuss their particular concerns and ability to have a positive impact in an ethnically divided Bosnian society. From the international presence, the Senator met with Head of the OSCE Mission Gary Robbins and the Deputy High Representative Roderick Moore, both from the United States. Senator Shaheen noted the continued commitment of the United States to political stability in Bosnia-Herzegovina and its progress toward increasing integration into European institutions, indicating that that engagement was supported both by the Administration and Congress. In a media interview, she stressed that the political and civil society leaders of Bosnia-Herzegovina need to work together and across ethnic lines if the country is to accede to the European Union or receive IMF funding.

THE CROATIAN SUMMIT

At the conclusion of the OSCE PA Annual Session and prior to their return to Washington, Senators Cardin and Shaheen joined their colleague, Senator Begich, who was attending the 6th Croatian Summit of regional political leaders and European officials in Dubrovnik, Croatia, as part of the official U.S. Delegation led by Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs William Burns. In his statement to the summit and during meetings with various leaders, particularly with Croatian officials, Senator Begich expressed his appreciation of Croatia's performance as a NATO ally, including its support for NATO operations in Afghanistan, and encouraged Croatia to support neighboring Bosnia's stability and prosperity. He also suggested ways Croatia could enhance its business and investment climate.

CONCLUSION

During the course of three days, the delegation led by Senator Cardin was able to advance U.S. objectives at the multilateral OSCE PA as well as the U.S. bilateral agenda with Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia. The curtailed schedule precluded additional travel, including a planned visit to Albania, but the Senators compensated with a level of activity that indicated their commitment as well as that of the U.S. Congress and the United States as a whole, to the countries of the Western Balkans and to European security and cooperation through the OSCE.

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly continues to serve not only as a venue for demonstrating the U.S. commitment to Europe, but for advancing new ideas and issues that parliamentarians can press their diplomatic counterparts in the OSCE to incorporate into the organization's work. In the past, Parliamentary Assembly efforts were responsible for the OSCE undertaking action to combat human trafficking and counter anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance that help define the OSCE today. With proper follow-up in capitals and at the OSCE in Vienna, the recommendations adopted in the Belgrade Declaration will hopefully provide the needed impetus to activity that will keep the OSCE effective and relevant.

Meeting in Belgrade gave a greater-than-usual regional dimension to this year's U.S. Delegation to the OSCE PA Annual Session, the immediately preceding Annual Sessions having been held in Oslo, Norway, and Vilnius, Lithuania. Ethnic tensions and suspicions from a decade of wars in the Western Balkans are still strong factors in the bilateral relations of the countries visited by the congressional delegation, and their economic growth has been negatively affected not only by the larger international crisis but by poor economic governance as well. At a time of both promise and uncertainty, the reassurance of continued U.S. engagement was welcomed by government officials, civil society representatives and by the media that extensively covered the delegation's activities.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would like to briefly address S. 1458, the intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2012, which has now been reported by the Select Committee on Intelligence. I know that the chair and vice chair of the committee, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator CHAMBLISS, along with their respective staff, have worked hard on this bill, and I support nearly every provision in it. However, I strongly disagree with the decision to include a 3-year extension of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 in this bill, and it is my intention to object to any request to pass this bill by unanimous consent. Consistent with my own policy and Senate rules, I am announcing my intention to object by placing a notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As most of my colleagues remember, Congress passed the FISA Amendments Act in 2008 in an effort to give the government new authorities to conduct surveillance of foreigners outside the United States. The bill contained an expiration date of December 2012, and the purpose of this expiration date was to force Members of Congress to come back in a few years and examine whether these new authorities had been interpreted and implemented as intended.

I believe that Congress has not yet adequately examined this issue and that there are important questions that need to be answered before the FISA Amendments Act is given a long-term extension.

The central section of the FISA Amendments Act, the part that is now section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act itself, specifically stated that it was intended to address foreigners outside the United States, and it even required the Attorney General to develop procedures designed to make sure that any individuals targeted with this new authority are believed to be outside the United States. So one of the central questions that Congress needs to ask is, Are these procedures working as intended? Are they keeping the communications of law-abiding Americans from being swept up under this authority that was designed to apply to foreigners?

I wanted to know the answer to this question, so Senator UDALL of Colorado and I wrote to the Director of National Intelligence if it was possible to count or estimate the number of people inside

the United States whose communications had been reviewed under section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act. The response we got was prompt and candid. The response said ''it is not reasonably possible to identify the number of people located in the United States whose communications may have been reviewed under the authority'' of the FISA Amendments Act.

I should be clear that I do not plan to accept this response as a final answer. I understand that it may be difficult to come up with an exact count of the number of people in the United States whose communications have been reviewed, but I believe Congress at least needs to obtain an estimate of this number so that people can understand the actual impact of the FISA Amendments Act on the privacy of law-abiding Americans.

During the markup of the intelligence authorization bill, Senator UDALL of Colorado and I proposed an amendment that would have directed the inspector general of the Department of Justice to review the implementation of the FISA Amendments Act and attempt to estimate how many people inside the United States have had their communications reviewed under this law since it was passed 3 years ago. Our amendment also would have directed the inspector general to examine other important aspects of the FISA Amendments Act, including the problem of recurring compliance violations, and report back to Congress within 1 year.

I regret that the amendment that Senator UDALL of Colorado and I offered was not adopted, but I obviously plan to keep trying to get more information about the effects of this law. I hope that I will find out that no law-abiding Americans, or at least very few, have had their communications reviewed by government agencies as a result of this law, but I believe that I have a responsibility to get concrete facts rather than just hope that this is not the case. And I believe that it would be not be responsible for the Senate to pass a multiyear extension of the FISA Amendments Act until I and others who have concerns have had our questions answered.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to amend this bill, and I am hopeful that they will be willing to modify it to address the concerns I have raised. In the meantime, I should be clear that it is my intention to object to any request to pass the current version of S. 1458 by unanimous consent.

COMBATTING ILLEGAL GUN TRAFFICKING

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I speak today in support of a new Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, ATF, rule requiring federally licensed firearm dealers in four Southwest border States to report the sale of multiple semi-automatic assault rifles to the same purchaser. This narrowly tailored reporting requirement, similar to one already in place for multiple handgun sales, will provide ATF with an important tool to combat straw purchases and the illegal trafficking of firearms, including the supply of weapons to drug cartels in Mexico.

Under the rule, federally licensed dealers in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas must report to ATF the sale of multiple semi-automatic rifles that have a caliber greater than .22 and accept detachable magazines to the same person within 5 consecutive business days. Weapons covered by the rule include AR–15s and AK–47s, military-style assault rifles favored by Mexican drug gangs. The rule focuses on sales in these four border states because they are the source of 75 percent of the firearms recovered and traced in drug-related crimes in Mexico, according to an analysis of Department of Justice statistics by the organization Mayors Against Illegal Guns. This rule allows ATF to collect information on guns that are frequently trafficked and used in crimes, improving in the Bureau's tracing efforts. Among other things, gun trace information can be used to identify potential trafficking networks and to link a suspect to a firearm in a criminal investigation.

Unfortunately, there are some who want to block ATF's ability to require this information, effectively hindering its efforts to combat gun trafficking and reduce violence along the U.S.-Mexico border. The National Rifle Association and some Members of Congress have claimed that ATF does not have the authority to implement the rule and that the rule would cause an unmanageable burden on law-abiding gun dealers. Both of these claims are false. The Firearm Owners' Protection Act of 1986, Public Law 99–308, 18 U.S.C. §923 (g)(5)(A), explicitly states that each Federal firearm licensee shall, when requested by ATF, submit to the ATF any information required to be kept by that law, like the name and address of a purchaser and a firearm's serial number, or such lesser information as ATF may request. Information on the sale of multiple semi-automatic rifles is part of the record which firearm dealers are required to maintain.

The claim that ATF's new rule will unfairly burden firearm dealers is also unfounded. ATF estimates that completing the form to report multiple rifle sales will take 12 minutes for gun dealers, and substantially less time for those with computerized sales systems. I cannot imagine that the overwhelming majority of Federal firearm licensees who are law-abiding will take offense to 12 minutes of work in the name of combating illegal trafficking and preventing violence.

The mandatory reporting of multiple sales of semi-automatic rifles to the same person is a measured, common sense step to help combat illegal firearm trafficking. The terrible drug cartel-related violence plaguing Mexico and spilling north of the border into the United States continues to be fueled by weapons illegally trafficked from the American Southwest. Again, I support ATF's new rule, and I urge my colleagues in Congress to oppose any legislative efforts to block ATF's ability to carry it out.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JAMES E. CARTWRIGHT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to GEN James E. Cartwright, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who will retire tomorrow after 40 years of distinguished service to his country.

General Cartwright is one of America's most respected four-star generals. His leadership and dedication to the security of this country will be sorely missed and I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

On a personal note, I will miss the detailed briefings, insightful discussions, and honest assessments that I have come to expect from General Cartwright.

Simply put, he has had a notable record of achievement throughout his career.

As head of the U.S. Strategic Command, STRATCOM, General Cartwright led the effort to develop new strategies to tackle cyber, nuclear proliferation, space, and missile defense issues.

He transformed Strategic Command from an organization largely dominated by its mission with respect to nuclear weapons and nuclear doctrine to being the true center in the U.S. military for all strategic issues.

Of special note was General Cartwright's interest and action on cybersecurity and the use of cyberspace. He saw this as a major emerging threat and responsibility of the Department, and put STRATCOM on a footing to deal with cyber as a major strategic issue.

He distinguished himself as one of those special leaders who is able to foresee and understand the constantly evolving national security environment rather than getting stuck in the old ways of seeing the world and doing things.

Based on his notable record of service, on June 28, 2007, President Bush nominated General Cartwright to succeed ADM Edmund Giambastiani as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Cartwright was confirmed by the full Senate on August 3, 2007 and was sworn in on August 31 as the eighth Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Recognizing his exceptional leadership, General Cartwright was confirmed for a second term on July 31, 2009.

He has, not surprisingly, used his capacity as the second most senior military officer in the Pentagon to make the Armed Forces a more strategic and more nimble military.

As the Vice Chairman, General Cartwright has helped guide the United States through many pivotal moments in our history: notably, the end of the military mission in Iraq, the implementation of a new strategy for the war in Afghanistan, and securing ratification of the New START agreement with Russia which will reduce the number of deployed strategic nuclear warheads by 30 percent.

I spoke with General Cartwright many times over the course of the treaty negotiations, and during the Senate's debate that ultimately led to ratification and signing New START.

He never failed to provide me with his frank and honest assessment and I greatly appreciated his clear and persuasive support for the treaty.

He recognized, as I do, that if we are to convince other nations to forgo acquiring nuclear weapons, it is imperative for the two nations that possess more than 90 percent of these weapons to take meaningful steps to reduce our stockpiles.

General Cartwright knows that lowering the number of nuclear weapons in the world and stopping their spread will enhance our national security, not diminish it. And we will still maintain a robust arsenal for our defense.

As he stated:

> I think we have more than enough capacity and capability for any threat that we see today or that might emerge in the foreseeable future.

General Cartwright's commitment to providing his honest and blunt assessments go beyond nuclear forces and extend to all security threats facing our nation, and the best way to prepare and respond to them, even when it was not popular to do so.

In his recent book, ''Obama's Wars,'' Bob Woodward describes General Cartwright as committed to providing the President his candid advice. Woodward quotes General Cartwright as saying ''I'm just not in the business of withholding options. I have an oath, and when asked for advice I'm going to provide it.''

He certainly has come a long way.

General Cartwright grew up in Rockford, IL, and joined the Marine Corps in 1971.

After numerous operational assignments as both a naval flight officer and naval aviator, the pinnacle of his Marine Corps operational aviation career came as the Commanding General of First Marine Aircraft Wing in Okinawa, Japan, from 2000 to 2002.

After a tour with the Joint Staff, in 2004, General Cartwright became the first Marine Corps general to lead the United States Strategic Command, STRATCOM.

As always, the security and defense of our Nation has been his top priority. That, along with his commitment to the active, guard, and reserve members of the Armed Forces and their families, is probably his greatest attribute and lasting impact.

I wish General Cartwright all the best as he retires from 40 years of service to his country and, on behalf of the people of California and all Americans, I offer him my most sincere and heartfelt thanks and gratitude.

COLD REGIONS RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING LABORATORY

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Research and Development Center's Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, CRREL. For half of a century, the men and women at CRREL have provided outstanding service to our military, our Nation, and our friends and allies around the world by advancing science and engineering and applying these disciplines to complex environments, materials, and processes in all seasons and climates.

CRREL's mission dates back to 1867, when the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers first began exploration and development of the newly acquired Alaskan territory. Formally established in 1961 under Army General Order No. 3, CRREL merged the Snow, Ice and Permafrost Research Establishment with the Arctic Construction and Frost Effects Laboratories, and continues to serve as one of seven laboratories under the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers' Engineer Research and Development Center, ERDC.

To complement its dedicated staff, CRREL operates some of the most advanced and unique research facilities in the world. At its headquarters in Hanover, NH, my home State, CRREL operates the 73,000 square foot Ice Engineering Facility, the 27,000 square foot Frost Effects Research Facility, as well as 24 separate low-temperature research cold rooms, capable of reaching temperatures down to −35°C. Other CRREL facilities include the Corps of Engineers' Remote Sensing/Geographic Information Systems Center of Expertise, the Cold Regions Science and Technology Information Analysis Center, as well as a permafrost research tunnel and 133 acre permafrost research center, both located in Alaska.

As part of the ERDC, CRREL's distinguished service record includes being recognized as the Army's top research and development laboratory 5 of the last 8 years and the last 3 consecutive years, a feat unmatched by any other Army laboratory. CRREL's scientists, engineers and staff continue the critical research that ensures that the men and women of our Armed Forces are the most capable and well prepared in the world.

I along with the entire State of New Hampshire would like to congratulate and honor the scientists, engineers and staff of CRREL for their honorable service to the Army, our Nation and our State. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating CRREL's 50 years of success and wishing them well as they work toward another 50 years of innovation and service.

VIOLATIONS DURING THE SRI LANKAN CIVIL WAR

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, this past spring marked the 2-year anniversary of the end of Sri Lanka's civil war. After more than two decades of fighting and estimated losses of far too many innocent people, Sri Lankans now seek to build a peaceful future from their recent violent past. The task will not be easy. Infrastructure must be rebuilt. Good governance must be established. Education, health care, and a thriving economy must be available for millions of citizens. And so, too, must there be accountability and investigation into alleged violations and abuses of international human rights.

From July 1983 until May 2009, Sri Lanka's civil war claimed the lives of innocent civilians including children and women, seniors and students, many of whom may have fallen victim to violations of international human rights and humanitarian laws. The families of these victims deserve to know the truth about their loved ones' deaths. They need to know that those responsible for the atrocities and violations of basic human rights will be held accountable. This is the only way Sri Lanka can come to grips with its past as it moves forward toward its future.

We have seen how accountability can lead to reconciliation for societies emerging from violent civil strife. South Africa and Northern Ireland are just two recent examples.

The Report of the United Nations Secretary-General's Panel of Experts on Accountability In Sri Lanka, released on March 31, 2011, found ''credible allegations, which if proven, indicate that a wide range of serious violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law was committed both by the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), some of which would amount to war crimes against humanity.''

This report further states that ''the conduct of the war represented a grave assault on the entire regime of international law designed to protect individual dignity during both war and peace.''

Under international law, parties responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian or human rights law must be held accountable.

In order to ensure that the Sri Lankan people receive the truth, an independent international inquiry must be established to investigate the credible reports of human rights abuses and humanitarian law violations by the LTTE and the Government of Sri Lanka.

This position is shared by Amnesty International, and other international human rights organizations; the European Union; and the panel of experts who authored the U.N.'s Report on Accountability in Sri Lanka.

Ignoring and denying abuse and accountability delays the progress of nation building and the creation of the stable, multiethnic democracy it seeks.

A truly independent international investigation with credible accountability will give Sri Lanka the ability to reconcile its past and build a peaceful future. The people of Sri Lanka deserve to know the truth.

TRIBUTE TO HARRIET HAGEMAN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is fitting that Harriet Hageman will be inducted into the 2011 Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. Harriet is known across Wyoming and across our Nation as a stalwart promoter and defender of agriculture. With this honor, she is following in the footsteps of her father Jim Hageman, who was previously inducted in the Agriculture Hall of fame in 2002.

Harriet comes from a long history of agricultural producers. Her great grandfather homesteaded in Wyoming in 1879 and her parents bought their first ranch near Fort Laramie in 1961. Harriet grew up on the family's cattle ranches in the Fort Laramie area. Rather than pursuing a career in agriculture, she earned a law degree from the University of Wyoming. Yet she did not stray from the agriculture industry. Much of her legal practice has been focused on protecting agriculture's land, water, and natural resources. She uses her Ag background coupled with her fine mind to effectively argue on behalf of Wyoming's ranchers and farmers in courtrooms at all levels of the judiciary.

A few of her many accomplishments should be noted. Harriet was the lead attorney for the State of Wyoming in protecting its share of the North Platte River. She fought the USDA to protect Wyoming's access to national forest lands. She successfully defended Wyoming's Open Range Law before the Wyoming Supreme Court. Her clients include ranchers, farmers, irrigation districts and grazing permitees. Harriet represents them with a passion that can only come from love of agriculture.

I have had the honor of working with Harriet Hageman and have benefitted from her wisdom. I would ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Harriet on this well-deserved honor.

TRIBUTE TO NIELS HANSEN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, at Wyoming's State Fair, I will have the honor of inducting Niels Hansen into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

Forty-eight percent of Wyoming's 97,100 square miles are managed by the Federal Government. Often, a Wyoming ranch will consist of a checkerboard of public and private lands. Running a profitable ranch, while negotiating various Federal and State regulations, is a challenge. However, Niels Hansen has done just that operating the PH Livestock Company. Niels is known as the public lands ranching leader of Wyoming. He has dedicated himself to building relationships with Federal land managers. He creates partnerships and opens lines of communication with fellow ranchers and government agencies. According to my friend, Wyoming Stock Growers Association vice president Jim Magana, Niels is highly recognized for his relentless efforts to maintain sustainable public land ranching.

Niels' efforts not only benefit his four-generation Wyoming ranch, he is also an asset to agriculturalists across Wyoming. He has worked closely with the Bureau of Land Management's, BLM, field office range staff and has been a State leader on agreements in conjunction with the BLM, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department, and the Wyoming State Grazing Board. Realizing that energy is the backbone of Wyoming's economy, Neils has brought oil and gas developers to the table.

Anna Helm, Niels' sister and ranch partner, said, ''Many ranchers have come to depend upon his insightful wisdom, understanding of the issues and willing leadership to help them through difficult times of their own.''

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Niels Hansen, the 2011 inductee into the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame. Wyoming lands—both public and private—are better because of his service.

NIOBRARA COUNTY, WYOMING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Centennial of Niobrara County, WY.

The residents of Niobrara County are fortunate to live in such a timeless and scenic place. Nearly 2,500 residents live in the communities of Lusk, Manville, Lance Creek, and Van Tassel. Its many natural wonders that fill the landscape make Niobrara one of the top places to visit in the State. Part of the county includes land set aside and known as the Thunder Basin National Grasslands. This area provides a valuable habitat for Wyoming's wildlife and numerous recreation opportunities for its residents. Two rivers, the Cheyenne and the Niobrara, run through the county and can be credited for creating rich, fertile soil in the area.

Although Niobrara County is one of the smallest counties in the State, it certainly has one of the most fascinating histories. The county boasts a wide array of prehistoric dinosaur fossils at its premier Spanish Diggings site. Several rare artifacts have been found and are displayed in national exhibits. The region also saw heavy traffic from Native Americans who used the grasslands as prime hunting and camping areas. Members of the Lakota Sioux, the Cheyenne, and the Kiowa tribes settled in the area many years ago.

With the great westward expansion came the greater urbanization of the West. Niobrara County was not immune from such development—instead, it embraced the changes. The grassland area of the county became a popular area for fur traders, homesteaders, and other emigrants caught in the throes of gold rush excitement. One popular stage stop, Running Water, was located along the banks of the Niobrara River and was used by several travelers as a spot to rest and refuel. The Cheyenne-Deadwood Stage Route, which traveled the length of the county, provided important transport of freight, gold, and passengers. This important route and the additional stage lines which passed through were essential to the development of the county.

Today, the residents of Niobrara County have capitalized on that industrious spirit. Thanks to the temperate climate and the fertile soil in the Powder River Basin, Niobrara County's primary industry is agriculture. The county's farmers consistently produce profitable crops like grain, wheat, and beans, and its ranchers work diligently in livestock production. The county's vast mineral resources played a key role in the county's robust economy. Several minerals and precious metals have been discovered and mined in the grasslands of Niobrara County. Both gold and silver were discovered and mined in the early days of settlement. Later, uranium was discovered near Lusk, a discovery which sparked a statewide boom in uranium drilling. Finally, the discovery of oil in Lance Creek was perhaps the most profitable of all mineral extraction. During World War II, Lance Creek was one of the country's important oil rigs, producing vast amounts of oil needed for the American war effort.

It is an honor to help the residents of Niobrara County celebrate their 100th anniversary. I invite my colleagues to visit this enterprising community in person. The residents of Niobrara County should be proud to present this heritage to visitors from all over the world.

UCON, IDAHO

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate and acknowledge the centennial anniversary of the founding of the city of Ucon, ID. On August 13, 2011, the citizens of Ucon will gather at Simmons Park to commemorate its 100th year and unveil a monument to its founders. This is a very historic and special day for this community.

Once a barren wilderness, the city of Ucon is an example of the Western spirit and determination in making the desert bloom. First colonized in 1884 by George Simmons, early settlers were confronted with challenging terrain. Despite the harsh conditions, the settlement quickly grew. Within 13 years, a church, school, amusement hall, and several dozen homes were built. In 1898, the power of steam and iron transformed the town with the introduction

of the Oregon Short Line Railroad. In order to take greater advantage of commercial opportunities provided by the railroad, the main town site was moved a mile west. Within a decade several businesses sprang up around the railroad tracks and the community began to take shape. On April 16, 1911, it was officially incorporated as the city of Ucon.

In the ensuing decades, changes in the railroad and the effects of the Great Depression transitioned Ucon from a commercial hub to a residential community. Today, many in southeastern Idaho can trace their roots to the pioneers and patriots who settled Ucon. Congratulations to the people of Ucon for 100 years of success.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING JUSTICE DOUGLAS GRAY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I honor the memory of the late Douglas Gray, a former New Hampshire Superior Court justice and an extraordinary public servant who dedicated his life to serving the Granite State.

Originally from Portsmouth, Justice Gray moved at the age of seven to Rye, where he resided for the remainder of his life. He graduated from Portsmouth High School and served his country in the U.S. Army from 1951 to 1954. After graduating from the University of New Hampshire in 1959, he earned his juris doctor from Boston College Law School, and went on to pursue a successful career practicing law in Portsmouth. During 1973–1983, he served as part-time special justice in the New Hampshire District Court system.

In 1983, he was appointed by Governor John H. Sununu to serve as associate justice of the New Hampshire Superior Court, where he presided until 1998. He was then elected to serve as a senior justice and presided on a part-time basis until his retirement in 2003.

As a judge, Justice Gray possessed exceptional intelligence and a deep respect for upholding the rule of law. And as a prosecutor, I had the privilege of trying cases before him. In fact, I tried my first murder case before Justice Gray. He was tough, but always fair, and I know that I and many of my peers in the New Hampshire bar learned a great deal from him. I deeply admired his integrity and his principled dedication to the law.

With Justice Gray's passing, New Hampshire has lost a devoted public servant and Rye has lost a beloved member of the community. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Cornelia and his entire family. At this sad time, we celebrate his life—grateful to have known a person who exemplified the very best of New Hampshire's tradition of public service.•

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH CONKLIN LANIER, II

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today, August 2, 2011, I wish to thank Joseph Conklin LaNier, II for his service to the United States of America as a member of the U.S. Navy during World War II, and for choosing to make Colorado his home. His has been a life of service for Colorado and for all Americans.

A native Southerner, Mr. LaNier was among the first African Americans to serve in the Navy with the rating of seaman, before President Truman signed the Executive order that desegregated the Armed Forces. He fought with the 23rd Special CB, ''Seabee'', unit, a part of the 3rd Marine Division, in some of the most horrific battles of the South Pacific.

I had the honor of meeting Mr. LaNier this past week during his visit to Washington, DC, with The Greatest Generations Foundation, a Colorado nonprofit organization that organizes trips for WWII veterans to return to locations where they have served.

We can all learn from Mr. LaNier. He entered the Armed Forces at the age of 17 in order to help support his family and serve his country. He served bravely from 1944 to 1946, supporting operations in Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and achieved a rank not commonly held by African Americans at the time.

Upon returning home from the war and finding strict laws and practices of segregation still in place throughout the South, Mr. LaNier followed the advice of his father regarding the importance of education as the primary tool for bettering one's future, and finished high school. With the aid of the G.I. bill, he enrolled in the Pharmacy School at Xavier University in New Orleans and took heavy course loads to make sure he completed his degree in 4 years. Despite the challenges of segregation, he studied and succeeded in his career, while keeping a constructive attitude, a trait he attributes to the teachings of his father.

Mr. LaNier is a role model for the many servicemembers who reside in Colorado and the veterans who elect to make Colorado their home after serving in the Armed Forces. His story exemplifies the successful transition that many returning veterans have made from active duty to civilian life.

Although he is a native of the South, and has traveled to a number of locations in the United States, it struck me as interesting that, out of all the places he traveled while in the Navy, Mr. LaNier chose to make Denver, CO, his home. In his autobiographical essay, ''My War on Two Fronts,'' LaNier recollects that during a period of leave, he had a stopover in Denver, where in a relatively brief period of time, the State showed him its character. A White female clerk at a drugstore seemed to sense his hesitation about sitting down, and invited him to take a seat and enjoy his ice cream. Later, when visiting a local movie theatre, he was surprised and delighted to find that there was no sign directing him to sit in segregated seating in the balcony. Mr. LaNier felt so welcomed by our State that he decided to make Colorado his home after the Navy. Following his graduation from pharmacy school, he moved to Denver and worked in pharmacies and in hospitals, and eventually opened up his own drugstore. Mr. LaNier found that, in Colorado, his voice could be heard on critical issues of the day, including the fight for fair housing measures to end discrimination in housing. Today, Mr. LaNier and his wife of more than 50 years, Eula Inez Long, continue to make Colorado their home.

Mr. President and all other Members here today, please join me in honoring the life and continued work of Joseph Conklin LaNier, II. A man who, despite all the discrimination he faced, is proud to be an American. A man who, despite returning home after the war and being denied his right to vote while wearing his uniform, is proud of his distinguished service in the Navy. A man who recognizes that even in the face of adversity, one can find a way forward and help our country to become a better place, a more perfect union. For his perseverance, hope, service and patriotism, I thank and commend Joseph LaNier, a great citizen of Colorado.•

TRIBUTE TO PAUL SANDOVAL

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, on behalf of all Coloradans, I want to recognize the extraordinary character and lifetime achievements of Colorado native Paul Sandoval. His far-reaching accomplishments—from civil rights to community organizing to business and to his passion, education—show an unwavering commitment to making Colorado a better place, and reflect, in noblest form, the enterprising spirit of the West.

I am sad to tell my colleagues that Paul has contracted locally advanced pancreatic cancer, and the Sandoval family is going through a difficult time now. And as he struggles to beat this terrible disease—and we need him to prevail—I cannot help but be reminded of all he has achieved in life, and all the social change he has helped bring about. To honor Paul and his many contributions, I would like to share a few moments from his life.

Paul and his wife Paula have for decades run a tamale shop in Denver—La Casita—that has served as the city's unofficial epicenter of political activity. According to Wellington Webb, the former Denver mayor whom Sandoval first met while the two worked delivering groceries, Paul could always be found ''holding court'' at his restaurant with firemen and city officials.

''I'm just a lowly tamale maker,'' Sandoval has grown accustomed to saying. But his life suggests there is

nothing ordinary about this accomplished man. A fixture in his community, Paul would make a name for himself by lifting up those around him. He cultivated enduring relationships in his community that propelled several generations of Colorado public servants. In short, Paul Sandoval has woven himself inextricably into Colorado's political fabric, and all Coloradans are the better for it.

Born in 1944 as 1 of 11 children to Jerry and Camilla Sandoval, Paul came from modest beginnings. Before he could even read newspaper headlines, Paul was selling copies of the Denver Post to help pay for his schooling at Annunciation Grade School in northeast Denver. From an early age, Paul thrived on the energy of those around him. By the time the young Sandoval finished middle school, he had helped his father win the presidency of the local meatpackers union and regularly canvassed for local candidates for office.

Paul graduated from high school in 1962, earning a scholarship to Louisiana State University. His education put him in close proximity to a fierce civil rights debate unfolding in neighboring Mississippi, where James Meredith sought to become the first African American to enroll at Ole Miss. Paul took up the cause and organized his fellow students for a bus trip. He participated firsthand in the demonstrations, receiving blows from the Oxford, MS, riot police.

Upon returning to Denver, Paul applied all he learned about the importance of equal opportunity in education to Colorado public life as well. He cofounded the Chicano Education Project, which focused on implementing bilingual curricula in schools and promoting civic engagement. During one trip to the San Luis Valley in southern Colorado, Paul met a young attorney named Ken Salazar who shared his passion for education. The two would become close allies for life.

Paul assumed his first official public role in 1974 when he successfully ran for a Colorado State Senate seat. He won the seat again in 1978. While serving in office, Paul became a leader in the educational community by personally sponsoring several Chicano doctoral students finishing their degrees. Rather than seeking a third term in the Senate, Paul pursued and won an at-large seat on the Denver school board in 1983, in which he would serve in a distinguished manner for 5 years.

After nearly 15 years serving in public office, Paul joined his wife and began serving Coloradans in a different equally satisfying way—at their tamale shop. And you can talk to anyone who has eaten there—you haven't lived until you've tried one of Paul and Paula's tamales with green chile. While I am in Washington during the week, one of the many reasons I look forward to getting back home to Denver is so that I can enjoy a meal courtesy of Paul.

A jack-of-all-trades if not master-of-all-trades, Paul has also remained a fixture in Colorado public life as a successful small business owner. He has provided invaluable advice to aspiring public servants. I cannot tell you how often I encounter people in my state who tell me how they have benefited from Paul's counsel and contagious enthusiasm. I can tell you that he helped me find my way as superintendent of Denver Public Schools. I have been truly privileged to know him, and I know I rank among many who are rooting for Paul and who stand by in support of his family.

Colorado is profoundly grateful for Paul Sandoval's public service. His efforts to advance the prospects of young Latino students and students of all backgrounds represent an enormous step forward in creating the next generation of selfless Coloradans who have been affected by Paul's unconquerable spirit. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Paul, his wife Paula, Kendra, Chris, Andrea and Amanda, his children, and his entire family.●

REMEMBERING GEORGE RAMOS

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to remember George Ramos, a Pulitzer Prize winning journalist with the Los Angeles Times who served his beloved hometown for decades and inspired countless others to follow in his extraordinary footsteps.

Born in 1947, George Ramos was a native of East Los Angeles. At a time when only a small number of Latino students enrolled in college, Ramos graduated in 1969 from California Polytechnic University in San Luis Obispo with a bachelor's degree in journalism.

Shortly after completing his studies, Ramos enlisted in the U.S. Army and served in West Germany and South Vietnam before returning to journalism. He worked for several newspapers before arriving at the Los Angeles Times, where he served for more than 25 years.

As an editor and reporter for the Los Angeles Times, Ramos joined with 17 Latino journalists to write the Pulitzer Prize winning ''Latino Project'' and also contributed to the Los Angeles Times' Pulitzer Prize-winning coverage of the 1992 Los Angeles riots and the 1994 Northridge earthquake. In addition to his award winning work in print media, Ramos also briefly co-hosted the Emmy Award-winning show ''Life & Times'' and served as a part-time faculty member at the University of Southern California. When he left the Los Angeles Times in 2003, he returned to California Polytechnic University in San Luis Obispo as a member of the journalism faculty.

Ramos lived in the Los Angeles area for most of his life and enjoyed the diversity of its vibrant neighborhoods. He maintained close ties to his childhood community of East Los Angeles and frequently visited local schools to speak about journalism and the importance of higher education. Ramos served as a mentor to many aspiring journalists and also as two-term president of California Chicano New Media Association—a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting diversity in the field of journalism.

I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring the memory of George Ramos for his long and distinguished service to our country.●

TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARY NORBERTA MALINOWSKI

● Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in 1855 in Warsaw, Poland, Blessed Angela founded the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Felix, an order dedicated to serving the poor, the sick, and the disabled. Today, thousands of Felician Sisters carry on a tradition of compassionate service around the world.

Today I wish to pay tribute to one of their number, a remarkable woman in Bangor, ME, the city where I live. Her name is Sister Mary Norberta Malinowski, but she is known and loved throughout Maine simply as Sister Norberta. She has dedicated her life to serving God by serving those in need.

Sister Norberta became a registered nurse in 1956 and began her career as one of the first pediatric nurse practitioners at Massachusetts General Hospital. After earning advanced degrees in public health and management, she received faculty appointments at Harvard Medical School and the Boston College Graduate School of Nursing.

In 1982, Sister Norberta became president and chief executive officer of St. Joseph Hospital in Bangor. As she prepares to step down after 29 years of service, her accomplishments are being celebrated by the Maine Legislature, the city of Bangor, the Honor Society of Nursing, the Maine chapter of Business and Professional Women, and many others.

There is much to celebrate. Under Sister Norberta's courageous and visionary leadership, St. Joseph has been transformed into the largest community hospital in Maine. She was instrumental in bringing many firsts to the region and to the State, from digital mammography and laparoscopic surgery to allowing fathers in the delivery room.

The Felician Sisters were founded with a particular focus on serving the Polish countryside. Sister Norberta continues that tradition by leading the effort to ensure primary care services for rural Maine and to organize small community hospitals under the Maine Health Alliance to create a statewide network of care.

Sister Norberta's contributions as a health care executive are only part of her inspiring story. She has given thousands of hours of her personal time to charity and has applied St. Joseph's facilities to such needs as providing laundry and food services to the area's

homeless shelters. Countless other quiet acts of kindness testify to her caring heart and deep humility.

The 16th century Capuchin friar canonized as St. Felix was known in his time as ''the saint of the streets of Rome'' for his daily journeys through the city dispensing food, medicine, and comfort to the poor, the sick, and the troubled. Sister Norberta has lived that legacy through the streets of Bangor and the country roads of Maine, and I join in thanking her for her blessed service.●

REMEMBERING DR. GERARD J. MANGONE

● Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to honor Dr. Gerard J. Mangone's life of service to this country and my home State of Delaware. Dr. Mangone passed away on Wednesday, July 27 at his home in Newark, DE. He was 92.

Born in the Bronx in 1918, Dr. Mangone's career as an international legal scholar spanned close to six decades, including almost 40 years as professor of marine policy at the University of Delaware. Dr. Mangone received his bachelor's degree from the College of the City of New York in 1938. Following 4 years of active military service, he earned his master's degree and doctoral degree in international law from Harvard University in 1947 and 1949 respectively. His dissertation won the Charles Sumner Award for the most distinguished contribution to international peace.

Before joining the University of Delaware, Dr. Mangone held faculty and administrative positions at institutions including Wesleyan University, Swarthmore College, and Syracuse University, where he served as associate and acting dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, as well as Temple University, where he served as dean for the College of Liberal Arts, vice president for academic affairs, and provost.

Dr. Mangone was appointed soon thereafter as executive director of the President's Commission on the United Nations during the creation of its Convention on the Law of the Sea and was the first senior fellow at the new Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars. Dr. Mangone also served as a consultant to the White House, U.S. Department of State, the United Nations, Japan, the Ford Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Dr. Mangone joined the University of Delaware in 1972 as professor of marine studies and political science. In 1973, he created the Center for the Study of Marine Policy—the first research center at an American university to study the legal, political, and economic issues facing the ocean, seabed, and coastal zone—and served as its director for the next 16 years. In 2003, the center was renamed in his honor as the Gerard J. Mangone Center for Marine Policy.

Dr. Mangone initiated the International Straits of the World book series in 1978 with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. For this series, he contracted with authors from around the globe to provide detailed information on some of the world's most critical navigation passages, much of which is still used today.

Dr. Mangone earned numerous accolades throughout his career. He was a visiting professor at Yale University, Mt. Holyoke College, Trinity College, Princeton University, and Johns Hopkins University as well as a visiting lecturer at the University of Bologna, Peking University, the University of Natal, Capetown University, and the University of Western Australia. At Calcutta University in India, he was honored as the Tagore Law Professor, and at the University of Delaware, he received the most distinguished faculty award as Francis Alison Professor. In 2010, UD awarded Dr. Mangone an honorary doctor of science degree.

The Young Scholars Award, which recognizes promising and accomplished faculty at the University of Delaware, was named in his honor. In celebration of his 90th birthday in 2008, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers established the Gerard J. Mangone Prize to be awarded annually to the author of the best contribution published in the International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law, of which Dr. Mangone was editor-in-chief.

With his remarkable energy and constant dedication to academic excellence, Dr. Mangone was an exemplary mentor, having advised 45 University of Delaware students in achieving graduate degrees. He wrote more than 20 books and edited 25 others, and he authored scores of scholarly papers.

Dr. Mangone's vision, passion, and dedication forever changed the way we view and manage our ocean resources. His contributions to marine and coastal policy will continue to have a lasting effect on our country and our world for generations. Dr. Mangone made a significant impact in his field and his legacy will live on in his students, his ideas, and his influence on our laws and international agreements.

I hope my colleagues will join me in remembering Dr. Gerard J. Mangone.●

WHITE RIVER, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I recognize the community of White River, SD, on reaching the 100th anniversary of its founding. White River serves as the county seat for Mellette County and is the oldest town in the county. White River will be celebrating its centennial during the month of August 2011.

White River was named by members of the Western Townsite Company of Dallas, SD, and COL C.P. Jordan. White River was referred to as the place ''where prairie skies meet western life.'' Since 1912, White River has been home to the annual Frontier Days festival. Which includes a rodeo, South Dakota's State sport, every year during the celebration.

White River will celebrate its 100th anniversary during the 2011 Frontier Days and plans to hold a White River High School reunion during the celebration along with the annual Frontier Days powwow.

White River is a close-knit community that has small town values. After 100 years, White River still maintains the spirit of independence of which South Dakotans are fiercely proud. I am honored to publicly recognize White River on this memorable occasion, and congratulate the people of White River on their achievements.●

WOOD, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the founding of Wood, SD. This community in Mellette County in western South Dakota, has a rich and proud history of representing our State's frontier spirit.

Wood, named for its founder, Albert Kirk Wood, was organized in 1911 a few miles north of Albert's trading post. In just 2 years it was home to a newspaper, a bank, and daily mail service. Thousands of people came to Wood for its renowned Fourth of July celebrations, as well as the Mellette County Fair. Like many towns in South Dakota, the railroad served as a major lifeline to the town of Wood. This first train from the Chicago Northwestern Railroad rolled into Wood from Winner on October 19, 1929. Wood claims many exceptional residents including James Abourezk, the first Arab American to serve South Dakota in the U.S. Senate.

Today, Wood stands as a testament to the steadfast commitment of the residents to their small town. Wood still maintains close ties to the rich agricultural heritage of South Dakota. Small communities like Wood are a vital part of the economy of South Dakota and a reminder of the hard struggles endured by our frontier-era forefathers. One hundred years after its founding, Wood remains a strong community and a great asset to the State of South Dakota. I am proud to honor Wood on this historic milestone.●

TRIBUTE TO GEOFFREY B. SHIELDS

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I honor the dean and president of Vermont Law School, Geoffrey B. Shields, as he announces his retirement after four decades as a practicing attorney, educator, and scholar. He will leave a legacy about which he should be very proud.

Dean Shields arrived at Vermont Law School in 2004, following a distinguished career in the public and private sectors. He received a bachelor of arts in economics, magna cum laude, from Harvard University in 1967. He earned his juris doctor from Yale Law School in 1972.

Over the last 8 years, Dean Shields has guided Vermont Law School along

a path of steady growth. Through his leadership the school has gained many new and talented faculty members, and has seen substantial growth in its endowment. He has initiated capital improvement projects on the school's campus, expanded the school's international partnerships, and has developed new clinics and institutes to focus on distinct fields of legal study. And he has sustained and built upon Vermont Law School's environmental law program, which has been rated the best program in the Nation for the last three consecutive years, and in the top two for the last 21 years. These continuing successes are reflective of Dean Shields' strong leadership and the dedication of the faculty, staff, and students who sustain a vital community of learning and innovation in the hills of central Vermont.

During his career in public service, Dean Shields served as assistant to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, counsel to the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and as counsel to Senator Frank Church. After he earned his law degree, he served as a law clerk for the late Judge James Oakes of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, for whom a class room building at Vermont Law School is named.

In the private sector, he served as a partner at the Chicago and Washington, DC, law firm of Gardner Carton and Douglas, where he was nationally recognized for his expertise in nonprofit law, corporate law, health care law and international trade law.

Dean Shields has also made important contributions to education and scholarship beyond Vermont Law School. In Brattleboro, VT, he served as a foreign student advisor and assistant to the president at the Experiment in International Living and as an adjunct professor of economics at Marlboro College in Marlboro, VT. Dean Shields has also been involved in foreign policy issues through editing and writing, and as a member of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations and the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Dean Shields recently overcame serious illness with grace, humility, and determination. As he moves into the next chapter of his life, Marcelle and I wish him and his wife Genie the best for continued health and happiness.

I thank Dean Shields for his 8 years of dedication to Vermont Law School, and I convey my admiration and respect for the contributions he has made to Vermont. He will leave Vermont's young law school and its faculty, staff and students in a strong position for continued growth and success. I am sure he will be greatly missed by all of those who have worked with him and learned from him. I wish him all the best.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CROSIER

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor John Crosier for his outstanding service to the State of New Hampshire's residents and business community.

John retired as president of our State's largest business organization, the Business and Industry Association of New Hampshire, in 2004 after 16 years. He has served the residents of my State as a trustee of the University System of New Hampshire, a position which I am proud to have first appointed him to, as a member of the board of governors for the New Hampshire Forum on Higher Education, as a member of the executive committee of the Whittemore School of Business and Economics, and as a member of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Committee representing State chambers of commerce. Before he came to New Hampshire, he worked in Massachusetts as the head of the Massachusetts Business Roundtable and as Commissioner of Employment Security for our neighboring State. He was appointed by a Republican Governor and reappointed by a Democratic Governor.

John has been a board leader at numerous nonprofits in my State, lending his energy, intellect and voice to some of New Hampshire's most influential and important organizations: the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation, Junior Achievement, Leadership New Hampshire and the American Cancer Society.

Throughout his years as the head of the Business and Industry Association, and through his nonprofit board leadership, John's guiding principle has been what's best for New Hampshire.

When I was Governor of New Hampshire, John Crosier was one of my most trusted advisors. A gentleman always, his courage of conviction and pragmatic optimism for our State's future always trumped ideology. He has been, and continues to be, a role model for civility in public discourse.

John's commitment to New Hampshire was evident in his visionary work on the State's most extensive research project, which resulted in a statewide economic strategy in 1996—An Agenda for Continued Economic Opportunity in New Hampshire. That plan set forth by John has been credited with my State's recent strong economic recovery in relation to neighboring States. Pieces of it are still being used today as a framework for New Hampshire, and it served as the foundation for a similar report by my administration during my second term as Governor. His belief that the health of the business sector is closely tied to issues of education, environment, and the nonprofit sector has contributed to the leadership of our State and will continue to guide our State in the future.

I thank John Crosier for his service to New Hampshire as he prepares for his well-deserved retirement. I am grateful for his friendship, leadership and advice throughout the years.●

RECOGNIZING FALCON PERFORMANCE FOOTWEAR

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, in cities and towns all across America, there are businesses that are synonymous with the communities they serve. Maine has historically been home to a number of these companies, from local paper mills to Bath Iron Works. In the Lewiston-Auburn region, Falcon Performance Footwear has been part of the fabric since 1963, producing high-quality shoes and boots for generations of Mainers and Americans. On Tuesday, August 23, Falcon Performance Footwear will be recognized by the Maine Manufacturing Extension Partnership, or MEP, with its 2011 Manufacturing Excellence Award. I commend Falcon for its fine work and congratulate the company on its recognition.

Falcon Shoe Manufacturing Company got its start in 1963, when Ted Johanson opened the factory's doors at the Roy Continental Mill in Lewiston. Originally, Falcon produced children's shoes, but over time focused its efforts on manufacturing boots for a number of uses. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Falcon began implementing a number of forward-thinking and innovative processes, including the first in the shoe industry to utilize computerized stitching equipment, as well as the first direct-attach polyurethane outer sole for shoes in the country. The company was also the first to make Timberland boots. To provide the company with the ability to expand, Falcon moved from its longtime home in Lewiston to a larger location in the neighboring city of Auburn earlier this year.

Today, Falcon's sole focus is on making reliable, sturdy, comfortable boots, particularly for consumers in labor-intensive jobs. The company produces a number of cutting-edge industrial boots, and in 2006 began working with Globe Firefighter Suits, a New Hampshire small business, to create a state-of-the-art boot for firefighters designed with an athletic shoe platform rather than a more rigid welted sole to provide added flexibility. Falcon added mining boots to its repertoire in 2009, which feature a type of leather that resists many of the salts and minerals frequently encountered by miners.

Over the past decade, Falcon has worked with the Maine MEP to improve its efficiency and productivity, allowing the company to better compete in the global economy. As a result of this collaboration, Falcon has increased its productivity by 60 percent, retained over 50 jobs, increased its sales, and trained all of its employees in a number of advanced manufacturing techniques. I have long been a supporter of, and advocate for, the MEP program, and recognize the immense value of its services to small- and medium-sized manufacturers across the country. Indeed, as a result of their partnership with the Maine MEP over the past 5 years, clients have reported increased and retained sales

over $368 million, $40.1 million in cost savings, and the creation or retention of over 2,500 jobs—or nearly 5 percent of Maine's manufacturing workforce. I commend Falcon for working with the Maine MEP to become a leaner, more efficient company that is poised for future success, and I am pleased to honor the company and its employees as it receives the Maine MEP's 2011 Manufacturing Excellence Award.

Maine was once home to dozens of shoemakers and tanneries, which provided thousands of jobs and enormous benefits to the State's economy. But over time, foreign competition and rising costs have devastated the shoe industry across America. That is what makes Falcon Performance Footwear's story all the more remarkable. I thank everyone at Falcon for their hard work and endurance, and wish them continued success as they remain an icon in the Lewiston-Auburn communities.●

REMEMBERING LARRY GERLACH

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Larry Gerlach. Larry Gerlach was born October 6, 1946, in Britton, SD. In 1967, he married Susan O'Connor, and they made their home in Aberdeen. Larry quickly made himself known throughout the community for his love of the area and his resolve to see it grow and prosper.

Larry became a member of the Brown County Fair Board in the 1980s and served on the board for 6 years. He became the president in 1989, and in January 1992, Larry was named the Brown County Fair manager. His ambition and driven attitude helped develop the Brown County Fair into one of the largest fairs in the region. He was able to book some of the biggest names in country music to perform at the grandstand that is being named in his honor. His friends, family, and coworkers all remember him as having an upbeat and positive attitude, and he was regarded by all as a joy to be around.

Larry received many prestigious awards in his life, among them was the 1996 People's Choice ABBY Award from the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce. In addition, he served as the president of the South Dakota Association of Fairs from 1997–2001, and in 2003, Larry was inducted into the South Dakota Fairman's Hall of Fame.

Unfortunately, Larry passed away in February of 2011. Although we are saddened by this loss, Larry's memory will live on through his loved ones and those who were fortunate to work closely with him. Larry's sense of determination, ambition, and positive attitude helped make the Brown County Fair the tremendous success it is today, as well as made him a greatly respected man within the Brown County community and the entire state. He will be greatly missed by all.●

TRIBUTE TO BO BRUINSMA

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Bo Bruinsma, an intern in my Sioux Falls, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Bo is a graduate of Elk Point-Jefferson High School in South Dakota. Currently he is attending the University of South Dakota, where he is majoring in political science and mass communications with a Spanish minor. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Bo for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued 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.)

TRANSMITTING CERTIFICATION THAT THE DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT IS WITHIN $100,000,000,000 OF THE LIMIT IN 31 U.S.C. 3101(b) AND THAT FURTHER BORROWING IS REQUIRED TO MEET EXISTING COMMITMENTS—PM 17

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 3101A(a)(1)(A) of title 31, United States Code, I hereby certify that the debt subject to limit is within $100,000,000,000 of the limit in 31 U.S.C. 3101(b) and that further borrowing is required to meet existing commitments.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 2, 2011.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:38 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2480. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Chairman.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 365. An act to provide for budget control.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUYE).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2480. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Administrative Conference of the United States for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 2, 2011, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 365. An act to provide for budget control.

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–2803. A communication from the Regulatory Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Export Inspection and Weighing Waiver for High Quality Specialty Grain Transported in Containers'' (RIN0580–AB18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2804. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the within the Operations and Maintenance Army account and was assigned Army case number 10–06; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–2805. A communication from the Senior Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Launch Safety: Lightning Criteria for Expendable Launch Vehicles'' ((RIN2120–AJ84) (Docket No. FAA–2011–0181)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2806. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Chelsea Street Bridge Construction, Chelsea, MA'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2011–

0536)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2807. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Harlem River, New York City, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0509)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2808. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones; Sector Southeastern New England Captain of the Port Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2010–0803)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2809. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; 2011 Seattle Seafair Fleet Week Moving Vessels, Puget Sound, Washington'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0505)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2810. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Bogue Sound; Morehead City, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0306)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2811. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations and Safety Zones; Marine Events in Captain of the Port Long Island Sound Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0550)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2812. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Port Huron to Mackinac Island Sail Race'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0648)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2813. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Detroit APBA Gold Cup, Detroit River, Detroit, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0614)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2814. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Lake Gaston, Enterprise, NC'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0277)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2815. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Extreme Sailing Series Boston; Boston Harbor, Boston, MA'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0103)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2816. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kathleen Whelan Wedding Fireworks, Lake St. Clair, Grosse Pointe Farms, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0573)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2817. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Swimming Events in Captain of the Port Boston Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0533)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2818. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; BGSU Football Gridiron Classic Golf and Dinner Fireworks, Catawba Island Club, Port Clinton, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0372)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2819. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Annual Events Requiring Safety Zones in the Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0264)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2820. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Central Astoria Independence Celebration Fireworks Event, Wards Island, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2011–0475)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2821. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Policy Statement of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission on the Protection of Cesium-137 Chloride Sources'' (NRC–2010–0209) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2822. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal to amend section 148 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, relative to unclassified Controlled Nuclear Information; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2823. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for calendar year 2010 relative to statistics mandated by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2824. A communication from the Director of the Regulation Policy and Management Office, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program—Changes to Subsistence Allowance'' (RIN2900–AO10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2011; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 623, a bill to amend chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing of cases, disclosures of discovery information in civil actions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 112–45).

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 538. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act (Rept. No. 112–46).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Mark P. Wetjen, of Nevada, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring June 19, 2016.

*Brian T. Baenig, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. LEVIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Air Force nomination of Gen. William M. Fraser III, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Donald P. Dunbar, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen L. Hoog, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Janet C. Wolfenbarger, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Verle L. Johnston, Jr., to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Leonard A. Patrick, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brigadier General Trulan A. Eyre and ending with Colonel Jennifer L. Walter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2011.

*Army nomination of Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, to be General.

*Army nomination of Gen. Raymond T. Odierno, to be General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Keith C. Walker, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Charles T. Cleveland, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Michael Ferriter, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert L. Caslen, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. David G. Perkins, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Brian R. Copes, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Bert K. Mizusawa, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Fred W. Allen, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., to be General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Stephen E. Bogle and ending with Colonel David C. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2011. (minus 1 nominee: Colonel David O. Smith)

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General David B. Enyeart and ending with Colonel David E. Wilmot, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 25, 2011.

Army nomination of Col. Gina D. Seiler, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Michael A. Calhoun, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Kaffia Jones, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. Jonathan W. Greenert, to be Admiral.

*Navy nomination of Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr., to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Scott R. Van Buskirk, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Mark E. Ferguson III, to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Scott H. Swift, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Michael A. LeFever, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Luke M. McCollum, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Lauren F. Aase and ending with Debra S. Zinsmeyer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2011.

Air Force nomination of Mary F. Hart-Gallagher, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Raymond S. Collins, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Wade B. Adair and ending with Elijio J. Venegas, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Air Force nominations beginning with Johnathan M. Compton and ending with Benjamin J. Mitchell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nomination of Thomas B. Murphree, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Pedro T. Raga and ending with Matthew H. Vinning, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 22, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Nicholas M. Cruzgarcia and ending with Joseph P. Lynn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Army nomination of Luisa G. Santiago, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Troy W. Ross and ending with Carlos E. Quezada, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with James L. Adams, Jr. and ending with Robert M. Thelen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Matthew B. Ahn and ending with Gregory S. Thogmartin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Army nomination of Cindy B. Katz, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Wiley C. Thompson, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Marshall S. Humes, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Cyruss A. Tsurgeon, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Colleen F. Blailes and ending with Curtis T. Chun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Brad M. Evans and ending with Jay S. Kost, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Matthew J. Baker and ending with Russell B. Chambers, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph B. Rusinko and ending with Paula S. Oliver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Charlespaul T. Anonuevo and ending with Tracy E. Walters, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with David H. Burnham and ending with Randall S. Verde, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Michael A. Adams and ending with Paula Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Geoffrey R. Adams and ending with D005579, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Alissa R. Ackley and ending with D003185, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Army nominations beginning with Thomas H. Aarsen and ending with D010899, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Marine Corps nomination of Carroll J. Connelley, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Samuel H. Carrasco, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Troy D. Carr, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Dawn C. Allen and ending with Jennifer L. Tietz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 22, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with James S. Brown and ending with Heather J. Walton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher A. Alfonzo and ending with Sara B. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Raul L. Barrientos and ending with Harold S. Zald, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with David L. Agey and ending with Laura L. V. Wegemann, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert P. Anselm and ending with Paul A. Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Randy E. Ashman and ending with Tammy L. Weinzatl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Deangelo Ashby and ending with Lagena K. G. Yarbrough, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Dennis K. Andrews and ending with Brian K. Waite, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Roberto M. Alvarado and ending with Joseph W. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 11, 2011.

Navy nomination of Mathew R. Loe, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael J. O'Donnell, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Lawrence Brandon, Jr., to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert A. Slaughter and ending with Robert Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Anthony Diaz and ending with Jane E. Mcneely, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Carissa L. Garey and ending with Daniel G. Nicastri, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy M. Derbyshire and ending with Christina J. Wong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeremiah E. Chaplin and ending with Pamela A. Tellado, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Paige H. Adams and ending with Andrew F. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert S. Bair and ending with Patricia R. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Kirkland M. Anderson and ending with Martha A. Wittosch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Cheryl E. Aimestillman and ending with Jon E. Zatlokowicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Archie L. Barber and ending with Zavean V. Ware, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Mylene R. Arvizo and ending with Ashley S. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Amelia F. Dudley and ending with Brandon D. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Richfield F. Agullana and ending with Chieh Yang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

Navy nominations beginning with Charity C. Hardison and ending with Stephanie B. Murdock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 20, 2011.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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 Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1467. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1468. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1469. A bill to require reporting on the capacity of foreign countries to combat cybercrime, to develop action plans to improve the capacity of certain countries to combat cybercrime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1470. A bill to promote timely exploration for geothermal resources under existing geothermal leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

S. 1471. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of an individual's status or history of unemployment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 1472. A bill to impose sanctions on persons making certain investments that directly and significantly contribute to the enhancement of the ability of Syria to develop its petroleum resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1473. A bill to amend Public Law 99–548 to provide for the implementation of the multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada, and to extend the authority to purchase certain parcels of public land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a deduction for travel expenses to medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs in connection with examinations or treatments relating to service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 1475. A bill to convey certain land to Clark County, Nevada, to designate the Nellis Dunes National Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1476. A bill to reduce the size of the Federal workforce and Federal employee cost relating to pay, bonuses, and travel; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1477. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to prevent the dissemination to the public of certain information with respect to noncommercial flights of private aircraft owners and operators; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1478. A bill to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1479. A bill to preserve Medicare beneficiary choice by restoring and expanding Medicare open enrollment and disenrollment opportunities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1480. A bill to provide for the construction, renovation, and improvement of medical school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1481. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a program of grants to newly accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools for the purpose of increasing the supply of physicians; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1482. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Newtown Battlefield located in Chemung County, New York, and the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1483. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations in ways that threaten homeland security, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Nebraska:

S. 1484. A bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to include ultralight vehicles under the definition of aircraft for purposes of the aviation smuggling provisions under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1486. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify and expand on criteria applicable to patient admission to and care furnished in long-term care hospitals participating in the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 1487. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to establish a program to issue Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Cards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1488. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1489. A bill to prohibit the discrimination and retaliation against individuals and health care entities that refuse to recommend, refer for, provide coverage for, pay for, provide, perform, assist, or participate in abortions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1490. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to authorize additional funding for the pregnancy assistance fund; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to expand the electric rate-setting authority of States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1492. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1493. A bill to provide compensation to relatives of Foreign Service members killed in the line of duty and the relatives of United States citizens who were killed as a result of the bombing of the United States Embassy in Kenya on August 7, 1998, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1494. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1495. A bill to amend the school dropout prevention program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1496. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit the delegation by the United States of inspection, certification, and related services to a foreign classification society that provides comparable services to Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1497. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend for 3 years reasonable cost contracts under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1498. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional reporting with respect to contributions to members of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. THUNE, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1499. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate a rule to improve the daytime and nighttime visibility of agricultural equipment that may be operated on a public road; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1500. A bill to give Americans access to affordable child-only health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. LEE, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 1501. A bill to require the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to conduct the business of the Committee in a manner that is open to the public; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1502. A bill to restore public trust in pipeline safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts:

S. 1503. A bill to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1504. A bill to restore Medicaid eligibility for citizens of the Freely Associated States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1505. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of particular specialists, determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to be directly related to the health needs stemming from environmental health hazards that have led to its declaration as a Public Health Emergency, to be eligible under the National Health Service Corps in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 1506. A bill to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from expanding United States bank reporting requirements with respect to interest on deposits paid to nonresident aliens; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1507. A bill to provide protections from workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1508. A bill to extend loan limits for programs of the Federal Housing Administration, the government-sponsored enterprises, and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1509. A bill to provide incentives for States to improve the well-being of children in the child welfare system through systemic reforms and innovations, increased collaboration between State agencies, and incorporation of higher standards of accountability; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, and Mr. NELSON of Florida):

S.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to requiring a balanced budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KIRK:

S. Res. 250. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the memorial park on Hero Street USA, in Silvis, Illinois, should be recognized as Hero Street Memorial Park and should continue to be supported as a park by the Town of Silvis at no cost to United States taxpayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 251. A resolution expressing support for improvement in the collection, processing, and consumption of recyclable materials throughout the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 252. A resolution celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the United States-Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

S. Res. 253. A resolution designating October 26, 2011, as ''Day of the Deployed''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 254. A resolution designating August 16, 2011, as ''National Airborne Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. Res. 255. A resolution designating October 8, 2011, as ''National Chess Day'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. Res. 256. A resolution designating the week of October 2 through October 8, 2011, as ''National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Con. Res. 28. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 207

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 274

At the request of Mrs. HAGAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 274, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to medication therapy management services under the Medicare prescription drug program.

S. 306

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 306, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 344

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain

retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 384, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.

S. 387

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 387, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide flexible spending arrangements for members of uniformed services, and for other purposes.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 418, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Civil Air Patrol.

S. 509

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 509, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs to develop and demonstrate 2 small modular nuclear reactor designs, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to eliminate the abstinence-only education program.

S. 598

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage.

S. 633

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to prevent fraud in small business contracting, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to promote industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement, and for other purposes.

S. 672

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 672, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Services for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a hazardous waste electronic manifest system.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs.

S. 738

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of comprehensive Alzheimer's disease and related dementia diagnosis and services in order to improve care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias by improving detection, diagnosis, and care planning.

S. 755

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for restitution and other State judicial debts that are past-due.

S. 806

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army to conduct levee system evaluations and certifications on receipt of requests from non-Federal interests.

S. 833

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to provide grants to States to ensure that all students in the middle grades are taught an academically rigorous curriculum with effective supports so that students complete the middle grades prepared for success in secondary school and post-secondary endeavors, to improve State and district policies and programs relating to the academic achievement of students in the middle grades, to develop and implement effective middle grades models for struggling students, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve education and prevention related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to certain sporting good articles, and to exempt those articles from a definition under that Act.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the perfiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for nonregular service.

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, supra.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to ensure that amounts are made available for projects to provide recreational public access, and for other purposes.

S. 919

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 919, a bill to authorize grant programs to ensure successful, safe, and healthy students.

S. 920

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 920, a bill to create clean

energy jobs and set efficiency standards for small-duct high-velocity air conditioning and heat pump systems, and for other purposes.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 950, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal a prohibition on allowing States to use toll revenues as State matching funds for Appalachian Development Highway projects.

S. 951

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 951, a bill to improve the provision of Federal transition, rehabilitation, vocational, and unemployment benefits to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 958

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 958, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to prohibit theft of medical products, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1025, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1039, a bill to impose sanctions on persons responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky, for the conspiracy to defraud the Russian Federation of taxes on corporate profits through fraudulent transactions and lawsuits against Hermitage, and for other gross violations of human rights in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) 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. 1100

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1100, a bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to prohibit inserting politics into the Federal acquisition process by prohibiting the submission of political contribution information as a condition of receiving a Federal contract.

S. 1108

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1108, a bill to provide local communities with tools to make solar permitting more efficient, and for other purposes.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1111, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level, and for other purposes.

S. 1145

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1145, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1177

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1177, a bill to provide grants to States to improve high schools and raise graduation rates while ensuring rigorous standards, to develop and implement effective school models for struggling students and dropouts, and to improve State policies to raise graduation rates, and for other purposes.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1248

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1248, a bill to prohibit the consideration of any bill by Congress unless the authority provided by the Constitution of the United States for the legislation can be determined and is clearly specified.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act with regard to certain exemptions under that Act for direct care workers and to improve the systems for the collection and reporting of data relating to the direct care workforce, and for other purposes.

S. 1280

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1280, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to require sexual assault risk-reduction and response training, and the development of sexual assault protocol and guidelines, the establishment of victims advocates, the establishment of a Sexual Assault Advisory Council, and for other purposes.

S. 1297

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1297, a bill to preserve State and institutional authority relating to State authorization and the definition of credit hour.

S. 1314

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. 1316

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1316, a bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending.

S. 1369

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1369, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to provide for the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne disease, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 1392

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to provide additional time for the Administrator of

the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes.

S. 1395

At the request of Mr. THUNE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1395, a bill to ensure that all Americans have access to waivers from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1420

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1420, a bill to require that the United States Government prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public, Social Security benefits, and military pay in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes.

S. 1433

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1433, a bill to pay personnel compensation and benefits for employees of the Federal Aviation Administration.

S. 1449

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1449, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for highway safety programs and for other purposes.

S. 1450

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1450, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a commercial truck safety program, and for other purposes.

S. 1457

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Made In America Block Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 80, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 132

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 132, a resolution recognizing and honoring the zoos and aquariums of the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1469. A bill to require reporting on the capacity of foreign countries to combat cybercrime, to develop action plans to improve the capacity of certain countries to combat cybercrime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the International Cybercrime Reporting and Cooperation Act with Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, which if enacted, will establish a framework for global cooperation on the fight against cybercrime. As the United States continues to work on combating cybercrime here at home, we must simultaneously direct our attention to the international arena. With bipartisan support and valued input from affected industry, we have worked together on drafting a bill that encompasses reporting measures, action plans, and multilateral efforts in support of government cooperation to dismantle this global threat.

This bill increases the U.S. Government's focus on combating cybercrime internationally by requiring the President, or his designee, to annually report to Congress on the assessment of the cybercrime fighting efforts of the countries chosen by key federal agencies in consultation with private sector stakeholders. The countries to be reviewed are those with a significant role in efforts to combat cybercrime impacting U.S. Government, entities and persons, or disrupting U.S. electronic commerce or intellectual property interests.

Cyberspace remains borderless, with no single proprietor. Accordingly, the United States must take the lead on maintaining the openness of the Internet, while securing accountability. If a country is a haven for cybercrime, or simply has demonstrated a pattern of uncooperative behavior with efforts to combat cybercrime, that nation must be held accountable. The government of each country must conduct criminal investigations and prosecute criminals when there is credible evidence of cybercrime incidents against the U.S. government, our private entities or our people.

With so many U.S. companies doing business overseas, we must do our part to safeguard their employees, their jobs, and their clients from cyber attacks. Our objective is simple: We need international cooperation to increase assistance and prevention efforts of cybercrime from those countries deemed to be of cyber concern. Without international cooperation, our economy, security, and people will continue to be under threat.

Cybercrime is a tangible threat to the security of our global economy, which is why we need to coordinate our fight worldwide. Until countries begin to take the necessary steps to fight criminals within their borders, cybercrime havens will continue to flourish. Countries that knowingly permit cybercriminals to attack within their borders will now know that the United States is watching, the global community is watching, and there will be consequences for not acting.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

S. 1476. A bill to reduce the size of the Federal workforce and Federal employee cost relating to pay, bonuses, and travel; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, after a contentious several months navigating the increase in the debt ceiling, Congress will be returning home in the next few days. I think many of us are anxious to go back to the States, where we will hear from our fellow citizens about their thoughts on what we are doing well and where we are falling short.

Getting out of Washington and returning to our States will be a relief, but I am fully aware that after this brief respite, we will come back to Washington in the fall with many more contentious issues still on our plates.

Our Nation is still on an unsustainable fiscal path, even with today's temporary resolution of the issues surrounding the debt ceiling. In addition, we have a government that has grown far too large and has taken on far too many obligations.

Today, with all these concerns in mind, I am joined by Senator TOM COBURN in introducing the Federal Workforce Reduction and Reform Act of 2011. If enacted, this bill will go a long way toward reducing the size of the Federal Government and helping to get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Specifically, our bill would extend the current pay freeze for Federal civilian employees for another 3 years. Bonuses paid Federal employees would also be frozen during that time. Currently, Federal workers receive an automatic cost-of-living adjustment every year and are eligible for relocation, retention, and performance bonuses as well.

While I don't begrudge government employees their compensation, these automatic increases come with significant costs and far outpace those typically offered in the private sector. By simply extending the current pay freeze for another 3 years, we will save the Federal Government roughly $140 billion over 10 years.

In addition, our bill would require the President, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Personnel Management, to reduce the size of the Federal workforce by 15 percent—roughly 300,000 employees—over the next 10 years. This could easily be accomplished through attrition and would save taxpayers over $225 billion over that time.

The bill would require a similar reduction in the Federal contract workforce as well. We have nothing against Federal agencies contracting services out to private venders. However, the significant increase in this practice

over the last several years has masked the size of the Federal Government. Indeed, when you include the contract workforce, the Federal Government is even larger than it appears.

Our bill would require that the President work with OMB and OPM to count the number of employees working on Federal contracts and reduce that number by 15 percent over the next 10 years. This would provide an even greater reduction in the size of the Federal Government and save taxpayers another $230 billion over the next decade.

Finally, this bill would reduce the travel budgets of Federal agencies by 75 percent over time. All told, the Federal Government spends over $15 billion a year on travel expenses. Most businesses respond to difficult financial times by reducing or eliminating unnecessary expenses. Most private sector leaders would tell you that travel expenses are one of the first things on the chopping block. Furthermore, improvements in teleconferencing technology and web-based communication have made much of the government-sponsored travel that was required in the past unnecessary.

Our bill would cut Federal travel expenses in half for the first 2 years, and then by three quarters thereafter. This will save American taxpayers something in the neighborhood of $40 billion over 10 years.

Mr. President, our Nation is currently in the midst of a fundamental debate over the constitutional limits on the Federal Government. The President and his allies see no bounds for a living Constitution, while conservatives like myself believe that Federal power has far exceeded the Founders' limits and is a genuine threat to personal liberty.

While this debate will likely not be resolved anytime soon, most of us can agree that we need to take immediate steps to address our Nation's looming fiscal crisis. The deal that was approved today was a step in the right direction, but it was only one step. We must do more, and we can do more, to right our fiscal ship. Some may see things differently, but I don't see any way that we can restore the integrity of the Nation's fiscal position without significantly reducing the size and cost of the Federal Government. The bill we are introducing today would be an important and measurable step toward that goal.

According to the numbers and methodology used by the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, these changes combined will save American taxpayers more than $600 billion over 10 years. These are significant numbers. They represent more than half of the deficit reduction required in the first part of the deal agreed to today, and they could easily be realized if we enact this small handful of relatively simple reforms.

I want to thank Senator COBURN—who continues to be a leader in the fight to bring us back to fiscal sanity—for his help and support on this bill. His has been a tireless voice against government excess and I am proud to join with him in this fight.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Federal Workforce Reduction and Reform Act of 2011.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1483. A bill to ensure that persons who form corporations in the United States disclose the beneficial owners of those corporations, in order to prevent wrongdoers from exploiting United States corporations in ways that threaten homeland security, to assist law enforcement in detecting, preventing, and punishing terrorism, money laundering, and other misconduct involving United States corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN. Today, I along with my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, am re-introducing the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a bill designed to combat terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, and other wrongdoing facilitated by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. This commonsense bill would end the practice of our States forming over about 2 million new corporations each year for unidentified persons, and instead require the States to ask for the identities of the persons establishing those corporations. With those names on record, U.S. law enforcement faced with corporate misconduct would then have a trail to chase instead of what today is too often a dead end.

Our bill is supported by key law enforcement organizations, including the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, the National Narcotic Officers' Associations Coalition, the United States Marshals Service Association, the Society of Former Special Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Association of Former ATF Agents. It is also endorsed by a number of small business and public interest groups, including the Main Street Alliance, Sustainable Business Network of Washington, Global Financial Integrity, Global Witness, Public Interest Research Group, Project on Government Oversight, Jubilee USA, Citizens for Tax Justice, Tax Justice Network USA, and the FACT Coalition.

This is the third time this bill has been introduced. In the 110th Congress, when the bill was introduced for the first time and he was a member of the U.S. Senate, President Obama served as an original cosponsor. It's an issue that has become more urgent with time.

Right now, it takes more information to get a drivers license or open a U.S. bank account than to form a U.S. corporation. Under current law, U.S. corporations can be established anonymously, by hidden owners who don't reveal their identity. Our bill would change that by requiring any State that accepts anti-terrorism funding from DHS to add a new question to their existing incorporation forms asking applicants who want to set up a new U.S. corporation or limited liability company to answer a simple but important question: who are the actual owners?

That is it. One new question on an existing form. It is not a complicated question, yet the answer could play a key role in helping law enforcement do their job. Our bill would not require States to verify the information, but penalties would apply to persons who submit false information. States, or licensed formation agents if a State has delegated the task to them, would supply the ownership information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

We have all seen the news reports about U.S. corporations involved in wrongdoing, from facilitating terrorism to money laundering, financial fraud, tax evasion, corruption, and more. Let me give you a few examples.

We now know that some terrorists use U.S. shell corporations to carry out their activities. Viktor Bout, an arms dealer who has been indicted and incarcerated in the United States for conspiracy to kill U.S. nationals, used shell corporations around the world in his work, including a dozen formed in Texas, Delaware, and Florida. Mr. Bout was recently extradited from Thailand to answer for his conduct at which time Attorney General Eric Holder stated: ''Long considered one of the world's most prolific arms traffickers, Mr. Bout will now appear in federal court in Manhattan to answer to charges of conspiring to sell millions of dollars worth of weapons to a terrorist organization for use in trying to kill Americans.'' It is unacceptable that Mr. Bout was able to set up shell corporations in three of our States and use them in illicit activities without ever being asked who owned those corporations.

In another case, a New York company called the Assa Corporation owned a Manhattan skyscraper and, in 2007, wire transferred about $4.5 million in rental payments to a bank in Iran. U.S. law enforcement tracking the funds had no idea who was behind that shell corporation, until another government disclosed that it was owned by the Alavi Foundation which was known to have ties to the Iranian military. In other words, a New York corporation was being used to ship millions of U.S. dollars to Iran, a notorious supporter of terrorism.

U.S. corporations with hidden owners have also been involved in financial crimes. In 2011, a former Russian military officer, Victor Kaganov, pled guilty to operating an illegal money transmitter business from his home in

Oregon, and using Oregon shell corporations to wire more than $150 million around the world on behalf of Russian clients. U.S. Attorney Dwight Holton of the District of Oregon used stark language when describing the case: ''When shell corporations are illegally manipulated in the shadows to hide the flow of tens of millions of dollars overseas, it threatens the integrity of our financial system.''

Another recent case involves Florida attorney Scott Rothstein who, in 2010, pled guilty to fraud and money laundering in connection with a $1.2 billion Ponzi investment scheme, in which he used 85 U.S. limited liability companies to conceal his participation or ownership stake in various real estate and business ventures.

Tax evasion is another type of misconduct which all too often involves the use of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. In 2006, for example, the Subcommittee showed how Kurt Greaves, a Michigan businessman, worked with Terry Neal, an offshore promoter, to form shell corporations in Nevada, Canada, and offshore secrecy jurisdictions, to hide more than $400,000 in untaxed business income. In 2004, both Mr. Greaves and Mr. Neal pled guilty to Federal tax evasion. Also in 2006, the Subcommittee showed how two brothers from Texas, Sam and Charles Wyly, created a network of 58 trusts and shell corporations to dodge the payment of U.S. taxes, including using a set of Nevada corporations to move offshore over $190 million in stock options without paying any taxes on that compensation.

Still another area of abuse involves the misuse of U.S. corporations in handling corruption proceeds. One example involves Teodoro Obiang, who is the son of the President of Equatorial Guinea, holds office in that country, and is currently under investigation by the U.S. Justice Department, along with his father, for corruption and other misconduct. Between 2004 and 2008, Mr. Obiang used U.S. lawyers to form multiple California shell corporations with names like Beautiful Vision, Unlimited Horizon, and Sweet Pink; open bank accounts in the names of those corporations; and move millions of dollars in suspect funds through those and other U.S. banks.

One last example involves 800 U.S. corporations whose hidden owners have stumped U.S. law enforcement which, as a result, has given up investigating their suspect conduct. In October 2004, the Homeland Security Department's division of Immigration and Customs Enforcement or ICE identified a single Utah corporation that had engaged in $150 million in suspicious transactions. ICE found that the corporation had been formed in Utah and was owned by two Panama entities which, in turn, were owned by a group of Panama holding corporations, all located in the same Panama City office. By 2005, ICE had located 800 additional U.S. corporations in nearly all 50 states associated with the same shadowy group in Panama, but was unable to obtain the name of a single natural person who owned one of the corporations. ICE learned that those corporations were associated with multiple investigations into tax fraud and other wrongdoing, but no one had been able to find the corporate owners. The trail went cold, and ICE closed the case. Yet it may be that many of those U.S. corporations are still operative.

These examples of U.S. corporations with hidden owners involved in or facilitating terrorism, financial crime, tax evasion, corruption, or other misconduct provide ample evidence of the need for legislation to address the problem.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association or FLEOA, which represents more than 26,000 federal law enforcement officers and is a strong supporter of the bill, has stated that ''the unfortunate lax attitude demonstrated by certain states has enabled large criminal enterprises to exploit those State's flawed filing systems.'' FLEOA has stated further: ''[W]hile all Americans are inspired by the spirit of free enterprise, our membership does not want to see the United States adopt the financial hideaway image of Switzerland. We regard corporate ownership in the same manner as we do vehicle ownership. Requiring the driver of a vehicle to have a registration and insurance card is not a violation of their privacy. This information does not need to be published in a Yellow Pages, but it should be available to law enforcement officers who make legally authorized requests pursuant to official investigations.''

The National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys which represents more than 1,500 federal prosecutors, urges Congress to take legislative action to remedy inadequate state incorporation practices. NAAUSA has written: ''[M]indful of the ease with which criminals establish 'front organizations' to assist in money laundering, terrorist financing, tax evasion and other misconduct, it is shocking and unacceptable that many State laws permit the creation of corporations without asking for the identity of the corporation's beneficial owners. Your legislation will guard against that from happening, and no longer permit criminals to exploit the lack of transparency in the registration of corporations.''

Just last week, the Administration released a new Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime that focused, in part, on the problem of corporations with hidden owners. It stated that transnational organized criminal networks ''rely on industry experts, both witting and unwitting, to facilitate corrupt transactions and to create the necessary infrastructure to pursue their illicit schemes, such as creating shell corporations, opening offshore bank accounts in the shell corporation's name, and creating front businesses for their illegal activity and money laundering.'' The Strategy established as one of its action plans to ''[w]ork with Congress to enact legislation to require disclosure of beneficial ownership information of legal entities at the time of company formation in order to enhance transparency for law enforcement and other purposes.''

We need legislation not only to stop the abuses being committed by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, but also to meet our international commitments. In 2006, the leading international anti-money laundering body in the world, the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, known as FATF, issued a report criticizing the United States for its failure to comply with a FATF standard requiring countries to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. This standard is one of 40 FATF standards that this country has publicly committed itself to implementing as part of its efforts to promote strong anti-money laundering laws around the world.

FATF gave the United States two years, until 2008, to make progress toward coming into compliance with the FATF standard on beneficial ownership information. That deadline passed three years ago, and we have yet to make any real progress. Enacting the bill we are introducing today would bring the United States into compliance with the FATF standard by requiring the States to obtain beneficial ownership information for the corporations formed under their laws. It would ensure that the United States meets its international commitment to comply with FATF anti-money laundering standards.

The bill being introduced today is the product of years of work by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. Over ten years ago, in 2000, the Government Accountability Office, at my request, conducted an investigation and released a report entitled, ''Suspicious Banking Activities: Possible Money Laundering by U.S. Corporations Formed for Russian Entities.'' That report revealed that one person was able to set up more than 2,000 Delaware shell corporations and, without disclosing the identity of the beneficial owners, open U.S. bank accounts for those corporations, which then collectively moved about $1.4 billion through the accounts. It is one of the earliest government reports to give some sense of the law enforcement problems caused by U.S. corporations with hidden owners. The alarm it sounded years ago is still ringing.

In April 2006, in response to a second Subcommittee request, GAO released a report entitled, ''Corporation Formations: Minimal Ownership Information Is Collected and Available,'' which reviewed the corporate formation laws in all 50 States. GAO disclosed that the

vast majority of the States do not collect any information at all on the beneficial owners of the corporations and limited liability companies, or LLCs, formed under their laws. The report also found that several States have established automated procedures that allow a person to form a new corporation or LLC in the State within 24 hours of filing an online application without any prior review of that application by State personnel. In exchange for a substantial fee, at least two States will form a corporation or LLC within one hour of a request. After examining these State incorporation practices, the GAO report described the problems that the lack of beneficial ownership information has caused for a range of law enforcement investigations.

In November 2006, our Subcommittee held a hearing on the problem. At that hearing, representatives of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Department of Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network or FinCEN testified that the failure of States to collect adequate information on the beneficial owners of the legal entities they form had impeded federal efforts to investigate and prosecute criminal acts such as terrorism, money laundering, securities fraud, and tax evasion. At the hearing, the Justice Department testified: ''We had allegations of corrupt foreign officials using these [U.S.] shell accounts to launder money, but were unable—due to lack of identifying information in the corporate records—to fully investigate this area.'' The IRS testified: ''Within our own borders, the laws of some states regarding the formation of legal entities have significant transparency gaps which may even rival the secrecy afforded in the most attractive tax havens.'' As part of its testimony, FinCEN described identifying 768 incidents of suspicious international wire transfer activity involving U.S. shell corporations.

The next year, in 2007, in a ''Dirty Dozen'' list of tax scams active that year, the IRS highlighted shell corporations with hidden owners as number four on the list. It wrote:

> 4. Disguised Corporate Ownership: Domestic shell corporations and other entities are being formed and operated in certain states for the purpose of disguising the ownership of the business or financial activity. Once formed, these anonymous entities can be, and are being, used to facilitate underreporting of income, non-filing of tax returns, listed transactions, money laundering, financial crimes and possibly terrorist financing. The IRS is working with state authorities to identify these entities and to bring their owners into compliance.

It was also in 2007, that we first introduced our bipartisan legislation, which was S. 2956 back then, to stop the formation of U.S. corporations with hidden owners. It was a Levin-Coleman-Obama bill. When asked about the bill in 2008, then DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff wrote: ''In countless investigations, where the criminal targets utilize shell corporations, the lack of law enforcement's ability to gain access to true beneficial ownership information slows, confuses or impedes the efforts by investigators to follow criminal proceeds.''

In 2009, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee held two hearings which examined not only the problem, but also possible solutions, including our by then revised bill, S. 569. At the first hearing entitled, ''Examining State Business Incorporation Practices: A Discussion of the Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act,'' held in June 2009, DHS testified that ''shell corporations established in the United States have been utilized to commit crimes against individuals around the world.'' The Manhattan District Attorney's office testified: ''For those of us in law enforcement, these issues with shell corporations are not some abstract idea. This is what we do and deal with every day. We see these shell corporations being used by criminal organizations, and the record is replete with examples of their use for money laundering, for their use in tax evasion, and for their use in securities fraud.''

At the second hearing, ''Business Formation and Financial Crime: Finding a Legislative Solution,'' held in November 2009, the Justice Department again testified about criminals using U.S. shell corporations. It also noted that ''each of these examples involves the relatively rare instance in which law enforcement was able to identify the perpetrator misusing U.S. shell corporations. Far too often, we are unable to do so.'' The Treasury Department testified that ''the ability of illicit actors to form corporations in the United States without disclosing their true identity presents a serious vulnerability and there is ample evidence that criminal organizations and others who threaten our national security exploit this vulnerability.''

The 2009 hearings also presented evidence of dozens of Internet websites advertising corporate formation services that highlighted the ability of corporations to be formed in the United States without asking for the identity of the beneficial owners. These websites explicitly pointed to anonymous ownership as a reason to incorporate within the United States, and often listed certain States alongside notorious offshore jurisdictions as preferred locations in which to form new corporations, essentially providing an open invitation for wrongdoers to form entities within the United States.

One website, for example, set up by an international incorporation firm, advocated setting up corporations in Delaware by saying: ''DELAWARE—An Offshore Tax Haven for Non US Residents.'' It cited as one of Delaware's advantages that: ''Owners' names are not disclosed to the state.'' Another website, from a U.K. firm called ''formacorporation-offshore.com,'' listed the advantages to incorporating in Nevada. Those advantages included: ''Stockholders are not on Public Record allowing complete anonymity.''

During the 2009 hearings, I presented evidence of how one Wyoming outfit was selling so-called shelf corporations—corporations formed and then left ''on the shelf'' for later sale to purchasers who could then pretend the corporations had been in operation for years. More recently, a June 2011 Reuters news article wrote a detailed expose of how that same outfit, called Wyoming Corporate Services, has formed thousands of U.S. corporations all across the country, all with hidden owners. The article quoted the website as follows: ''A corporation is a legal person created by state statute that can be used as a fall guy, a servant, a good friend or a decoy. A person you control . . . yet cannot be held accountable for its actions. Imagine the possibilities!''

The article described a small house in Cheyenne, Wyoming, which Wyoming Corporate Services used to provide a U.S. address for more than 2,000 corporations that it had helped to form. The article described ''the walls of the main room'' as ''covered floor to ceiling with numbered mailboxes labeled as corporate suites.'' The article reported that among the corporations using the address was a shell corporation controlled by a former Ukranian prime minister, Pavlo Lazarenko, who had been convicted of money laundering and extortion; a corporation indicted for helping online-poker operators evade a U.S. ban on Internet gambling; and two corporations barred from U.S. federal contracting for selling counterfeit truck parts to the Pentagon. The article observed that Wyoming Corporate Services continued to sell shelf corporations that existed solely on paper but could show a history of regulatory and tax filings, despite having had no real U.S. operations. That's what is going on right now, here in our own backyard, with respect to U.S. corporations.

Despite the evidence of U.S. corporations being misused by organized crime, terrorists, tax evaders, and other wrongdoers, and despite years of law enforcement complaints, many of our States are reluctant to admit there is a problem in establishing U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. Too many of our States are eager to explain how quick and easy it is to set up corporations within their borders, without acknowledging that those same quick and easy procedures enable wrongdoers to utilize U.S. corporations in a variety of crimes and tax dodges both here and abroad.

Beginning in 2006, the Subcommittee worked with the States to encourage them to recognize the homeland security problem they'd created and to come up with their own solution. After the Subcommittee's 2006 hearing on this issue, for example, the National Association of Secretaries of State or

NASS convened a 2007 task force to examine state incorporation practices. At the request of NASS and several States, I delayed introducing legislation while they worked on a proposal to require the collection of beneficial ownership information. My Subcommittee staff participated in multiple conferences, telephone calls, and meetings; suggested key principles; and provided comments to the Task Force.

In July 2007, the NASS task force issued a proposal. Rather than cure the problem, however, the proposal had many deficiencies, leading the Treasury Department to state in a letter that the NASS proposal ''falls short'' and ''does not fully address the problem of legal entities masking the identity of criminals.''

Among other shortcomings, the NASS proposal would not require States to obtain the names of the natural individuals who would be the beneficial owners of a U.S. corporation or LLC. Instead, it would allow States to obtain a list of a corporation's ''owners of record'' who can be, and often are, offshore corporations or trusts. The NASS proposal also did not require the States themselves to maintain the beneficial ownership information, or to supply it to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. Instead, law enforcement would have to get the information from the suspect corporation or one of its agents, thereby tipping off the corporation to the investigation. The proposal also failed to require the beneficial ownership information to be updated over time. These and other flaws in the proposal were identified by the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and others, but NASS decided to continue on the same course.

NASS enlisted the help of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws or NCCUSL, which produced a proposed model law for States that wanted to adopt the NASS approach. NCCUSL presented its proposal at the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee's June 2009 hearing, where it was subjected to significant criticism. The Manhattan District Attorney's office, for example, testified: ''I say without hesitation or reservation—that from a law enforcement perspective, the bill proposed by NCCUSL would be worse than no bill at all. And there are two very basic reasons for this. It eliminates the ability of law enforcement to get corporate information without alerting the target of the investigation that the investigation is ongoing. That is the primary reason. It also sets up a system that is time-consuming and complicated.''

The Department of Justice testified: ''Senator, I would submit to you that in a criminal organization everyone knows who is in control and this will not be an issue of determining who is in control. What we are concerned about here from the law enforcement perspective are the criminals and the criminal organizations and so what we are asking is that when criminals use shell companies, they provide the name of the beneficial owner. That is the person who is in control, the criminal in control, as opposed to the NCCUSL proposal where they are suggesting that instead two nominees are provided—two nominees between law enforcement and the criminal in control.''

Despite these criticisms, NCCUSL finalized its model law in July 2009, issuing it under the title, ''Uniform Law Enforcement Access to Entity Information Act.'' At the November 2009 hearing, law enforcement again criticized the NCCUSL model law. At the hearing, Senator Levin asked: ''Now the NCCUSL, in their proposal just requires a records contact and that records contact could simply be an owner of record, which could be a shell corporation, putting us right back into a circle which leads absolutely nowhere in terms of finding the beneficial owners. Would you agree that the approach of NCCUSL in this regard is not acceptable, Ms. Shasky?'' The Justice Department representative, Jennifer Shasky, responded: ''Yes, Senator. To allow companies to provide anything less than the beneficial owner information merely provides criminals with an opportunity to evade responsibility and put nominees between themselves and the true perpetrator.'' With regard to NCCUSL's proposal, the Treasury representative, David Cohen, testified: ''[T]here is not an obligation for that live person to not be a nominee. And what I think is important in the legislation is that we get at the true beneficial owner and not someone who may be a nominee.''

In addition to its flaws, the NCCUSL model law has proven unpopular with the States for whom it was written. Despite the effort and fanfare attached to this uniform law, after two years of sitting on the books, not a single State has adopted it or given any indication of doing so.

It is deeply disappointing that the States, despite the passage of five years since FATF first called upon the United States to meet its commitment to collect beneficial ownership information, have been unable to devise an effective proposal. Part of the difficulty is that the States have a wide range of practices, differ on the extent to which they rely on incorporation fees as a major source of revenue, and differ on the extent to which they attract non-U.S. persons as incorporators. In addition, the States are competing against each other to attract persons who want to set up U.S. corporations, and that competition creates pressure for each individual State to favor procedures that allow quick and easy incorporations, with no questions asked. It's a classic case of competition causing a race to the bottom, making it difficult for any one State to do the right thing and request the identity of the persons behind the incorporation efforts.

That is why Federal legislation in this area is critical. Federal legislation is needed to level the playing field among the States, set minimum standards for obtaining beneficial ownership information, put an end to the practice of States forming millions of legal entities each year without knowing who is behind them, and bring the United States into compliance with its international commitments.

The bill's provisions would require the States to obtain from incorporation applicants a list of the beneficial owners of each corporation or LLC formed under their laws, to maintain this information for a period of years after a corporation is terminated, and to provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons. The bill would also require corporations and LLCs to update their beneficial ownership information on a regular basis. The ownership information would be kept by the State or, if a State maintains a formation agent licensing system and delegates this task, by a State's licensed formation agents.

The particular information that would have to be provided for each beneficial owner is the owner's name, address, and unique identifying number from a State drivers license or U.S. passport. The bill would not require States or their licensed formation agents to verify this information, but penalties would apply to persons who submitted false information.

In the case of U.S. corporations formed by individuals who do not possess a drivers license or passport from the United States, the bill would require the incorporation application to include a written certification from a formation agent residing within the State attesting to the fact that the agent had obtained and verified the identity of the non-U.S. beneficial owners of the corporation, by obtaining their names, addresses, and identifying information from a non-expired non-U.S. passport. The formation agent would be required to retain this information in the State for a specified period of time and produce it upon receipt of a subpoena or summons from law enforcement.

To ensure that its provisions are tightly targeted, the bill would exempt a wide range of corporations from the disclosure obligation. It would exempt, for example, virtually all highly regulated corporations, because we already know who owns them. That includes all publicly-traded corporations, banks, broker-dealers, commodity brokers, registered investment funds, registered accounting firms, insurers, utilities, and charities that file returns with the IRS. The bill would also exempt corporations with a substantial U.S. presence, including at least 20 employees physically located in the United States, since those individuals could provide law enforcement with the leads needed to trace a corporation's true owners. In addition, the bill would exempt corporations whose beneficial

ownership information would not benefit the public interest or assist law enforcement. These exemptions dramatically reduce the number of corporations who would be required to provide beneficial ownership information to ensure that the bill's disclosure obligation is focused on only those whose owners' identities are currently hidden.

The bill does not take a position on the issue of whether the States should make the beneficial ownership information available to the public. Instead, the bill leaves it entirely up to the States to decide whether, under what circumstances, and to what extent to make beneficial ownership information available to the public. The bill explicitly permits the States to place restrictions on providing beneficial ownership information to persons other than government officials. The bill focuses instead on ensuring that law enforcement with a subpoena or summons is given ready access to the beneficial ownership information.

Relative to the costs of compliance, the bill provides States with access to two separate funding sources, neither of which involves appropriated funds. For the first three years after the bill's enactment, the bill directs both the Treasury and Justice Departments to make funds available from their individual forfeiture programs to States seeking to comply with the requirements of the Act. These forfeiture funds are not appropriated taxpayer dollars; instead they are the proceeds of forfeiture actions taken against persons involved in money laundering, drug trafficking, or other wrongdoing. The two forfeiture funds typically contain between $300 and $500 million at a time. The bill would direct a total of $30 million over three years to be provided to the States from the two funds to carry out the Act. These provisions would ensure that States have adequate funds for the modest compliance costs involved with adding a new question to their incorporation forms requesting the names of the covered corporations' beneficial owners.

It is common for bills establishing minimum Federal standards to seek to ensure State action by making some Federal funding dependent upon a State's meeting the specified standards. Our bill, however, states explicitly that nothing in its provisions authorizes DHS to withhold funds from a State for failing to modify its incorporation practices to meet the beneficial ownership information requirements in the Act. Instead, the bill calls for a GAO report in 2015 to identify which States, if any, have failed to strengthen their incorporation practices as required by the Act. After getting this status report, a future Congress can decide what steps to take, including whether to reduce any funding going to noncompliant States.

The bill also contains a provision that would require corporations bidding on Federal contracts to provide the same beneficial ownership information to the Federal Government as provided to the relevant State. The Subcommittee has become aware of instances in which the Federal Government has found itself doing business with U.S. corporations whose owners are hidden. It's important that when the Federal Government contracts to do business with someone, it knows who it is dealing with.

Finally, the bill would require the Treasury Department to issue a rule requiring U.S. formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to ensure they are not forming U.S. corporations or LLCs for wrongdoers. The bill requires the programs to be risk based so that formation agents can target their preventative efforts toward persons who pose a high risk of being involved with money laundering. GAO would also be asked to conduct a study of existing State formation procedures for partnerships, trusts, and charitable organizations.

We have worked with the Departments of Homeland Security, Treasury, and Justice to craft a bill that would address, in a fair and reasonable way, the homeland security problems created by States allowing the formation of millions of U.S. corporations and LLCs with hidden owners. What the bill comes down to is a simple requirement that States change their incorporation applications to add a single question requesting identifying information for the true owners of the corporations they form. That is not too much to ask to protect this country and the international community from wrongdoers seeking to misuse U.S. corporations.

For those who say that, if the United States tightens its incorporation rules, new corporations will be formed elsewhere, it is appropriate to ask exactly where they will go. Every country in the European Union is already required to have their formation agents collect beneficial information for the corporations formed by those agents. Most offshore jurisdictions also already require request this information to be collected, including the Bahamas, Cayman Islands, and the Channel Islands. Countries around the world already request beneficial ownership information, in part because of their commitment to FATF's international anti-money laundering standards. Our 50 States should be asking for the same ownership information, but there is no indication that they will any time in the near future, unless required to do so.

I wish Federal legislation weren't necessary. I wish the States could solve this homeland security problem on their own, but ongoing competitive pressures make it unlikely that the States will do the right thing. It is been more than five years since our 2006 hearing on this issue and more than two years since the States came up with a model law on the subject, with no progress to speak of, despite repeated pleas from law enforcement.

Federal legislation is necessary to reduce the vulnerability of the United States to wrongdoing by U.S. corporations with hidden owners, to protect interstate and international commerce from criminals misusing U.S. corporations, to strengthen the ability of law enforcement to investigate suspect U.S. corporations, to level the playing field among the States, and to bring the United States into compliance with its international anti-money laundering obligations.

There is also an issue of consistency. For years, I have been fighting offshore corporate secrecy laws and practices that enable wrongdoers to secretly control offshore corporations involved in money laundering, tax evasion, and other misconduct. I have pointed out on more than one occasion that corporations were not created to hide ownership, but to protect owners from personal liability for corporate acts. Unfortunately, today, the corporate form has too often been corrupted into serving those who wish to conceal their identities. It is past time to stop this misuse of the corporate form. But if we want to stop inappropriate corporate secrecy offshore, we need to stop it here at home as well.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation and putting an end to incorporation practices that promote corporate secrecy and render the United States and other countries vulnerable to abuse by U.S. corporations with hidden owners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a bill summary be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF INCORPORATION TRANSPARENCY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

August 2, 2011

To protect the United States from U.S. corporations being misused to support terrorism, money laundering, tax evasion, or other misconduct, the Levin-Grassley Incorporation Transparency and Law Enforcement Assistance Act would:

Beneficial Ownership Information. Require the States directly or through licensed formation agents to obtain the names of beneficial owners of corporations or limited liability companies (LLCs) formed under a State's laws, ensure this information is updated, and provide the information to law enforcement upon receipt of a subpoena or summons.

Identifying Information. Require corporations to provide beneficial owners' names, addresses, and a U.S. drivers license or passport number; or if the owners do not have either a U.S. drivers license nor passport, information from their non-U.S. passports.

Federal Contractors. Require corporations bidding on federal contracts to provide the same beneficial ownership information to the federal government.

Shelf Corporations. Require formation agents selling ''shelf corporations''—companies formed for later sale to a third party—to identify the beneficial owners of those corporations.

Penalties for False Information. Establish penalties for persons who knowingly provide false information, or willfully fail to provide required information, on beneficial ownership.

Exemptions. Exempt from the disclosure obligation regulated corporations, including publicly traded companies, banks, broker-dealers, insurers, registered investment funds, and charities; corporations with a substantial U.S. presence; and corporations whose beneficial ownership information would not benefit the public interest or assist law enforcement.

Funding. Provide $30 million over three years to States from existing Treasury and Justice Department forfeiture funds to pay for the costs of complying with the Act.

State Compliance Report. Specify that nothing in the Act authorizes funds to be withheld from any State for failure to comply with the Act, but also require a GAO report by 2015 identifying which States are not in compliance so a future Congress can determine what steps to take.

Transition Period. Give the State' s three years, until October 2014, to require beneficial ownership information for corporations and LLCs formed under their laws.

Anti-Money Laundering Safeguards. Require paid formation agents to establish anti-money laundering programs to guard against supplying U.S. corporations or LLCs that facilitate misconduct. Attorneys using paid formation agents would be exempt from this requirement.

GAO Study. Require GAO to complete a study of State beneficial ownership information requirements for partnerships, charities, and trusts.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1485. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to include ultralight vehicles under the definition of aircraft for purposes of the aviation smuggling provisions under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the Ultralight Aircraft Smuggling Prevention Act, legislation that will crack down on smugglers who use ultralight aircraft, also known as ULAs, to bring drugs across the U.S.-Mexico border. I am pleased to be working on this in a bipartisan manner with Senator HELLER, who introduced a very similar bill last year in the House with Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS. That bill passed overwhelmingly by a 412–3 vote. I hope we can have a similar bipartisan result here in the Senate.

ULAs are single-pilot aircraft capable of flying low, landing and taking off quickly, and are typically used for sport or for recreation. However, because of increased detection and interdiction of more traditional smuggling conveyances, ULAs have increasingly been employed along the Southwest border by Mexican drug trafficking organizations to smuggle drugs into the United States.

The use of ULAs by drug smugglers presents a unique challenge for Border Patrol and prosecutors. Every year hundreds of ULAs are flown across the Southwest border and each one can carry hundreds of pounds of narcotics. Under existing law, ULAs are not categorized as aircraft by the Federal Aviation Administration, so they do not fall under the aviation smuggling provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. This means that a drug smuggler piloting a small airplane is subject to much stronger criminal penalties than a smuggler who pilots a ULA.

Our bill will close this unintended loophole and establish the same penalties if convicted—a maximum sentence of 20 years in prison and a $25,000 fine—for smuggling drugs on ULAs as currently exist for smuggling on airplanes or in automobiles. This is a common sense solution that will give our law enforcement agencies and prosecutors additional tools they need to combat drug smuggling.

The bill would also add an attempt and conspiracy provision to the aviation smuggling law to allow prosecutors to charge people other than the pilot who are involved in aviation smuggling. This would give them a new tool to prosecute the ground crews who aid the pilots as well as those who pick up the drug loads that are dropped from ULAs in the U.S. Finally, the bill directs the Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security to collaborate in identifying equipment and technology used by DOD that could be used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to detect ULAs.

In addition to Senator HELLER, I am pleased to be joined by Senators BINGAMAN and FEINSTEIN in introducing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the Ultralight Aircraft Smuggling Prevention Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an article be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1485

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 ''Ultralight Aircraft Smuggling Prevention Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE AVIATION SMUGGLING PROVISIONS OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 590 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1590) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) DEFINITION OF AIRCRAFT.—As used in this section, the term 'aircraft' includes an ultralight vehicle, as defined by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.''.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Subsection (d) of section 590 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1590(d)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', or attempts or conspires to commit,'' after ''commits''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply with respect to violations of any provision of section 590 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, identify equipment and technology used by the Department of Defense that could also be used by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to detect and track the illicit use of ultralight aircraft near the international border between the United States and Mexico.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 19, 2011]

ULTRALIGHT AIRCRAFT NOW FERRYING DRUGS ACROSS U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

MEXICAN ORGANIZED CRIME GROUPS ARE USING ULTRALIGHT AIRCRAFT TO DROP MARIJUANA BUNDLES IN AGRICULTURAL FIELDS AND DESERT SCRUB ACROSS THE U.S. BORDER. THE INCURSIONS ARE HARD TO DETECT AND ARE ON THE UPSWING.

(By Richard Marosi)

They fly low and slow over the border, their wings painted black and motors humming faintly under moonlit skies. The pilots, some armed in the open cockpits, steer the horizontal control bar with one hand and pull a latch with the other, releasing 250-pound payloads that land with a thud, leaving only craters as evidence of another successful smuggling run.

Mexican organized crime groups, increasingly stymied by stepped-up enforcement on land, have dug tunnels and captained boats to get drugs across the U.S.-Mexico border. Now they are taking to the skies, using ultralight aircraft that resemble motorized hang gliders to drop marijuana bundles in agricultural fields and desert scrub across the Southwest border.

What began with a few flights in Arizona in 2008 is now common from Texas to California's Imperial Valley and, mostly recently, San Diego, where at least two ultralights suspected of carrying drugs have been detected flying over Interstate 8, according to U.S. border authorities.

The number of incursions by ultralights reached 228 in the last federal fiscal year ending Sept. 30, almost double from the previous year. Seventy-one have been detected in this fiscal year through April, according to border authorities.

Flying at night with lights out, and zipping back across the border in minutes, ultralight aircraft sightings are rare, but often dramatic. At least two have been chased out of Arizona skies by Black Hawk Customs and Border Protection helicopters and F–16 jet fighters. Last month, a pair of visiting British helicopter pilots almost crashed into an ultralight during training exercises over the Imperial Valley.

The smuggling work is fraught with danger. High winds can flip the light aircraft. Moonlight provides illumination, but some pilots wear night-vision goggles. Others fly over major roads to orient themselves. Drop zones are illuminated by ground crews using strobe lights or glow sticks. There is little room for error.

At least one pilot has been paralyzed; another died in a crash.

In Calexico, Det. Mario Salinas was walking to his car one morning last year when he heard something buzzing over the Police Department on 5th Street. ''I hear this weird noise, like a lawn mower. I look up and I see this small plane,'' said Salinas, who pursued the aircraft before it eluded him as it flew over the desert.

The ultralight activity is seen as strong evidence that smugglers are having an increasingly difficult time getting marijuana over land crossings. Authorities noticed a surge in flights in Imperial County after newly erected fencing along California's southeast corner blocked smugglers from crossing desert dunes in all-terrain vehicles.

U.S. Border Patrol agents, accustomed to scouring for footprints and tracks in the sand, have had to adapt. They are now instructed to turn off their engines and roll

down their windows so they can listen for incursions by air.

''We're trained to look down and at the fence. Now we have to look up for tell-tale signs of ultralight traffic,'' said Roy D. Villarreal, deputy chief patrol agent of the El Centro sector in the Imperial Valley.

Although the new trend poses serious challenges, authorities point out that ultralights are a decidedly inefficient way of getting drugs across the border. Traffickers who once moved thousands of pounds of drugs across the border now appear to be packing their loads by the pound, not the ton, authorities say.

The ultralights—lightweight planes typically used as recreational aircraft—are customized for smuggling purposes. All-terrain wheels are added for bumpy landings. Second seats are ripped out to add fuel capacity. Drugs are loaded onto metal baskets affixed to the bottom of the framing. From 150 to 250 pounds of marijuana are generally carried, depending on the weight of the pilot. Some ultralights are shrouded in black paint, with even the plastic tarp covers for the marijuana blackened for stealth entries.

Radar operators at Riverside County's Air and Marine Operations Center, where general aviation air traffic across the country is monitored, have trouble detecting the aircraft.

Flying as low as 500 feet, their small frames are hard to distinguish from trucks. Many appear, then disappear from radar screens. Others never appear at all, and the ultralight trend has prompted border authorities to develop new radar technologies specifically designed to detect the aircraft.

''There are indications of larger amounts of activity,'' said Tony Crowder, director of the Air and Marine Operations Center, which is housed at March Air Reserve Base.

The close cooperation among radar operators, helicopter pilots and agents on the ground has resulted in some successes.

Ultralight pilots no longer land on U.S. soil after authorities began responding quickly to offloading sites. The Mexican Army has seized four ultralights around Baja California in recent weeks after being tipped off by U.S. authorities.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1486. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to clarify and expand on criteria applicable to patient admission to and care furnished in long-term care hospitals participating in the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Long-Term Care Hospital Improvement Act of 2011, with the support of my colleague Mr. NELSON of Florida. This legislation develops new federal standards and certification criteria for Long Term Acute Care Hospitals, LTCHs.

We are also joined by Senators CRAPO, WYDEN, TOOMEY and HELLER, in introducing this bill. We hope to get the support of many more of our colleagues.

This legislation has the support of the major hospital associations, including the American Hospital Association, AHA, the Federation of American Hospitals, FAH, and the Acute Long Term Hospital Association, ALTHA.

As many of you know, Long-Term Acute Care Hospitals, referred to as LTCHs, specialize in treating medically complex patients who need longer than usual hospital stays, on average 25 days. By comparison, the average stay for a patient in a general acute hospital is only 5–6 days.

LTCHs, like rehabilitation hospitals and nursing homes, often care for patients who are discharged from a general hospital. Because of that, LTCHs are sometimes referred to as post-acute care providers. However, LTCHs are fully licensed and certified as acute care hospitals. There are approximately 425 LTCHs in the nation, compared to approximately 12,000 nursing homes and 1,400 rehabilitation hospitals. LTCH patients are very ill, with many suffering from complex respiratory issues, including those who are ventilator dependent, or other complex medical issues. LTCHs account for about of Medicare spending.

The bill that I am introducing today implements a comprehensive set of federal criteria that will supplement existing Medicare classification criteria for LTCHs. These criteria are designed to ensure that LTCHs are treating high acuity patients who need extended hospital stays. Analysis by the Moran Company estimates that these criteria could generate approximately $374 million over 5 years and $2.7 billion over 10 years. The bill is expected to result in a net savings of $500 million over 10 years. I plan to work with CBO to confirm that estimate.

This legislation will generate savings for the Medicare program; promote patients being cared for in the most appropriate setting; and, protect access to LTCH care for medically acute beneficiaries who need extended stays due to their complex condition.

This is not a new concept and the American Hospital Association has been working on this issue for years. In August 2010, the AHA initiated a workgroup representing a cross section of the nation' LTCHs and larger general hospital systems including Geisinger Medical System, Pennsylvania, and Partners HealthCare System, Inc., Boston. The goals of the AHA workgroup were to develop policy recommendations for uniform LTCH patient and facility criteria; distinguish LTCH hospitals from general acute hospitals and all post-acute settings; assess fiscal impact, with goal of showing overall Medicare savings; develop consensus among AHA's LTCH members; and achieve relief from the LTCH ''25 percent Rule.''

We believe that we have accomplished these goals with my legislation. Additionally, for a body that just voted on a debt ceiling increase, this bill has the potential to achieve significant savings.

I hope that my colleagues will agree with me and that this legislation is something that they can support. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Long-Term Care Hospital Improvement Act of 2011.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to expand the electric rate-setting authority of States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce the PURPA PLUS Act.

In my home State we have numerous emerging small renewable energy technologies, such as wave energy buoys, hydropower turbines in irrigation canals, biomass burning cogeneration facilities and rooftop solar installations. Like Oregon, many States have sought to advance new electricity technologies by providing these kinds of projects with higher power purchase rates for their power than utility companies normally pay for electricity. These incentive rates allow individuals and small businesses to recover money they invest in solar panels or other electricity generation projects over a reasonable period of time.

The PURPA PLUS Act simply provides States the clear legal authority to set these incentive rates for small renewable energy projects. Currently, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, has exclusive jurisdiction over wholesale energy prices. Under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, PURPA, FERC regulates the price that utility companies pay for electricity from small, independent power providers and that rate can be no higher than what it would normally cost a utility company to buy additional power, known as ''avoided cost''. My bill would transfer the authority for setting power purchase rates for small power projects of less than 2 megawatts from FERC to the States. This transfer is voluntary. If a State chose to exercise this authority to promote small wind energy development, or solar, or cogeneration projects, it could. If a State chose not to use this authority, FERC would continue to regulate these projects as before. By capping the project size at 2 megawatts, the bill only extends this new authority for small projects that are providing very small amounts of power to the local utility company. It would leave regulation of large wind farms, hydroprojects and other large renewable energy projects that often sell their power to out-of-state customers unchanged. Conversely, it shouldn't be necessary for the Federal Government to get involved in setting rates for solar panels on top of a house or apartment building.

At a time when both State legislatures and the Federal Government are tightening their purse strings on grants, loans and tax incentives for the development of renewable energy projects, this legislation would give State public utility commissions another tool to promote small renewable resources. In Oregon, the State legislature and State utility commission have already established a pilot program to spur residential rooftop solar projects.

Oregon's utility commission also has a program that allows net metering of renewable customer-produced energy where customers are charged for the extra energy they buy from the utility company minus the amount of electricity produced themselves. This bill will simply provide these programs stronger legal footing, and allow States to expand these sorts of programs if they wish.

While I acknowledge that the power from these small projects may be more expensive than a large central generation station powered by coal or gas, I believe that States should be able to consider the associated benefits of small renewable power and set higher prices when the benefits outweigh the costs if they choose. Benefits of small renewable energy projects include local job creation, less investment in high-voltage transmission lines, diversity in an area's power generation portfolio, and the environmental benefits of green energy.

The bill has the support of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, which represents the individual State commissions, as well as the Solar Energy Industry Association, the Distributed Wind Energy Association, the Clean Coalition and the Oregon Public Utility Commission. I am very pleased to be introducing this bill with my colleague on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator COONS. I hope that many of our colleagues will join us in supporting this bill.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1492. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Three Kids Mine Reclamation Act of 2011. My legislation transfers approximately 900 acres of federal land to the city of Henderson to facilitate the remediation and redevelopment of a dangerous abandoned mine site near Lake Mead.

The Three Kids mine was originally developed during World War I to provide manganese needed to harden steel used by the U.S. military. The mine and mill continued to support the building of warships and tanks through 1961 after which it was mostly abandoned and used occasionally as a storage site for federal manganese reserves. The Three Kids site was forgotten for decades until the population explosion in southern Nevada put the mine right in people's backyards.

The Three Kids Mine site is littered with hazards that include three large mine pits that are hundreds of feet deep, ruins from the mine facility, and a sludge pool of mine tailings made up of arsenic, lead, and diesel fuel. As a result of how the mine was developed and managed, approximately 75 percent of the area is federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, and the Bureau of Reclamation, while part of the site is privately owned. Unfortunately, because of the complicated land ownership pattern and the immense cost of clean-up, the Federal Government was never able to initiate the reclamation process.

To turn the Three Kids Mine site into a job-creating opportunity while also cleaning up this public health and safety hazard, my legislation directs the BLM to convey the Federal portions of the site to the Henderson Redevelopment Agency for the fair market value after taking into consideration the cost of cleanup for the whole mine site. The city of Henderson will then be able to take advantage of Nevada redevelopment laws and work with local developers to finance and implement a plan to remediate the abandoned toxic mine site. Local officials and developers will finally be able to turn this wasteland into safe, productive land for the local community. The project will take decades from start to finish, but the city and the developers are committed to the effort and worked hard to put together a viable plan to fix this old problem without costing taxpayers a dime for cleanup.

Keeping our communities safe, healthy, and livable is critical. Removing this physical and environmental hazard from southern Nevada is a high priority for the city of Henderson and our delegation. I appreciate your help and I look forward to working with the Senate Energy Committee to move this legislation forward in the near future.

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. 1492

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 ''Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 948 acres of Bureau of Reclamation and Bureau of Land Management land within the Three Kids Mine Project site, as depicted on the map.

(2) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE; POLLUTANT OR CONTAMINANT; RELEASE; REMEDY; RESPONSE.—The terms ''hazardous substance'', ''pollutant or contaminant'', ''release'', ''remedy'', and ''response'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(3) HENDERSON REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—The term ''Henderson Redevelopment Agency'' means the redevelopment agency of the City of Henderson, Nevada, established and authorized to transact business and exercise the powers of the agency in accordance with the Nevada Community Redevelopment Law (Nev. Rev. Stat. 279.382 to 279.685).

(4) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Three Kids Mine Project Area'' and dated August 2, 2011.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(7) THREE KIDS MINE PROJECT SITE.—The term ''Three Kids Mine Project Site'' means the approximately 1,262 acres of land that is—

(A) comprised of—

(i) the Federal land; and

(ii) the approximately 314 acres of adjacent non-Federal land; and

(B) depicted as the ''Three Kids Mine Project Site'' on the map.

SEC. 3. LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713) and section 120 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620), and any other provision of law, as soon as practicable after the conditions described in subsection (b) have been met, and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall convey to the Henderson Redevelopment Agency all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) CONDITIONS.—

(1) APPRAISAL; FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the Henderson Redevelopment Agency shall pay the fair market value of the Federal land, if any, as determined under subparagraph (B) and as adjusted under subparagraph (E).

(B) APPRAISAL.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land based on an appraisal—

(i) that is conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(ii) that does not take into account any existing contamination associated with historical mining on the Federal land.

(C) REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION COSTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a reasonable estimate of the costs to assess, remediate, and reclaim the Three Kids Mine Project Site.

(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—The estimate prepared under clause (i) shall be—

(I) based on the results of a comprehensive Phase II environmental site assessment of the Three Kids Mine Project Site prepared by the Henderson Redevelopment Agency or a designee that has been approved by the State; and

(II) prepared in accordance with the current version of the ASTM International Standard E–2137–06 entitled ''Standard Guide for Estimating Monetary Costs and Liabilities for Environmental Matters.''

(iii) ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS.—The Phase II environmental site assessment prepared under clause (ii)(I) shall, without limiting any additional requirements that may be required by the State, be conducted in accordance with the procedures of—

(I) the most recent version of ASTM International Standard E–1527–05 entitled ''Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process''; and

(II) ASTM International Standard E–1903–97entitled ''Standard Guide for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Process'' (2002).

(iv) REVIEW OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review and consider cost information proffered

by the Henderson Redevelopment Agency and the State in the preparation of the estimate under this subparagraph.

(II) FINAL DETERMINATION.—If there is a disagreement among the Secretary, Henderson Redevelopment Agency, and the State over the reasonable estimate of costs under this subparagraph, the parties shall jointly select 1 or more experts to assist the Secretary in making the final estimate of the costs.

(D) DEADLINE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall begin the appraisal and cost estimates under subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

(E) ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall administratively adjust the fair market value of the Federal land, as determined under subparagraph (B), based on the estimate of remediation, and reclamation costs, as determined under subparagraph (C).

(2) MINE REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION AGREEMENT EXECUTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be contingent on the Secretary receiving from the State written notification that a mine remediation and reclamation agreement has been executed in accordance with subparagraph (B).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The mine remediation and reclamation agreement required under subparagraph (A) shall be an enforceable consent order or agreement administered by the State that—

(i) obligates a party to perform the remediation and reclamation work at the Three Kids Mine Project Site necessary to complete a permanent and appropriately protective remedy to existing environmental contamination and hazardous conditions; and

(ii) contains provisions determined to be necessary by the State, including financial assurance provisions to ensure the completion of the remedy.

(3) NOTIFICATION FROM AGENCY.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall receive from the Henderson Redevelopment Agency written notification that the Henderson Redevelopment Agency is prepared to accept conveyance of the Federal land under that subsection.

SEC. 4. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, for the 10-year period beginning on the earlier of the date of enactment of this Act or the date of the conveyance required by this Act, the Federal land is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, operation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and the geothermal leasing laws.

(b) EXISTING RECLAMATION WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights, any withdrawal under the public land laws that includes all or any portion of the Federal land for which the Bureau of Reclamation has determined that the Bureau of Reclamation has no further need under applicable law is relinquished and revoked solely to the extent necessary—

(1) to exclude from the withdrawal the property that is no longer needed; and

(2) to allow for the immediate conveyance of the Federal land as required under this Act.

SEC. 5. ACEC BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

Notwithstanding section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713), the boundary of the River Mountains Area of Critical Environmental Concern (NVN 76884) is adjusted to exclude any portion of the Three Kids Mine Project Site consistent with the map.

SEC. 6. RELEASE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Upon making the conveyance under section 3, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States is released from any and all liabilities or claims of any kind or nature arising from the presence, release, or threat of release of any hazardous substance, pollutant, contaminant, petroleum product (or derivative of a petroleum product of any kind), solid waste, mine materials or mining-related features (including tailings, overburden, waste rock, mill remnants, pits, or other hazards resulting from the presence of mining related features) at the Three Kids Mine Project Site in existence on or before the date of the conveyance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1495. A bill to amend the school dropout prevention program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce Early Intervention for Graduation Success Authorization Act. This legislation would, if enacted, amend the current School Dropout Prevention provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It would focus attention on identifying and helping students who are at risk to not graduate from high school as early as pre-kindergarten and through elementary and middle school.

Some may ask, ''Why are you concentrating on toddlers and elementary school children when you are trying to solve the high school dropout crisis facing our Nation? Why not focus attention and our Nation's scarce resources on high school students, or even middle school students?''

The reason is simple. Early on is when children's troubles in school begin, and an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. High school and middle school students do not just wake up one day and say, ''I think I'll drop out of school today.'' Twenty-five years of research tells us that dropping out is a long process of frustration, alienation, and even boredom, it is not a sudden decision. We know that students with disabilities, minority and poor children, and students whose home lives are, in all sorts of ways, difficult have lower graduation rates than their peers. The challenges children face today are all too prevalent, and we know the factors that make it harder for them to succeed in school. We know this.

It only makes sense that we re-work the program that is intended to help schools increase their graduation rates so that it actually helps schools help children when we can make the most difference. We need to act before these children have fought for years just to stay afloat, and before they are too tired, frustrated, alienated, and angry to fight anymore.

Factors that have been shown to present a significant risk factor even in elementary school include: low achievement, grade retention, poor attendance, misbehavior and aggression, and low socioeconomic status. Family background characteristics play a role as well, such as family disruption, not living with parents, and parents' low educational attainment. Even low birth weight has been shown by numerous studies to be linked with poor educational outcomes.

My ''Early Intervention for Graduation Success'' bill would focus Federal funds on states that have the lowest graduation rates. State education agencies would be required to develop or update their plans to increase graduation rates. They would also be required to work with health, social services, juvenile justice, and other relevant state agencies to help school districts and early childhood education providers better identify which of their students have research-based risk factors. In turn, schools and early learning providers would be required to develop and update individual learning plans for these students and ensure that the next school of enrollment has the child's plan.

My bill also gives States and partnerships a menu of research-based activities from which to choose to improve services to students, including professional development, program quality improvement, curriculum alignment, community integration and support services, and setting high expectations for academic achievement.

In short, my bill helps States and schools to give students the support they need to achieve their dreams, and inspires them to dream big, right from the very start.

We can continue to spend millions of dollars every year on intensive services for teenagers who are far behind in school, who are frustrated beyond all measure, and who gave up on success long ago. We may even have some limited success helping some young people get back on track and graduate from high school. Or, we can start at the beginning, making sure that the children who already have challenges get the help they need to succeed.

I look forward to passage of this bill or incorporating it into the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 1496. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit the delegation by the United States of inspection, certification, and related services to a foreign classification society that provides comparable services to Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Ethical Shipping Inspections Act of 2011. This bill would prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security and U.S. Coast Guard from delegating vessel inspection and certification authority to a foreign-based classification society that also provides these services on behalf of the governments of Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria.

I am joined in the effort to close this critical loophole by my colleagues, Senators LIEBERMAN and BEGICH. With the introduction of the Ethical Shipping Inspections Act of 2011, we seek to end U.S. relationships with foreign-based classification societies that also represent nations like the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Each year, non-governmental classification societies conduct more than 4,500 statutory inspections of U.S. flagged vessels to verify that these vessels meet international maritime conventions and national regulatory requirements. World-wide, more than 100 governments have established relationships with classification societies. In addition, the vast majority of commercial ships are built to and surveyed for compliance with the standards developed by classification societies.

The relationship between classification societies and the U.S. Government was established in statute in the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, when the Secretary of the Department overseeing the U.S. Coast Guard was granted the authority to delegate certain inspection and certification services to the American Bureau of Shipping, ABS, or another recognized Class Society. In 1996 Congress expanded this program to allow foreign-based classification societies to also serve on behalf of the U.S. Government in this capacity. Today, there are four foreign-based classification societies that have established Memorandums of Understanding with the U.S. Coast Guard to conduct these inspections on the Coast Guard's behalf.

While this act would allow this relationship between the U.S. Government and foreign-based classification societies to continue, it would eliminate a loophole in the law that allows the foreign-based classification societies that represent the United States to also represent the governments of Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria. Ironically, the current law provides more latitude to foreign-based societies than we allow the American Bureau of Shipping. As a U.S.-based non-profit, non-governmental organization, ABS is restricted from providing such services in Iran under existing Iranian Transaction Regulations. Yet, the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, does not prevent foreign-based classification societies from representing both the U.S. and Iranian governments.

With this in mind, my colleagues and I have introduced this legislation to prohibit the U.S. from obtaining vessel inspection, certification, and related services from a foreign-based class society that also provides these services on behalf of the Iranian, North Korean, North Sudanese, or Syrian governments. For the United States to maintain such relationships runs directly contrary to the spirit of United States policy.

It is important that we all understand the special nature of the relationship between classification societies and our Government and take action to ensure that our Government is represented by classification societies in a manner befitting of our nation's values and consistent with U.S. foreign policy. For these reasons, my colleagues and I believe it is imperative that we amend the law to prohibit this activity, and we urge our colleagues to support this important 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. 1496

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 ''Ethical Shipping Inspections Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON DELEGATION OF INSPECTION, CERTIFICATION, AND RELATED SERVICES.

Section 3316 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Secretary may not make a delegation, and shall revoke an existing delegation made, to a foreign classification society pursuant to subsection (b) or (d) to provide inspection, certification, or related services if the Secretary of State determines that the foreign classification society provides comparable services—

''(1) in Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria; or

''(2) for the government of Iran, North Korea, North Sudan, or Syria.''.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1504. A bill to restore Medicaid eligibility for citizens of the Freely Associated States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Medicaid Restoration for Citizens of Freely Associated States Act of 2011. This bill would reinstate eligibility for critical Federal health benefits for citizens of certain Pacific Island nations who have been invited by the Federal Government to live in the United States, but for whom the costs of services have fallen to individual states, Hawaii in particular. I would like to thank Senators INOUYE and BINGAMAN for joining me in introducing this bill.

The Freely Associated States, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau, are island nations that have a unique political relationship with the United States.

At the end of World War II, the United Nations established the ''Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,'' which was administered by the United States between 1947 and 1986. It included the islands that now make up the FAS nations, as well as other Pacific islands liberated from Japan after World War II.

This U.S. Trusteeship presented the Federal Government with new strategic and military opportunities, allowing the United States to establish military bases and station forces in the Trust Territory and close off areas for security reasons. It also bestowed upon the United States the responsibility to promote economic development and self-reliance for the territory.

In the 1980s, the United States entered into a new phase in its relationship with the FAS through the Compact of Free Association and the Palau Compact of Free Association. The Compacts allow FAS citizens to freely enter, reside, and work in the United States and authorize their participation in certain Federal programs.

As a part of the Compacts, FAS citizens were extended Medicaid eligibility.

Unfortunately, when the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 was enacted, FAS citizens lost many of their public benefits, including Medicaid coverage.

Subsequently, state and territorial governments have been the sole sources of funding for meeting the social service and public health needs of this ever growing population. And FAS migrants to Hawaii often arrive with serious medical needs, requiring costly health care services such as dialysis and chemotherapy.

These costs will continue to rise, even as the State's resources are increasingly constrained.

Restoration of Medicaid eligibility for these individuals is crucial for states where many FAS citizens reside. In the Pacific, this includes Hawaii, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

In the continental U.S., this includes California, Oregon, Washington, and Arkansas. Health care providers that operate in areas with high rates of uninsured are having difficulties meeting the health care needs of their communities. Uninsured FAS citizens who seek health care services contribute to the uncompensated costs that are creating an ever-greater burden on health care providers.

I ask my colleagues for their support of the Medicaid Restoration for Citizens of Freely Associated States Act of 2011. The decision to allow citizens of the Freely Associated States to come to the United States was a federal decision, with national benefits.

That we also accept the cost of that decision is a matter of fairness and responsibility.

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. 1504

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 ''Medicaid Restoration for Citizens of Freely Associated States Act of 2011''.

SEC. 2. MEDICAID ELIGIBILITY FOR CITIZENS OF FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402(b)(2) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1612(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G) MEDICAID EXCEPTION FOR CITIZENS OF FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.—With respect to eligibility for benefits for the program defined in paragraph (3)(C) (relating to medicaid), paragraph (1) shall not apply to any individual who lawfully resides in the United States (including territories and possessions of the United States) in accordance with—

''(i) section 141 of the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia, approved by Congress in the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003;

''(ii) section 141 of the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, approved by Congress in the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; or

''(iii) section 141 of the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Government of Palau, approved by Congress in Public Law 99–658 (100 Stat. 3672).''.

(b) EXCEPTION TO 5-YEAR LIMITED ELIGIBILITY.—Section 403(d) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1613(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) an individual described in section 402(b)(2)(G), but only with respect to the designated Federal program defined in section 402(b)(3)(C).''.

(c) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED ALIEN.—Section 431(b) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1641(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) an individual who lawfully resides in the United States (including territories and possessions of the United States) in accordance with a Compact of Free Association referred to in section 402(b)(2)(G).''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1108 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (g)'' and inserting ''subsections (g) and (h)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) The limitations of subsections (f) and (g) shall not apply with respect to medical assistance provided to an individual described in section 431(b)(8) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to benefits for items and services furnished on or after that date.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1507. A bill to provide protections from workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I have introduced the Employee Rights Act, a comprehensive workers' rights bill that would address many issues plaguing America's workers.

Our Nation's labor laws were designed to preserve the rights of employees to join labor unions and engage in collective bargaining. Contrary to what some may think, I am not anti-union and I do not want to stand in the way of unionization if the decision to unionize is truly the will of the employees. However, I believe that the right not to join a union is equally important. It is this right that far too often goes overlooked under our current laws, and particularly under policies implemented by unelected bureaucrats at various administrative agencies.

I am under no illusions that this legislation will be noncontroversial. There will most certainly be opposition. Indeed, I fully expect the unions and their supporters to come out against the Employee Rights Act, and characterize it as a radical, anti-union bill.

But, that just isn't the case. There is not a single provision in this bill that will empower employers at the expense of the union. The only parties whose position will be improved by the Employee Rights Act are employees. Anyone whose real concern is preserving the rights of individual workers should support this bill.

Let me take a few minutes to go over the specific provisions.

First, the bill would conform and equalize unfair labor practices by unions with those of employers under the National Labor Relations Act. Currently, under Section 8 of the NLRA, employers face penalties if they ''interfere with, restrain, or coerce employees'' in the exercise of their rights under the Act. The same section punishes labor organizations only if they ''restrain or coerce'' employees in the exercise of those same rights.

There is no reasonable or logical justification for this difference, and workers should have the benefit of equal protection against abuse from both sides. That is why, under the Employee Rights Act, both sides will be held to the higher standard.

Next, my bill would ensure that employees are guaranteed a right to a federally supervised, secret ballot vote before a union can be certified. According to the NLRB, 38 percent of all unions certified in 2009 did not have to go through a secret ballot election. Instead, these unions were able to use card checks to unionize employees. True enough, in such cases, employers voluntarily opted to recognize the union without demanding a secret ballot election. But what about the workers who wanted a secret ballot vote?

There is, of course, a long-standing debate over the integrity and appropriateness of card check elections. But even the most committed union supporter must admit that the card check process is unregulated and less reliable than a secret ballot vote. Indeed, that's exactly why the unions prefer it. Anyone who claims otherwise is either lacking in common sense, on a union's payroll, or both.

We have all heard the accounts of unions obtaining signatures through deception and intimidation. And, we've all heard about union organizing campaigns and boycotts that have all but forced employers to give up their right to demand a secret ballot vote. Well, Mr. President, under the Employee Rights Act, that right will belong to the employees, and it will be guaranteed.

For the record, the American people agree with me on this issue. Earlier this year, the Opinion Research Corporation conducted a poll of 1,000 adults that addressed a number of these issues. All told, 75 percent—three out of every four—were somewhere between strongly supportive and somewhat supportive of a rule requiring that all employees be given the right to a secret ballot election when deciding whether to join a union.

There is no way around it. If you are pro-worker, and not just pro-union, you have to support the right to a secret ballot.

Next, my bill would require every unionized workplace to conduct a secret ballot election every three years to determine whether a majority of employees still want to be represented by the union.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, less than 10 percent of current union members voted for the union at their workplace. Most union members simply took jobs at sites that were already unionized, many of which require union membership as a condition of employment.

Under current law, if any of these employees want to decertify a union, they must go through an arduous process. It is a nearly impossible task. In addition to overcoming the many procedural hurdles provided by laws and regulations, they are required to speak out publicly against the union and subject themselves to public criticism, if not outright intimidation. Not surprisingly, very few even make the effort.

As a result, millions of American workers belong to unions they never voted for and will never get to vote for. No one who claims to support the rights of workers can argue that this is a good thing. Every citizen is guaranteed an opportunity to vote out their representatives in State, local, and Federal Government. Yet, a union, once certified, is in place for perpetuity. This just shouldn't be the case.

Once again, I am not alone in my thinking. In the same survey I cited earlier, 75 percent, again, 3/4 of those polled, supported a change that would require unions to be periodically recertified.

This proposal is not outlandish or punitive. It is simply common sense. It is fair to both employers and unions, and,

far more importantly, it is fair to workers.

Another provision of the bill would put a stop to the NLRB's current proposal to shorten the required length of time between the filing of a union certification petition and an election, commonly referred to as the quickie or snap election proposal.

With this proposed rule, which is set to be finalized later this year, the pro-union NLRB hopes to help unions catch unwitting employers unprepared. Although there is no specific timeline in the proposal, experts have concluded that, if the regulation is finalized, union elections could occur within 7 days of a union filing a petition. Even worse, the proposal would eliminate many of the pre-election opportunities to appeal the petition and to resolve fundamental issues, like the size and scope of the bargaining unit.

There is no need for this new rule. According to the NLRB, the average time between the filing of a petition and an election is 39 days. This gives both the union and the employer an opportunity to communicate their perspective on union membership to employees and ensures that workers are able to make informed decisions.

Though the current rule is eminently reasonable and appears to be working well for everyone, including the unions who already win the majority of elections, the Obama Administration can't risk losing the support of Big Labor. Richard Trumka, President of the AFL–CIO, recently remarked that this and other similar so-called reforms are effectively consolation prizes for the Democrats' loss in the fight to pass the deceptively-named Employee Free Choice Act.

Indeed, the Obama administration, for obvious reasons, has consistently been all too eager to stack the deck in favor of the unions. Since they haven't been able to do it through the legislative process, they're trying to do so via regulation.

Sadly, employees are caught in the middle. The NLRB doesn't care if they have enough time to consider all their options. They simply want to make sure the unions win more elections. To combat this, the Employee Rights Act would preserve substantive and procedural protections in the election process and ensure that workers have an opportunity to make informed decisions.

The bill would also prevent a union from ordering a strike or work stoppage unless it obtains the consent of a majority of the affected workforce through a secret ballot vote.

This is important because the rules governing when and how a union can order a strike are not uniform. They are determined by each union's constitution. There is no federal rule whatsoever requiring that unions obtain majority support before they can force members into unemployment and possible replacement.

Many would be surprised to learn that union strike funds, kept to provide financial assistance for striking union members, rarely pay more than 20 percent of an employee's salary during a work stoppage. And, more often than not, a member cannot receive any compensation for lost wages unless they participate on a picket line.

Isn't it only fair to give workers an opportunity to weigh in before a union orders a strike? Most people seem to think so. According to the same poll I mentioned earlier, 74 percent of Americans support this proposal.

Another provision of the Employee Rights Act would prevent an employee's union dues or fees from being used for purposes unrelated to the union's collective bargaining functions—including political contributions and expenditures—without that member's written consent.

Exit polls have shown that America's union members are almost evenly split between Democrats and Republicans, yet more than 90 percent of union political contributions go to Democrats. This is, not to put too fine a point on it, the reason why I expect strong opposition to this bill.

However I would like anyone who would oppose this provision to explain to me why it is fair to force workers to contribute to political campaigns at all, regardless of the party on the receiving end. Once again, the only people who would object to empowering individual workers in this way are those who have a vested interest in the status quo.

When asked about this issue, 78 percent of those polled agreed with this idea.

The Employee Rights Act would do several more things. It would make unions liable for lost wages, unlawfully collected union dues, and even liquidated damages if they coerce, intimidate, or discipline workers for exercising their rights under the NLRA, including the right to file a decertification petition. Any union found to have unlawfully interfered with the filing of a decertification petition would be barred from filing objections to the subsequent decertification vote.

The bill would also strengthen prohibitions on the use or threat of violence to achieve union goals, overturning an egregious Supreme Court decision that all but exempted unions from Federal racketeering statutes.

It would allow all affected workers, union and non-union alike, the same rights as union members to vote to ratify a collective bargaining agreement or to begin a strike.

These are not outlandish proposals. They would simply introduce some long-overdue common sense into our labor laws. Not surprisingly, polls have demonstrated that each of these ideas has broad support among the public.

We have had many fierce debates in this chamber about the role of labor unions in our nation's economy. In fact, I have been on the floor several times in the last week decrying the steps taken by the Obama Administration when it comes to helping out Big Labor.

But truthfully, I'm not interested in stopping unions from organizing or preventing collective bargaining. I simply want to protect the rights of individual workers and ensure that, if they do opt for union representation, that choice is freely made and fairly determined.

For too long, American workers have been treated by union leaders as little more than human ATMs. They claim to be progressives, supportive of equality and democracy and the working man. This bill is consistent with those principles, providing working men and women with a real and meaningful voice in decisions regarding unionization. It is supported by the National Right to Work Committee, and I am proud to have Congressman TIM SCOTT of South Carolina introducing companion legislation in the House.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Employee Rights Act.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1509. A bill to provide incentives for States to improve the well-being of children in the child welfare system through systemic reforms and innovations, increased collaboration between State agencies, and incorporation of higher standards of accountability; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce the Promoting Accountability and Excellence in Child Welfare Act, a bill that would pave the way for new innovations that improve the lives and well-being of vulnerable children and their families.

The Federal government spends roughly ten times as much money on foster care as it does on preventative services, when foster care is, in nearly every case, the worst possible outcome for a child. The Promoting Accountability and Excellence in Child Welfare Act would establish a 5-year grant program to give States and localities greater flexibility to implement comprehensive reforms to existing child welfare programs provided they can demonstrate success in improving child well-being. This flexibility would allow States to use early-intervention techniques to prevent youth from entering foster care, heightened reunification or adoption practices to decrease a child's time in care, and strengthened support services to ensure that children and youth do not fall behind their peers while they remain in foster care. Importantly, this act establishes strong performance measures that allow successful practices to serve as scalable models.

Children and families that come into contact with the child welfare system are often served through multiple local, State, and Federal agencies including the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Too often, these agencies operate in silos, with the effects playing

out at the State, local, and even individual level. This act promotes collaboration by requiring an inter-agency working group to identify existing Federal resources and streamline them to reduce duplication and allow grantees to access additional services and funding streams.

States and localities have proven their ability to save money through innovation while also working to promote the best interest of children and families and the Federal government often turns to state best practices to improve national laws. The history of subsidized guardianship serves as one such example. Due to an all-time high in the number of children in State foster care, in 1996 Illinois was granted the authority to allow grandparents, aunts, uncles and other adult relatives to receive Federal foster care payments if they opened their homes permanently to their relative children in foster care. Raising a child is expensive and these modest payments gave relatives the financial means to care for their kin.

Allowing children and youth to remain with relatives is not only a compassionate way to prevent unnecessary disruptions in a child's life and keep families together, it also saves money. The Illinois demonstration proved that children and youth did better living with relative caregivers than they did when they remained in foster care. In addition, offering guardianship assistance to relatives actually increased the odds that they would be adopted. Due to the success of kinship care in Illinois and other States, the Federal government now realizes a cost savings by reimbursing States for a portion of the cost of offering guardianship assistance. The Promoting Accountability and Excellence in Child Welfare Act would further enable such innovations and savings while improving child well-being.

Furthermore, the legislation directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report to Congress with recommendations on how to update Federal foster care financing. Under current law, eligibility for Federal foster care assistance remains tied to the obsolete AFDC program, meaning each year fewer children in foster care are eligible for Federal funding. As a result, States are required to take on an ever-increasing share of foster care financing. This structure forces States to compensate by drawing funds from other programs such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, TANF, and the Social Security Block Grant, SSBG, to provide for children in care.

As a country, we cannot afford to let children fall through the cracks of the many systems that exist to serve them. By targeting our resources, improving collaboration, spurring innovation, and, above all, holding ourselves accountable, we can systemically serve the best interest of at-risk children, their families and communities, and the Nation as a whole.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 250—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE MEMORIAL PARK ON HERO STREET USA, IN SILVIS, ILLINOIS, SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS HERO STREET MEMORIAL PARK AND SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE SUPPORTED AS A PARK BY THE TOWN OF SILVIS AT NO COST TO UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS

Mr. KIRK submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 250

Whereas in the small town of Silvis, Illinois, there is a street that is only one and a half blocks long;

Whereas formerly known as Second Street, today it is officially known as Hero Street USA;

Whereas from this short street, brave men and women of Hispanic ancestry have served in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas today, young men and women from Hero Street USA, valiantly join the United States Armed Forces to defend the Nation;

Whereas the memorial on Hero Street USA is located near the intersection of Highway 84 and 2nd Street;

Whereas on the east side of Hero Street USA, the memorial will honor the personal sacrifice of eight young men from Hero Street USA, who were killed in defense of the United States, including six during World War II, PFC Joseph H. Sandoval, PFC Frank H. Sandoval, PFC William L. Sandoval, Sgt. Tony Lopez Pompa, SSG Claro Soliz, and PFC Peter Perez Masias, and two men during the Korean War, PFC John S. Munos and PFC Joseph Gomez;

Whereas the memorial will pay fitting tribute to these gallant eight men who made the ultimate and selfless sacrifice in the defense of liberty, not only for their loved ones and their country, but for people everywhere around the world who hope to breathe free;

Whereas these eight men gave their lives so that those of us that gather here at this memorial park can do so free to speak and think;

Whereas additionally, these men died so that those who follow in their footsteps can be secure in the knowledge that the United States Constitution which they swore to uphold and defend stands firm;

Whereas the Hero Street Memorial Park symbolizes the devotion to duty and personal sacrifice in the cause of liberty and freedom these eight men displayed that was instrumental in the triumph of the United States and its allies during World War II and the Korean War; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States have a continuing obligation to educate future generations about this small street in Silvis, Illinois, whose sons and daughters have given so much in the defense of liberty of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the memorial park on Hero Street USA, in Silvis, Illinois, should be recognized as Hero Street Memorial Park and should continue to be supported as a park by the Town of Silvis at no cost to United States taxpayers.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of the fallen soldiers from Hero Street USA in Silvis, Illinois and ask that the Senate recognize the memorial park on Hero Street as Hero Street Memorial Park.

In 1967, 2nd Street in Silvis, Illinois was renamed ''Hero Street USA'' in recognition of the fallen soldiers and their families who grew up on that street. When World War II and the Korean Wars broke out, 78 young Mexican-American men, who lived on Hero Street, bravely went to war to serve our Nation and defend our freedoms in battle. Six soldiers lost their lives during World War II and two others lost their lives during battle in the Korean War.

Located halfway down the block on the east side of Hero Street USA there is a neighborhood park that was redesigned to honor these fallen soldiers in 1971. This memorial park honors the story that brought these families together and brave sacrifices these men made to defend of our freedom and to uphold liberty and the principles of the Constitution of the United States.

Recognizing Hero Street Memorial Park will tell the story of these fallen soldiers for future generations and will honor the bravery and selfless sacrifice of those who gave so much for their country.

SENATE RESOLUTION 251—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR IMPROVEMENT IN THE COLLECTION, PROCESSING, AND CONSUMPTION OF RECYCLABLE MATERIALS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CARPER (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 251

Whereas maximizing the recycling economy in the United States will create and sustain additional well-paying jobs in the United States, further stimulate the economy of the United States, save energy, and conserve valuable natural resources;

Whereas recycling is an important action that people in the United States can take to be environmental stewards;

Whereas municipal recycling rates in the United States steadily increased from 6.6 percent in 1970 to 28.6 percent in 2000, but since 2000, the rate of increase has slowed considerably;

Whereas a decline in manufacturing in the United States has reduced both the supply of and demand for recycled materials;

Whereas recycling allows the United States to recover the critical materials necessary to sustain the recycling economy and protect national security interests in the United States;

Whereas recycling plays an integral role in the sustainable management of materials throughout the life-cycle of a product;

Whereas 46 States have laws promoting the recycling of materials that would otherwise be incinerated or sent to a landfill;

Whereas more than 10,000 communities in the United States have residential recycling and drop-off programs that collect a wide variety of recyclable materials, including

paper, steel, aluminum, plastic, glass, and electronics;

Whereas, in addition to residential recycling, the scrap recycling industry in the United States manufactures recyclable materials collected from businesses into commodity-grade materials;

Whereas those commodity-grade materials are used as feedstock to produce new basic materials and finished products in the United States and throughout the world;

Whereas recycling stimulates the economy and plays an integral role in sustaining manufacturing in the United States;

Whereas, in 2010, the United States recycling industry collected, processed, and consumed over 130,000,000 metric tons of recyclable material, valued at $77,000,000,000;

Whereas many manufacturers use recycled commodities to make products, saving energy and reducing the need for raw materials, which are generally higher-priced;

Whereas the recycling industry in the United States helps balance the trade deficit and provides emerging economies with the raw materials needed to build countries and participate in the global economy;

Whereas, in 2010, the scrap recycling industry in the United States sold over 44,000,000 metric tons of commodity-grade materials, valued at almost $30,000,000,000, to over 154 countries;

Whereas recycling saves energy by decreasing the amount of energy needed to manufacture the products that people build, buy, and use;

Whereas using recycled materials in place of raw materials can result in energy savings of 92 percent for aluminum cans, 87 percent for mixed plastics, 63 percent for steel cans, 45 percent for recycled newspaper, and 34 percent for recycled glass; and

Whereas a bipartisan Senate Recycling Caucus and a bipartisan House Recycling Caucus were established in 2006 to provide a permanent and long-term way for members of Congress to obtain in-depth knowledge about the recycling industry and to help promote the many benefits of recycling: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for improvement in the collection, processing, and consumption of recyclable material throughout the United States in order to create well-paying jobs, foster innovation and investment in the United States recycling infrastructure, and stimulate the economy of the United States;

(2) expresses support for strengthening the manufacturing base in the United States in order to rebuild the domestic economy, which will increase the supply, demand, and consumption of recyclable and recycled materials in the United States;

(3) expresses support for a competitive marketplace for recyclable materials;

(4) expresses support for the trade of recyclable commodities, which is an integral part of the domestic and global economy;

(5) expresses support for policies in the United States that promote recycling of materials, including paper, which is commonly recycled rather than thermally combusted or sent to a landfill;

(6) expresses support for policies in the United States that recognize and promote recyclable materials as essential economic commodities, rather than wastes;

(7) expresses support for policies in the United States that promote using recyclable materials as feedstock to produce new basic materials and finished products throughout the world;

(8) expresses support for research and development of new technologies to more efficiently and effectively recycle materials such as automobile shredder residue and cathode ray tubes;

(9) expresses support for research and development of new technologies to remove materials that are impediments to recycling, such as radioactive material, polychlorinated biphenyls, mercury-containing devices, and chlorofluorocarbons;

(10) expresses support for Design for Recycling, to improve the design and manufacture of goods to ensure that, at the end of a useful life, a good can, to the maximum extent practicable, be recycled safely and economically;

(11) recognizes that the scrap recycling industry in the United States is a manufacturing industry that is critical to the future of the United States;

(12) expresses support for policies in the United States that establish the equitable treatment of recycled materials; and

(13) expresses support for the participation of households, businesses, and governmental entities in the United States in recycling programs, where available.

SENATE RESOLUTION 252—CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED STATES-PHILIPPINES MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY

Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 252

Whereas Filipinos and Americans fought together in World War II, and an estimated 1,000,000 Filipinos gave their lives to defend freedom;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of the Philippines signed the United States–Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty in 1951;

Whereas the Philippines and the United States are longstanding allies, as demonstrated by the Mutual Defense Treaty, cooperation in conflicts since World War II, and the United States' designation of the Philippines as a Major Non-NATO Ally;

Whereas the United States Government seeks to maintain an alliance with the Government of the Philippines that promotes peace and stability in Southeast and East Asia, rule of law and human rights, economic growth, counter-terrorism efforts, and maritime security;

Whereas United States naval ships visit Philippines ports, and the United States and Philippines military forces participate in combined military exercises under the Visiting Forces Agreement established in 1998;

Whereas the United States Government and the Government of the Philippines work closely together in the struggle against terrorism to make local communities safer and help establish an environment conducive to good governance and development;

Whereas the navy of the Government of the Philippines has received a United States Coast Guard cutter and assistance in establishing a coastal radar system to enhance its monitoring of its waters;

Whereas the United States Government works closely with the Government of the Philippines on humanitarian and disaster relief activities, and in the past has provided prompt assistance to make United States troops, equipment, assets, and disaster relief assistance available;

Whereas the Mutual Defense Board and the Security Engagement Board serve as important platforms for the continuing stability of the long-standing alliance between the Philippines and the United States in a rapidly changing global and regional environment;

Whereas Philippines military forces have supported over the years many United Nations peacekeeping operations worldwide;

Whereas the United States ranks as one of the Philippines' top trading partners, with 11 percent of the Philippines' imports coming from the United States and 15 percent of exports from the Philippines delivered to the United States in 2010;

Whereas total United States foreign direct investment in the Philippines was almost $6,000,000,000 at the end of 2009;

Whereas the Philippines is one of four countries that has been invited to participate in the new Partnership for Growth Initiative, which promotes broad-based economic growth in emerging markets;

Whereas many Americans and Filipinos have participated in people-to-people programs such as the Peace Corps, the International Visitor Leadership Programs, the Aquino Fellowship, Eisenhower Fellowships, and the Fulbright Scholar Program;

Whereas an estimated 4,000,000 people living in the United States are of Filipino ancestry, over 300,000 United States citizens live in the Philippines, and an estimated 600,000 United States citizens travel to the Philippines each year;

Whereas the alliance between the United States and the Philippines is founded on core values that aim to promote and preserve democracy, freedom, peace, and justice, and is fortified by the two nations' partnerships in defending these values;

Whereas the Government of the Philippines seeks to improve governance, strengthen the rule of law, and further develop accountable, democratic institutions that can better safeguard human rights, secure justice, and promote equitable economic development; and

Whereas Secretary of State Hillary Clinton met with Foreign Secretary of the Philippines, Albert del Rosario, on June 23, 2011, in Washington, D.C., and reaffirmed that the United States and the Philippines are longstanding allies that are committed to honoring mutual obligations, and strengthening the alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) celebrates the 60th Anniversary of the United States–Philippines Mutual Defense Treaty;

(B) confirms the alliance's enduring value as one of the key pillars of peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region; and

(C) encourages both countries to mark this important occasion with continued high-level exchanges; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the United States Government should propose to the Government of the Philippines that a joint commission be established to review the potential for enhancing security ties between the United States Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the Philippines, including facilities access, expanded joint training opportunities, and humanitarian and disaster relief preparedness activities;

(B) the United States Government should redouble efforts to expand and deepen the economic relationship with the Government of the Philippines toward achieving broad-based economic development in that country, including by working on new bilateral initiatives that support the efforts of the Government of the Philippines to reform its economy and enhance its competitiveness, and through trade-capacity building;

(C) the private sectors of the United States and the Philippines should be urged to establish a United States–Philippines organization with a mission to promote actively and

expand closer bilateral ties across key sectors, including security, trade and investment, education, and people-to-people programs;

(D) the Government of the Philippines should continue its efforts to strengthen its democratic institutions to fight corruption, curtail politically-motivated violence and extrajudicial killings, expand economic opportunity, and tackle internal security challenges; and

(E) the United States Government should continue efforts to assist the Government of the Philippines in the areas of maritime security, related communications infrastructure to enable enhanced information-sharing, and overall military professionalization.

SENATE RESOLUTION 253—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 26, 2011, AS ''DAY OF THE DEPLOYED''

Mr. HOEVEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 253

Whereas more than 2,250,000 people serve as members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas several hundred thousand members of the Armed Forces rotate each year through deployments to 150 countries in every region of the world;

Whereas more than 2,200,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the United States is kept strong and free by the loyal people who protect our precious heritage through their positive declaration and actions;

Whereas the deployed members of the Armed Forces serving at home and abroad have courageously answered the call to duty to defend the ideals of the United States and to preserve peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces and veterans personify the virtues of patriotism, service, duty, courage, and sacrifice;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make important and significant sacrifices for the United States;

Whereas North Dakota began honoring the members of the Armed Forces and their families by designating October 26 as ''Day of the Deployed'' in 2006 ; and

Whereas 40 States designated October 26, 2010, as ''Day of the Deployed'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the members of the United States Armed Forces who are deployed at home and abroad;

(2) calls on the people of the United States to reflect on the service of those members of the United States Armed Forces, wherever they serve, both now and in the future;

(3) designates October 26, 2011, as ''Day of the Deployed''; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe ''Day of the Deployed'' with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY''

Mr. REED of Rhode Island (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 254

Whereas the airborne forces of the Armed Forces have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the United States' experiment with airborne operations began on June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations, such as the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas included in these divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities that provide the lineage and legacy of many airborne units throughout our Armed Forces;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne forces during World War II prompted the evolution of those forces into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, United States airborne forces, which include members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, and special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, together with other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne force also includes other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and para-rescue teams;

Whereas of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with their special skills and achievements, distinguishes such members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in former days, glider troops;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2011, as ''National Airborne Day''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 8, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL CHESS DAY'' TO ENHANCE AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGE STUDENTS AND ADULTS TO ENGAGE IN A GAME KNOWN TO ENHANCE CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. LEVIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 255

Whereas there are more than 76,000 members of the United States Chess Federation (referred to in this preamble as the ''Federation''), and unknown numbers of additional people in the United States who play the game without joining an official organization;

Whereas approximately ½ of the members of the Federation are scholastic members, and many of the scholastic members join by the age of 10;

Whereas the Federation is very supportive of the scholastic programs and sponsors a Certified Chess Coach program that provides the coaches involved in the scholastic programs training and ensures schools and students can have confidence in the programs;

Whereas many studies have linked chess programs to the improvement of student scores in reading and math, as well as improved self-esteem;

Whereas the Federation offers a school curriculum to educators to help incorporate chess into the school curriculum;

Whereas chess is a powerful cognitive learning tool that can be used to successfully enhance reading and math concepts; and

Whereas chess engages students of all learning styles and strengths and promotes problem-solving and higher-level thinking skills: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 8, 2011, as ''National Chess Day''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe ''National Chess Day'' with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 2 THROUGH OCTOBER 8, 2011, AS ''NATIONAL NURSE-MANAGED HEALTH CLINIC WEEK''

Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 256

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics are nonprofit community-based health care sites that offer primary care and wellness services based on the nursing model;

Whereas the nursing model emphasizes the protection, promotion, and optimization of health, the prevention of illness, the alleviation of suffering, and the diagnosis and treatment of illness;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics are led by advanced practice nurses and staffed by an interdisciplinary team of highly qualified health care professionals;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics offer a broad scope of services including treatment for acute and chronic illnesses, routine physical exams, immunizations for adults and children, disease screenings, health education, prenatal care, dental care, and drug and alcohol treatment;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics have a proven track record, as the first federally funded nurse-managed health clinic was created more than 35 years ago;

Whereas, as of June 2011, more than 250 nurse-managed health clinics provided care across the United States and recorded more than 2,000,000 client encounters annually;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics serve a unique dual role as both health care safety net access points and health workforce development sites, given that the majority of nurse-managed health clinics are affiliated with schools of nursing and serve as clinical education sites for students entering the health profession;

Whereas nurse-managed health clinics strengthen the health care safety net by expanding access to primary care and chronic disease management services for vulnerable and medically underserved populations in diverse rural, urban, and suburban communities;

Whereas research has shown that nurse-managed health clinics experience high patient retention and patient satisfaction rates, and nurse-managed health clinic patients experience higher rates of generic medication fills and lower hospitalization rates when compared to similar safety net providers; and

Whereas the use of nurse-managed health clinics offering both primary care and wellness services will help meet this increased demand in a cost-effective manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 2 through October 8, 2011, as ''National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week'';

(2) supports the ideals and goals of National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week; and

(3) encourages the expansion of nurse-managed health clinics so that nurse-managed health clinics may continue to serve as health care workforce development sites for the next generation of primary care providers.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today Senator ALEXANDER and I rise to recognize over 250 Nurse-Managed Health Clinics in a Resolution designating the week of October 2, 2011, as National Nurse-Managed Health Clinic Week. Nurse-managed health clinics provide primary care and wellness services to a diverse population through all age groups and ethnicities. These clinics provide care to over two million patients in underserved or vulnerable areas across this country. Nurse-managed health clinics offer a full range of accessible and affordable health services, including primary care, health promotion, and disease prevention to low-income, as well as un-and under insured patients, regardless of their ability to pay. The care is primarily provided by nurse practitioners working in partnership with an interdisciplinary team of health professions including clinical nurse specialists, registered nurses, health educators, community outreach workers, health care students, and collaborating physicians. As recognized by the Institute of Medicine's ''Future of Nursing'' report, the nurse managed clinics play a critical role in community-based preventive health care and have done so since their inception three decades ago.

A Senate resolution will help pave the way for this effort. We ask our colleagues to join us in supporting this tribute to Nurse-Managed Health Clinics.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 28—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL, COLLECTIVELY, TO THE 100TH INFANTRY BATTALION, 442ND REGIMENTAL COMBAT TEAM, AND THE MILITARY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, UNITED STATES ARMY, IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR DEDICATED SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. INOUYE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used for an event on November 2, 2011 to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion, 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and the Military Intelligence Service, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 2, 2011.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. REID. 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 August 2, 2011, at 10 a.m. to conduct a committee hearing entitled ''Housing Finance Reform: National Mortgage Servicing Standards.''

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works and the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 2, 2011, at 10 a.m. in Dirksen 406 to conduct a joint hearing entitled, ''Review of the NRC's Near-Term Task Force Recommendations for Enhancing Reactor Safety in the 21st Century.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 2, 2011, at 2:30 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Health Reform and Health Insurance Premiums: Empowering States to Serve Consumers'' on August 2, 2011, at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an intern in Senator BINGAMAN's office, Trey Debrine, be granted floor privileges during today's business.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Rachel Travis of my staff be granted privileges of the floor for this pending legislation.

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Ukraine	Dollar		628.27						628.27
Georgia	Dollar		280.63						280.63
Lithuania	Dollar		207.71						207.71
Estonia	Dollar		370.77						370.77
Sandra Luff:									
Ukraine	Dollar		765.11						765.11
Georgia	Dollar		309.63						309.63
Lithuania	Dollar		244.11						244.11
Estonia	Dollar		420.34						420.34
Brooke F. Buchanan:									
Italy	Dollar		187.00						187.00
Greece	Dollar		137.00						137.00
Egypt	Dollar		426.00						426.00
Oman	Dollar		189.00						189.00
Qatar	Dollar		164.00						164.00
France	Dollar		188.00						188.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		232.00						232.00
Jason W. Maroney									
United States	Dollar				12,294.46				12,294.46
Japan	Dollar		1,248.16						1,248.16
Senator John McCain:									
Italy	Dollar		135.46						135.46
Greece	Dollar		181.12						181.12
Egypt	Dollar		190.84						190.84
Oman	Dollar		623.50						623.50
France	Dollar		229.35						229.35
United Kingdom	Dollar		213.88						213.88
Senator Carl Levin:									
United States	Dollar				8,446.00				8,446.00
Japan	Dollar		820.00						820.00
Russell L. Shaffer:									
United States	Dollar				12,294.00				12,294.00
Japan	Dollar		810.00						810.00
Senator Jim Webb:									
United States	Dollar				13,703.90				13,703.90
Republic of Korea	Won		340.00						340.00
Vietnam	Dong		716.00						716.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		194.00						194.00
Japan	Dollar		555.00						555.00
Gordon I. Peterson:									
United States	Dollar				13,703.90				13,703.90
Republic of Korea	Won		340.00						340.00
Vietnam	Dong		716.00						716.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		194.00						194.00
Japan	Yen		555.00						555.00
Marta McLellan Ross:									
United States	Dollar				13,329.90				13,329.90
Republic of Korea	Won		340.00						340.00
Vietnam	Dong		716.00						716.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		194.00						194.00
Senator Kelly Ayotte:									
Israel	Dollar		179.74						179.74
Egypt	Dollar		190.62						190.62
Brooke F. Buchanan:									
Thailand	Dollar		244.00						244.00
Burma	Dollar		268.00						268.00
Singapore	Dollar		657.00						657.00
Senator John McCain:									
Thailand	Dollar		584.31						584.31
Burma	Dollar		123.52						123.52
Singapore	Dollar		337.17						337.17
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar				11,837.10				11,837.10
United States	Dollar				10,337.85				10,337.85
Qatar	Dollar		298.18						298.18
Bahrain	Dollar		47.77						47.77
Sergio Sarkany:									
United States	Dollar				11,837.10				11,837.10
Senator John McCain:									
Montenegro	Dollar		81.59						81.59
Moldova	Dollar		80.41						80.41
Brooke Buchanan:									
Montenegro	Dollar		162.00						162.00
Poland	Dollar		156.00						156.00
Moldova	Dollar		123.00						123.00
Christine D. Brose:									
Italy	Dollar		165.00						165.00
Greece	Dollar		119.00						119.00
Egypt	Dollar		336.00						336.00
Oman	Dollar		125.00						125.00
Qatar	Dollar		114.00						114.00
France	Dollar		131.00						131.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		105.00	70.00					175.00
Thailand	Dollar		219.00						219.00
Burma	Dollar		227.00						227.00
Singapore	Dollar		489.00						489.00
Poland	Dollar		128.00						128.00
Montenegro	Dollar		131.00						131.00
Moldova	Dollar		76.00						76.00
Brooke F. Buchanan:									
United States	Dollar				11,273.55				11,273.55
Egypt	Dollar		97.62						97.62
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				10,790.35				10,790.35
Egypt	Dollar		125.55						125.55
Italy	Dollar		50.00						50.00
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
France	Euro		241.47						241.47

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joseph M. Bryan:									
United States	Dollar				4,426.00		11.00		4,437.00
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,645.96		10.00				1,655.96
Christian D. Brose:									
United States	Dollar				11,508.35				11,508.35
Egypt	Dollar		241.00						241.00
Italy	Dollar		167.00						167.00
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
United States	Dollar				5,126.80				5,126.80
Croatia	Kuna		260.80						260.80
France	Euro		3,484.44						3,484.44
Sandra E. Luff:									
United States	Dollar				10,376.70				10,376.70
Croatia	Kuna		481.59						481.59
France	Euro		3,746.74						3,7476.74
Bryan D. Parker:									
United States	Dollar				5,742.70		120.00		5,862.70
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,531.41						1,531.41
Ilona R. Cohen:									
United States	Dollar		31.28		13,632.70				13,663.98
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,738.38		31.00				1,769.38
Total			33,803.43		180,772.36		131.00		214,706.79

SENATOR CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, July 15, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM Apr. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Nikole Manatt:									
United States	Dollar				1,666.30				1,666.30
Belgium	Euro		532.16						532.16
United Kingdom	Pound		182.00						182.00
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso		711.00						711.00
Vietnam	Dong		860.06						860.06
Senator Daniel Inouye:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso		711.00						711.00
Vietnam	Dong		860.06						860.06
*Delegation Expenses:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso						828.64		828.64
Vietnam	Dong						8,846.55		8,846.55
Kay Webber:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso		711.00						711.00
Vietnam	Dong		860.06						860.06
Mary C. Fitzpatrick:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso		711.00						711.00
Vietnam	Dong		978.92						978.92
Margaret Cummisky:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso		567.98						567.98
Vietnam	Dong		552.44						552.44
Stewart Holmes:									
Republic of the Philippines	Peso		711.00						711.00
Vietnam	Dong		975.92						975.92
Senator Daniel Inouye:									
United States	Dollar				12,524.60				12,524.60
Japan	Yen		2,798.82						2,798.82
*Delegation Expenses:									
Japan	Yen						1,440.98		1,440.98
Elizabeth Schmid:									
United States	Dollar				12,524.60				12,524.60
Japan	Yen		1,723.21						1,723.21
Margaret Cummisky:									
United States	Dollar				12,524.60				12,524.60
Japan	Yen		2,042.85						2,042.85
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Belgium	Euro		788.60						788.60
Ireland	Euro		462.96						462.96
Russia	Ruble		2,056.35						2,056.35
Kay Webber:									
Belgium	Euro		788.60						788.60
Ireland	Euro		462.96						462.96
Russia	Ruble		2,056.34						2,056.34
Bruce Evans:									
Belgium	Euro		788.60						788.60
Ireland	Euro		462.96						462.96
Russia	Ruble		2,056.34						2,056.34
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Belgium	Euro		788.60						788.60
Ireland	Euro		462.96						462.96
Russia	Ruble		2,056.34						2,056.34
*Delegation Expenses:									
Belgium	Euro						6,578.95		6,578.95
*Delegation Expenses:									
Ireland	Euro						2,469.15		2,469.15
*Delegation Expenses:									
Russia	Ruble						14,832.06		14,832.06
Kevin McDonald:									
Belgium	Euro		788.60						788.60
Ireland	Euro		462.96						462.96
Russia	Ruble		2,056.34						2,056.34
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
Israel	Shekel		181.73						181.73
Egypt	Egyptian Pound		171.07						171.07
Belgium	Euro		8.01						8.01
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel						14,616.88		14,616.88

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM Apr. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
*Delegation Expenses:									
Egypt	Egyptian Pound						10,047.00		10,047.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Belgium	Euro						7,056.23		7,056.23
Paul Grove:									
Israel	Shekel		286.00						286.00
Egypt	Egyptian Pound		92.00						92.00
Belgium	Euro		168.00						168.00
Andrew King:									
Israel	Shekel		179.73						179.73
Egypt	Egyptian Pound		171.07						171.07
Belgium	Euro		19.55						19.55
United States	Dollar					63.77			63.77
Senator Roy Blunt:									
Israel	Shekel		286.00						286.00
Egypt	Egyptian Pound		92.00						92.00
Belgium	Euro		168.00						168.00
Senator Mark Kirk:									
Bahrain	Dinar		24.00						24.00
Djibouti	Franc		56.00		298.30				354.30
Kenya	Kenyan Schilling		20.00						20.00
United States	Dollar				10,793.70				10,793.70
*Delegation Expenses:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,332.00		1,332.00
Djibouti	Franc						2,596.00		2,596.00
Kenya	Kenyan Schilling						10,642.11		10,642.11
Dennis Balkham:									
Bahrain	Dinar		24.00						24.00
Djibouti	Franc		56.00						56.00
Kenya	Kenyan Schilling		20.00						20.00
United States	Dollar				10,793.70				10,793.70
Patrick Magnuson:									
Bahrain	Dinar		20.00						20.00
Djibouti	Franc		19.00						19.00
Kenya	Kenyan Schilling		20.00						20.00
Paul Grove:									
Kuwait	Dinar		113.00						113.00
United States	Dollar				7,042.10				7,042.10
Charles Houy:									
Belgium	Euro		445.00						445.00
South Africa	Rand		322.00						322.00
Kenya	Kenyan Schilling		647.00		274.00				921.00
United States	Dollar				10,517.50				10,517.50
Gary Reese:									
Belgium	Euro		474.00						474.00
South Africa	Rand		360.00						360.00
Kenya	Kenyan Schilling		685.00		271.00				956.00
United States	Dollar				10,517.50				10,517.50
Senator Thad Cochran:									
France	Euro		6,442.70						6,442.70
Senator Tom Harkin:									
France	Euro		6,371.11						6,371.11
Senator Frank Lautenberg:									
France	Euro		5,690.00						5,690.00
Senator Richard Shelby:									
France	Euro		6,442.70						6,442.70
Senator Daniel Inouye:									
France	Euro		6,442.70						6,442.70
Anne Caldwell:									
France	Euro		6,442.70						6,442.70
Gary Reese:									
France	Euro		6,442.70						6,442.70
Charles Houy:									
France	Euro		6,180.00						6,180.00
Elizabeth Schmid:									
France	Euro		6,265.60						6,265.60
Brian Potts:									
France	Euro		6,259.77						6,259.77
Stewart Holmes:									
France	Euro		6,442.77						6,442.77
Gary Myrick:									
France	Euro		6,442.77						6,442.77
Dave Schiappa:									
France	Euro		6,442.77						6,442.77
Kay Webber:									
France	Euro		6,442.77						6,442.77
Total			126,908.21		89,747.90		81,350.32		298,006.43

SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 22, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mike Crapo:									
Ukraine	Hyrvnia		362.00						362.00
Georgia	Lari		148.00						148.00
Lithuania	Litas		167.00						167.00
Estonia	Euro		220.00						220.00
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Belgium	Euro		500.00						500.00
Russia	Ruble		808.00						808.00
Ireland	Pounds		263.00						263.00
Anne Caldwell:									
Belgium	Euro		500.00						500.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Russia	Ruble		808.00						808.00
Ireland	Pounds		263.00						263.00
Daniel O'Brien:									
Spain	Euro		615.00						615.00
United States	Dollar				8,010.30				8,010.30
Total			4,654.00		8,010.30				12,664.30

SENATOR TIM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
July 12, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1, TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Roy Blunt:									
United States	Dollar				13,523.20				13,523.20
Republic of Korea	Won		366.68						366.68
Mongolia	Tugrik		425.19						425.19
China	Yuan		2,724.95						2,724.95
Brian Diffell:									
United States	Dollar				13,523.20				13,523.20
Republic of Korea	Won		366.68						366.68
Mongolia	Tugrik		425.19						425.19
China	Yuan		2,724.95						2,724.95
*Delegation Expenses:									
China	Dollar						299.00		299.00
Total			7,033.64		27,046.40		299.00		34,379.04

SENATOR JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
July 22, 2011.

*Delegation Expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Isaac Edwards:									
United States	Dollar				6,425.09				6,425.09
Micronesia	Dollar		274.00						274.00
Marshall Islands	Dollar		362.25						362.25
Al Stayman:									
United States	Dollar				6,425.09				6,425.09
Micronesia	Dollar		271.54						271.54
Marshall Islands	Dollar		380.95						380.95
Total			1,288.74		12,850.18				14,138.92

SENATOR JEFF BINGAMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, June 24, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dimitrios Karakitsos:									
United States	Dollar				1,795.90				1,795.90
Switzerland	Franc		1,098.00						1,098.00
Total			1,098.00		1,795.90				2,893.90

SENATOR BARBARA BOXER,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, July 22, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS—AMENDED— FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Amber Cottle:									
Brazil	Real		115.16						115.16
Colombia	Peso		1,437.59						1,437.59

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS—AMENDED— FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				6,462.50				6,462.50
Total			1,552.75		6,462.50				8,015.25

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 28, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Amber Cottle:									
Colombia	Peso		2,024.70						2,024.70
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Chelsea Thomas:									
Colombia	Peso		2,064.38						2,064.38
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Michael Smart:									
Colombia	Peso		1,980.69						1,980.69
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Gabriel Adler:									
Colombia	Peso		2,146.34						2,146.34
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Everett Eisenstat:									
Colombia	Peso		1,936.16						1,936.16
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
David Johanson:									
Colombia	Peso		1,867.19						1,867.19
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Rebecca Nasca:									
Colombia	Peso		1,883.94						1,883.94
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
James Catella:									
Colombia	Peso		1,815.22						1,815.22
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Rori Kramer:									
Colombia	Peso		1,914.81						1,914.81
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Jeffrey Phan:									
Colombia	Peso		1,778.17						1,778.17
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Andrew Siracuse:									
Colombia	Peso		1,870.43						1,870.43
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Verna Regier:									
Colombia	Peso		1,923.92						1,923.92
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Daniel Sepulveda:									
Colombia	Peso		2,010.62						2,010.62
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Janel George:									
Colombia	Peso		1,902.33						1,902.33
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
Arnoldo Vela:									
Colombia	Peso		1,901.20						1,901.20
United States	Dollar				2,955.60				2,955.60
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar						25,237.00		25,237.00
Senator John Thune:									
Israel	Shekel		819.73						819.73
Egypt	Egyptian Pound		309.94						309.94
Belgium	Euro		268.13						268.13
Senator Maria Cantwell:									
Israel	Shekel		802.75						802.75
Egypt	Egyptian Pound		309.94						309.94
Belgium	Euro		256.59						256.59
Chelsea Thomas:									
Zambia	Kwacha		1,310.31						1,310.31
South Africa	Rand		31.94						31.94
United States	Dollar				9,800.90				9,800.90
Total			33,129.43		54,134.90		25,237.00		112,501.33

SENATOR MAX BAUCUS
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 28, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include: interpretation, transportation, embassy travel and overtime, as well as other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Israel	Shekel		179.73						179.73
Egypt	Dinar		171.07						171.07
Belgium	Euro		19.55						19.55
Senator Christopher Coons:									
Nigeria	Naira		55.00						55.00
Benin	Franc		67.00						67.00
Ghana	Cedi		17.79						17.79
United States	Dollar				7,591.10				7,591.10

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Johnny Isakson:									
Nigeria	Naira		55.00						55.00
Benin	Franc		100.00						100.00
Ghana	Cedi		23.24						23.24
United States	Dollar				8,878.10				8,878.10
Senator John Kerry:									
Pakistan	Rupee		10.00						10.00
United States	Dollar				11,738.50				11,738.50
Senator John Kerry:									
United Kingdom	Pound		177.67						177.67
France	Euro		589.22						589.22
United States	Dollar				9,741.20				9,741.20
Senator John Kerry:									
Italy	Euro		50.00						50.00
United States	Dollar				4,406.00				4,406.00
Senator Robert Menendez:									
Spain	Euro		415.00						415.00
United States	Dollar				7,782.30				7,782.30
Jennifer Berlin:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		13.00						13.00
Pakistan	Rupee		78.00						78.00
United States	Dollar				11,703.50				11,703.50
Jonah Blank:									
United Kingdom	Pound		755.00						755.00
India	Rupee		775.00						775.00
United States	Dollar				14,741.80				14,741.80
Jason Bruder:									
Turkey	Lirasi		852.00						852.00
United States	Dollar				1,993.10				1,993.10
Perry Cammack:									
Israel	Shekel		513.00						513.00
Lebanon	Pound		444.00						444.00
Egypt	Pound		468.00						468.00
United States	Dollar				3,922.85				3,922.85
Heidi Crebo-Rediker:									
Egypt	Pound		537.62						537.62
United States	Dollar				4,026.70				4,026.70
Steven Feldstein:									
Belgium	Euro		193.00						193.00
United Kingdom	Pound		364.00						364.00
Tunisia	Dinar		1,052.00						1,052.00
United States	Dollar				4,450.80				4,450.80
Douglas Frantz:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		206.00						206.00
Pakistan	Rupee		115.00						115.00
United States	Dollar				11,673.50				11,673.50
Christina Gleason:									
Nigeria	Naira		94.00						94.00
Benin	Franc		108.00						108.00
Ghana	Cedi		18.45						18.45
Christina Gleason:									
United States	Dollar				7,591.10				7,591.10
Jodi Herman:									
Spain	Euro		469.26						469.26
United States	Dollar				8,010.30				8,010.30
Frank Jannuzi:									
China	RMB		2,387.00						2,387.00
United States	Dollar				15,659.90				15,659.90
Garrett Johnson:									
Haiti	Dollar		1,554.00						1,554.00
United States	Dollar				894.20				894.20
Gregory Kausner:									
United Kingdom	Pounds		718.84						718.84
Pakistan	Rupee		101.00						101.00
India	Rupee		911.00						911.00
United States	Dollar				14,741.80				14,741.80
Tamara Klajn:									
Zambia	Kwacha		1,240.00						1,240.00
United States	Dollar				4,553.90				4,553.90
Frank Lowenstein:									
Egypt	Pound		30.00						30.00
Italy	Euro		199.00						199.00
United States	Dollar				8,147.00				8,147.00
Nicholas Ma:									
Tunisia	Dinar		554.88						554.88
United States	Dollar				3,411.40				3,411.40
Carl Meacham:									
Haiti	Dollar		1,036.00						1,036.00
United States	Dollar				897.90				897.90
Sarah Peck:									
Pakistan	Rupee		325.00						325.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		160.00						160.00
United States	Dollar				11,219.20				11,219.20
Christopher Sullivan:									
Nigeria	Naira		94.00						94.00
Benin	Franc		66.00						66.00
Ghana	Cedi		29.88						29.88
United States	Dollar				8,878.10				8,878.10
Faterma Sumar:									
Afghanistan	Afghani		185.00						185.00
Pakistan	Rupee		96.00						96.00
United States	Dollar				11,473.50				11,473.50
Atman Trivedi:									
Japan	Yen		522.00						522.00
South Korea	Won		680.00						680.00
United States	Dollar				5,437.10				5,437.10
Total			19,875.20		203,564.85				223,440.05

SENATOR JOHN F. KERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 27, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Thomas R. Carper:									
United States	Dollar				13,433.70				13,433.70
India	Rupee		1,669.45						1,669.45
Pakistan	Rupee		283.18						283.18
Harlan C. Geer:									
United States	Dollar				13,892.70				13,892.70
India	Rupee		1,711.46						1,711.46
Pakistan	Rupee		283.07						283.07
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				1,388.20				1,388.20
England	Pound		942.51						942.51
Vance Serchuk:									
United States	Dollar				20,805.20				20,805.20
Singapore	Dollar		657.00						657.00
Christopher Griffin:									
United States	Dollar				20,805.20				20,805.20
Singapore	Dollar		493.00						493.00
Bradford Belzak:									
United States	Dollar				2,831.05				2,831.05
Russia	Ruble		430.00						430.00
Israel	Shekel		1,762.00						1,762.00
Lisa Powell:									
United States	Dollar				2,831.05				2,831.05
Russia	Ruble		447.00						447.00
Israel	Shekel		1,735.00						1,735.00
Eric Tamarkin:									
United States	Dollar				2,831.05				2,831.05
Russia	Ruble		442.27						442.27
Israel	Shekel		1,730.00						1,730.00
Elyse Greenwald:									
United States	Dollar				2,831.05				2,831.05
Russia	Ruble		430.00						430.00
Israel	Shekel		1,715.00						1,715.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
India	Rupee						562.22		562.22
Pakistan	Rupee						2,026.31		2,026.31
Israel	Shekel						1,300.50		1,300.50
Total			14,730.04		81,649.20		3,889.03		100,269.17

SENATOR JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,
July 26, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jon Kyl:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		751.83						751.83
Georgia	Lari		210.44						210.44
Lithuania	Litas		214.92						214.92
Latvia	Lat		7.74						7.74
Estonia	Euro		372.12						372.12
Timothy Morrison:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		846.50						846.50
Georgia	Lari		210.44						210.44
Lithuania	Litas		211.36						211.36
Latvia	Lat		11.41						11.41
Estonia	Euro		373.50						373.50
*Delegation Expenses:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia						2,716.97		2,716.97
Georgia	Lari						265.06		265.06
Lithuania	Litas						307.44		307.44
Latvia	Lat						141.86		141.86
Estonia	Euro						1,311.72		1,311.72
Senator Charles Grassley:									
Belgium	Euro		544.43						544.43
Russia	Ruble		1,858.95						1,858.95
Ireland	Euro		346.81						346.81
Elisabeth Levine:									
Belgium	Euro		631.17						631.17
Russia	Ruble		1,890.17						1,890.17
Ireland	Euro		432.20						432.20
J. Edward Pagano:									
Belgium	Euro		788.60						788.60
Russia	Ruble		2,056.34						2,056.34
Ireland	Euro		462.96						462.96
*Delegation Expenses:									
Belgium	Euro						1,973.68		1,973.68
Russia	Ruble						4,449.61		4,449.61
Ireland	Euro						935.96		935.96
Total			12,221.89				12,102.30		24,324.19

SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 26, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joan Kirchner:									
Nigeria	Naira		55.00						55.00
Benin	Franc		58.00						58.00
Ghana	Cedi		11.73						11.73
United States	Dollar				9,206.10				9,206.10
Total			124.73		9,206.10				9,330.83

SENATOR TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
July 13, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mary L. Landrieu:									
United States	Dollar				1,989.10				1,989.10
Guatemala	Quetzal		1,112.00						1,112.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Guatemala	Quetzal						5,139.00		5,139.00
Total			1,112.00		1,989.10		5,139.00		8,240.10

SENATOR MARY L. LANDRIEU,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship,
July 22, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–382, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE—ADDENDUM TO 1ST QUARTER REPORT FOR 2011—FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Saxby Chambliss:	Dollar						119.54		119.54
Total							119.54		119.54

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, July 12, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Andrew Kerr:			1,534.00						1,534.00
	Dollar				9,122.90				9,122.90
James Smythers:			1,446.00						1,446.00
	Dollar				9,122.90				9,122.90
Brian Walsh:			1,384.78						1,384.78
	Dollar				5,300.27				5,300.27
Brian Miller:			893.30						893.30
	Dollar				5,335.27				5,335.27
Martha Scott Poindexter:			2,563.82						2,563.82
	Dollar				9,997.35				9,997.35
James Smythers:			2,275.00						2,275.00
	Dollar				9,997.35				9,997.35
Total			10,096.90		48,876.04				58,972.94

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, July 12, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL McCONNELL TRAVEL FROM APR. 15 TO APR. 23, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mitch McConnell:									
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
India	Rupee		1,531.00						1,531.00
Italy	Euro		501.00						501.00
Senator Mike Johanns:									
South Korea	Won		248.81						248.81

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL McCONNELL TRAVEL FROM APR. 15 TO APR. 23, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
India	Rupee		986.00						986.00
Italy	Euro		251.00						251.00
Senator Jerry Moran:									
South Korea	Won		230.00						230.00
India	Rupee		943.00						943.00
Italy	Euro		282.00						282.00
Senator Rob Portman:									
Senator John Hoeven:									
Tom Hawkins:									
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
India	Rupee		820.00						820.00
Italy	Euro		409.00						409.00
Rohit Kumar:									
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
India	Rupee		967.00						967.00
Italy	Euro		409.00						409.00
Roy E. Brownell II:									
South Korea	Won		350.00						350.00
India	Rupee		1,069.18						1,069.18
Italy	Euro		309.00						309.00
Stefanie Hagar:									
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
India	Rupee		1,160.89						1,160.89
Italy	Euro		409.00						409.00
Sally Walsh:									
South Korea	Won		400.00						400.00
India	Rupee		1,279.00						1,279.00
Italy	Euro		409.00						409.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
South Korea	Won						4,227.12		4,227.12
India	Rupee						6,313.42		6,313.42
Afghanistan	Dollar						57.00		57.00
Italy	Euro						4,953.65		4,953.65
Total			14,563.88				15,551.19		30,115.07

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Chairman, Codel McConnell, June 20, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				9,997.35				9,997.35
Israel	Shekel		879.00						879.00
Jordan	Dinar		460.98						460.98
Egypt	Pound		481.82						481.82
Total			1,821.80		9,997.35				11,819.15

SENATOR MITCH McCONNELL,
Republican Leader, Senator Mitch McConnell, July 1, 2011.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL REID FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Harry Reid:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Senator Barbara Boxer:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		890.00						890.00
China	Yuan		1,129.47						1,129.47
Senator Richard Durbin:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		945.50						945.50
China	Yuan		1,292.94						1,292.94
Senator Michael Enzi:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		817.00						817.00
China	Yuan		1,270.00						1,270.00
Senator Charles Schumer:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Senator Frank Lautenberg:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Senator Johnny Isakson:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		816.00						816.00
China	Yuan		1,284.00						1,284.00
Senator Jeff Merkley:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		817.00						817.00
China	Yuan		1,233.00						1,233.00
Senator Michael Bennet:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		0.00						

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL REID FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2011—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
China	Yuan		0.00						
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		941.00						941.00
China	Yuan		1,409.00						1,409.00
Michael Castellano:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Jon Summers:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Stephen Krupin:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Terrell Henry:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,040.00						1,040.00
China	Yuan		1,507.00						1,507.00
Julia Reed:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		940.00						940.00
China	Yuan		1,438.48						1,438.48
*Delegation Expenses:									
Hong Kong							10,931.08		10,931.08
China							20,070.19		20,070.19
Total			35,599.39				31,001.27		66,600.66

SENATOR HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, July 22, 2011.

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State, and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

THANKING SENATE STAFF

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I appreciate your patience presiding over the Senate at this late hour. I extend my appreciation to this staff, everybody here, for all this work. About the last month has been very difficult. I appreciate very much the professionalism that is shown here in the Senate and the efforts they go to to make all of us look good. Sometimes that takes a lot of effort. But I do appreciate their working so hard together here at the desk. If there is ever anything that is bipartisan, it is right here, Republicans and Democrats, and there is no partisanship on the Senate floor. Step back a little bit and there is when we are away from the professional staff, but I appreciate very much their hard work.

EXTENSION OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have tried for days now to change what the Republicans in the House have tried to do to the American people. In fact, it appears they are going to be able to do it. We have the extension of the Federal Aviation Administration legislation that is being held up. We wanted a temporary extension for the next few weeks. We have already extended it more than 20 times. We thought we should do it again. We have done that. That has been routine until we get some of the big issues worked out. But Republicans wanted to increase the ante a little bit this time with essential air service. In Pennsylvania, some of the rural areas—the Presiding Officer is from Pennsylvania; of course, Nevada has a lot of rural areas, and other States. Even the heavily populated State of New York has essential air service. Essential air service was set up a long time ago to allow underpopulated areas to be able to be in touch with the rest of the States.

The Republicans have tried to eliminate essential air service. That is the ransom we are asking now for an extension of the FAA bill. I am not going to ask consent today; we have asked it many times. But I want the RECORD to be spread with how unreasonable it is, what the Republicans have done. As a result of their activities, the House Republicans, we have 80,000 people who will not be working now—80,000 people, more than 70,000 construction workers and thousands of people who are employees of the Federal Aviation Administration.

For example, in Nevada we have an air traffic control tower, a new one that needs to be built. It is going to be big, expensive, and necessary. The work has stopped. They worked there for less than a month. The work has stopped. The construction work has stopped.

I talked to the Senator from California, Senator BOXER, today. In Palm Springs they have one that is essential, is badly needed. Work has stopped on that.

Construction projects all over America are held up at our airports. It is so very unreasonable what they have done. I appreciate KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, the Republican Senator from Texas, who has worked with the chairman of the committee, JAY ROCKEFELLER, to try to work past this. She agrees with Senator ROCKEFELLER it is unreasonable that they have done this.

What I want to do is read a column out of the New York Times of July 29. The writer introduces his column by saying:

> The facts of the crisis over the debt ceiling aren't complicated. Republicans have, in effect, taken America hostage, threatening to undermine the economy and disrupt the essential business of government unless they get policy concessions they would never have been able to enact through legislation.

That is where we are with the FAA problem. He goes on to say:

> As I said, it's not complicated. Yet many people in the news media apparently can't bring themselves to acknowledge this simple reality. News reports portray the parties as equally intransigent; pundits fantasize about some kind of ''centrist'' uprising, as if the problem was too much partisanship on both sides. Some of us have long complained about the cult of ''balance,'' the insistence on portraying both parties as equally wrong and equally at fault on any issue, never mind the facts. I joked long ago that if one party declared that the earth was flat, the headlines would read ''Views Differ on Shape of Planet.'' But would that cult still rule in a situation as stark as the one we now face, in which one party is clearly engaged in blackmail?

He went on to say more and then he said:

> The answer, it turns out, is yes. And this is no laughing matter: The cult of balance has played an important role in bringing us to the edge of disaster. For when reporting on political disputes always implies that both sides are to blame, there is no penalty for extremism. Voters won't punish you for outrageous behavior if all they ever hear is that both sides are at fault.

Mr. President, I wish the press would report this outrageous conduct on the part of the House Republicans, in effect closing down work for 80,000 people in America because of their trying to eliminate essential air service.

The issue is certainly more than that. We know it is a labor issue. We have one airline that is terribly anti-union and they are the ones behind all this. They are using the essential air service as a guise to get what they want.

I am not going to ask consent, but I want the American people to know why essential air service is being attacked

and why 80,000 people are basically today not going to be able to go to work tomorrow.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, September 6, 2011, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to Executive Session to consider Calendar No. 109; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of that time the Senate proceed to vote with no intervening action or debate on Calendar No. 109, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

THE LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 87, H.R. 1249.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform.

CLOTURE MOTION

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 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 87, H.R. 1249, the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Thomas R. Carper, Joseph I. Lieberman, Richard Blumenthal, Charles E. Schumer, Amy Klobuchar, Robert Menendez, Jeanne Shaheen, John F. Kerry, Mark Udall, Mark R. Warner, Ben Nelson, Jeff Bingaman, Max Baucus, Mark Begich, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, September 6, following the disposition of the nomination of Bernice Bouie Donald and the resumption of the legislative session, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 87, H.R. 1249; further, that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the following Environment and Public Works bills, en bloc: Calender No. 72, S. 710; and Calendar No. 117, S. 1302.

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

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that the Chair has granted consent for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of those two bills; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed, en bloc; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, and any relevant statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

HAZARDOUS WASTE ELECTRONIC MANIFEST ESTABLISHMENT ACT

The bill (S. 710) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a hazardous waste electronic manifest system was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 710

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 ''Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest Establishment Act''.

SEC. 2. HAZARDOUS WASTE ELECTRONIC MANIFEST SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6921 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 3024. HAZARDOUS WASTE ELECTRONIC MANIFEST SYSTEM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) BOARD.—The term 'Board' means the Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Advisory Board established under subsection (f).

''(2) FUND.—The term 'Fund' means the Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund established by subsection (d).

''(3) PERSON.—The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation (including a Government corporation), company, association, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, trust, municipality, commission, Federal agency, State, political subdivision of a State, or interstate body.

''(4) SYSTEM.—The term 'system' means the hazardous waste electronic manifest system established under subsection (b).

''(5) USER.—The term 'user' means a hazardous waste generator, a hazardous waste transporter, an owner or operator of a hazardous waste treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal facility, or any other person that—

''(A) is required to use a manifest to comply with any Federal or State requirement to track the shipment, transportation, and receipt of hazardous waste or other material that is shipped from the site of generation to an off-site facility for treatment, storage, disposal, or recycling; and

''(B)(i) elects to use the system to complete and transmit an electronic manifest format; or

''(ii) submits to the system for data processing purposes a paper copy of the manifest (or data from such a paper copy), in accordance with such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate to require such a submission.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a hazardous waste electronic manifest system that may be used by any user.

''(c) USER FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may impose on users such reasonable service fees as the Administrator determines to be necessary to pay costs incurred in developing, operating, maintaining, and upgrading the system, including any costs incurred in collecting and processing data from any paper manifest submitted to the system after the date on which the system enters operation.

''(2) COLLECTION OF FEES.—The Administrator shall—

''(A) collect the fees described in paragraph (1) from the users in advance of, or as reimbursement for, the provision by the Administrator of system-related services; and

''(B) deposit the fees in the Fund for use in accordance with this subsection.

''(3) FEE STRUCTURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with information technology vendors, shall determine through the contract award process described in subsection (e) the fee structure that is necessary to recover the full cost to the Administrator of providing system-related services, including costs relating to—

''(i) materials and supplies;

''(ii) contracting and consulting;

''(iii) overhead;

''(iv) information technology (including costs of hardware, software, and related services);

''(v) information management;

''(vi) collection of service fees;

''(vii) investment of any unused service fees;

''(viii) reporting and accounting;

''(ix) employment of direct and indirect Government personnel dedicated to establishing and maintaining the system; and

''(x) project management.

''(B) ADJUSTMENTS IN FEE AMOUNT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Board, shall increase or decrease amount of a service fee determined under the fee structure described in subparagraph (A) to a level that will—

''(I) result in the collection of an aggregate amount for deposit in the Fund that is sufficient to cover current and projected system-related costs (including any necessary system upgrades); and

''(II) minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the accumulation of unused amounts in the Fund.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR INITIAL PERIOD OF OPERATION.—The requirement described in clause (i)(II) shall not apply to any additional fees that accumulate in the Fund, in an amount that does not exceed $2,000,000, during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the system enters operation.

''(iii) TIMING OF ADJUSTMENTS.—Adjustments to service fees described in clause (i) shall be made—

''(I) initially, at the time at which initial development costs of the system have been recovered by the Administrator such that the service fee may be reduced to reflect the elimination of the system development component of the fee; and

''(II) periodically thereafter, upon receipt and acceptance of the findings of any annual accounting or auditing report under subsection (d)(6), if the report discloses a significant disparity for a fiscal year between the funds collected from service fees under this

subsection for the fiscal year and expenditures made for the fiscal year to provide system-related services.

''(d) HAZARDOUS WASTE ELECTRONIC MANIFEST SYSTEM FUND.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund, to be known as the 'Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund', consisting of—

''(A) such amounts as are appropriated to the Fund under paragraph (2); and

''(B) any interest earned on investment of amounts in the Fund under paragraph (4).

''(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—There are appropriated to the Fund amounts equivalent to amounts collected as fees and received by the Administrator under subsection (c).

''(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), on request by the Administrator, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the Fund to the Administrator such amounts as the Administrator determines to be necessary to pay costs incurred in developing, operating, maintaining, and upgrading the system under subsection (c).

''(B) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Fees collected by the Administrator and deposited in the Fund under this section shall be available to the Administrator for use in accordance with this section without fiscal year limitation and without further appropriation.

''(ii) OVERSIGHT.—The Administrator shall carry out all necessary measures to ensure that amounts in the Fund are used only to carry out the goals of establishing, operating, maintaining, upgrading, managing, supporting, and overseeing the system.

''(4) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator, required to meet current withdrawals.

''(B) INTEREST-BEARING OBLIGATIONS.—Investments may be made only in—

''(i) interest-bearing obligations of the United States; or

''(ii) obligations, participations, or other instruments that are lawful investments for fiduciaries, trusts, or public funds, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(C) ACQUISITION OF OBLIGATIONS.—For the purpose of investments under paragraph (1), obligations may be acquired—

''(i) on original issue at the issue price; or

''(ii) by purchase of outstanding obligations at the market price.

''(D) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

''(E) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

''(5) TRANSFERS OF AMOUNTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amounts required to be transferred to the Fund under this subsection shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

''(B) ADJUSTMENTS.—Proper adjustment shall be made in amounts subsequently transferred to the extent prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

''(6) ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING.—

''(A) ACCOUNTING.—For each 2-fiscal-year period, the Administrator shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

''(i) an accounting of the fees paid to the Administrator under subsection (c) and disbursed from the Fund for the period covered by the report, as reflected by financial statements provided in accordance with—

''(I) the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–576; 104 Stat. 2838) and amendments made by that Act; and

''(II) the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–356; 108 Stat. 3410) and amendments made by that Act; and

''(ii) an accounting describing actual expenditures from the Fund for the period covered by the report for costs described in subsection (c)(1).

''(B) AUDITING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of section 3515(c) of title 31, United States Code, the Fund shall be considered a component of an Executive agency.

''(ii) COMPONENTS OF AUDIT.—The annual audit required in accordance with sections 3515(b) and 3521 of title 31, United States Code, of the financial statements of activities carried out using amounts from the Fund shall include an analysis of—

''(I) the fees collected and disbursed under this section;

''(II) the reasonableness of the fee structure in place as of the date of the audit to meet current and projected costs of the system;

''(III) the level of use of the system by users; and

''(IV) the success to date of the system in operating on a self-sustaining basis and improving the efficiency of tracking waste shipments and transmitting waste shipment data.

''(iii) FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY.—The Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency shall—

''(I) conduct the annual audit described in clause (ii); and

''(II) submit to the Administrator a report that describes the findings and recommendations of the Inspector General resulting from the audit.

''(e) CONTRACTS.—

''(1) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FUNDED BY SERVICE FEES.—The Administrator may enter into 1 or more information technology contracts with entities determined to be appropriate by the Administrator (referred to in this subsection as 'contractors') under which—

''(A) the Administrator agrees to award a contract for the provision of system-related services; and

''(B) the contractor agrees to assume the initial risk of the information technology investment, and to obtain reimbursement for investment costs, operating costs, and other fees, by receiving as payment an agreed-upon share of the amounts collected as fees by the Administrator under subsection (c).

''(2) TERM OF CONTRACT.—A contract awarded under this subsection shall have a term of not more than 10 years.

''(3) ACHIEVEMENT OF GOALS.—The Administrator shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that a contract awarded under this subsection—

''(A) is performance-based;

''(B) identifies objective outcomes; and

''(C) contains performance standards that may be used to measure achievement and goals to evaluate the success of a contractor in performing under the contract and the right of the contractor to payment for services under the contract, taking into consideration that a primary measure of successful performance shall be the development of a hazardous waste electronic manifest system that—

''(i) meets the needs of the user community (including States that rely on data contained in manifests);

''(ii) attracts sufficient user participation and service fee revenues to ensure the viability of the system;

''(iii) decreases the administrative burden on the user community; and

''(iv) provides the waste receipt data applicable to the biennial reports required by section 3002(a)(6).

''(4) PAYMENT STRUCTURE.—Each contract awarded under this subsection shall include a provision that specifies—

''(A) the service fee structure of the contractor that will form the basis for payments to the contractor;

''(B) the fixed-share ratio of monthly service fee revenues from which the Administrator shall reimburse the contractor for system-related development, operation, and maintenance costs and provide an additional profit or fee commensurate with the risk undertaken by the contractor in performing in accordance with the contract;

''(C) the amount of additional transactional costs attributed to—

''(i) the ancillary costs of the Administrator in implementing and managing the system, including the costs of integrating the applications of the contractor with the central data exchange architecture of the Environmental Protection Agency;

''(ii) the direct and indirect personnel costs incurred by the Administrator to employ personnel dedicated to the implementation and management of the system; and

''(iii) expenses incurred in procuring any independent contractor services to assist staff of the Administrator in the preparation of financial statements and reports and the conduct of regular user group and governance meetings necessary for the oversight of the system.

''(5) CANCELLATION AND TERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator determines that sufficient funds are not made available for the continuation in a subsequent fiscal year of a contract entered into under this subsection, the Administrator shall cancel or terminate the contract.

''(B) COSTS.—The costs of cancellation or termination under subparagraph (A) may be paid using—

''(i) appropriations available for performance of the contract;

''(ii) unobligated appropriations available for acquisition of the information technology procured under the contract; or

''(iii) funds subsequently appropriated for payment of costs of the cancellation or termination.

''(C) NEGOTIATION OF AMOUNTS.—The amount payable in the event of cancellation or termination of a contract entered into under this subsection shall be negotiated with the contractor at the time at which the contract is awarded.

''(D) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.—The Administrator may enter into a contract under this subsection for any fiscal year, regardless of whether funds are made specifically available for the full costs of cancellation or termination of the contract, if—

''(i) funds are available at the time at which the contract is awarded to make payments with respect to a contingent liability in an amount equal to at least 100 percent of the estimated costs of a cancellation or termination during the first fiscal year of the contract, as determined by the Administrator; or

''(ii) funds described in clause (i) are not available as described in that clause, but the contractor—

''(I) is informed of the amount of any unfunded contingent liability; and

''(II) agrees to perform the contract despite the unfunded contingent liability.

''(6) NO EFFECT ON OWNERSHIP.—Regardless of whether the Administrator enters into a contract under this subsection, the system shall be owned by the Federal Government.

''(f) HAZARDOUS WASTE ELECTRONIC MANIFEST SYSTEM ADVISORY BOARD.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall establish a board to be known as the 'Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Advisory Board'.

''(2) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of 9 members, of which—

''(A) 1 member shall be the Administrator (or a designee), who shall serve as Chairperson of the Board; and

''(B) 8 members shall be individuals appointed by the Administrator—

''(i) at least 2 of whom shall have expertise in information technology;

''(ii) at least 3 of whom shall have experience in using or represent users of the manifest system to track the transportation of hazardous waste under this subtitle (or an equivalent State program); and

''(iii) at least 3 of whom shall be a State representative responsible for processing those manifests.

''(3) DUTIES.—The Board shall meet annually to discuss, evaluate the effectiveness of, and provide recommendations to the Administrator relating to, the system.

''(g) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) PROMULGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The regulations promulgated pursuant to subparagraph (A) may include such requirements as the Administrator determines to be necessary to facilitate the transition from the use of paper manifests to the use of electronic manifests, or to accommodate the processing of data from paper manifests in the electronic manifest system, including a requirement that users of paper manifests submit to the system copies of the paper manifests for data processing purposes.

''(C) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall ensure that each electronic manifest provides, to the same extent as paper manifests under applicable Federal and State law, for—

''(i) the ability to track and maintain legal accountability of—

''(I) the person that certifies that the information provided in the manifest is accurately described; and

''(II) the person that acknowledges receipt of the manifest;

''(ii) if the manifest is electronically submitted, State authority to access paper printout copies of the manifest from the system; and

''(iii) access to all publicly available information contained in the manifest.

''(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF REGULATIONS.—Any regulation promulgated by the Administrator under paragraph (1) and in accordance with section 3003 relating to electronic manifesting of hazardous waste shall take effect in each State as of the effective date specified in the regulation.

''(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator shall carry out regulations promulgated under this subsection in each State unless the State program is fully authorized to carry out those regulations in lieu of the Administrator.

''(h) REQUIREMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN STATES.—In any case in which the State in which waste is generated, or the State in which waste will be transported to a designated facility, requires that the waste be tracked through a hazardous waste manifest, the designated facility that receives the waste shall, regardless of the State in which the facility is located—

''(1) complete the facility portion of the applicable manifest;

''(2) sign and date the facility certification; and

''(3) submit to the system a final copy of the manifest for data processing purposes.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901) is amended by inserting at the end of the items relating to subtitle C the following:

''Sec. 3024. Hazardous waste electronic manifest system.''.

GENERAL SERVICES PARCEL ACT

The bill (S. 1302) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Tracy, California, to the City of Tracy was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1302

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PARCEL, TRACY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) CITY.—The term ''City'' means the city of Tracy, California.

(3) PARCEL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Parcel'' means the approximately 150 acres conveyed to the City for educational or recreational purposes pursuant to section 140 of division C of Public Law 105–277 (112 Stat. 2681–599; 113 Stat. 104; 118 Stat. 335).

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''Parcel'' does not include the approximately 50 acres conveyed to the City for economic development, in which the United States retains no reversionary interest, pursuant to section 140 of division C of Public Law 105–277 (112 Stat. 2681–599; 113 Stat. 104; 118 Stat. 335).

(b) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (c) through (f) of section 140 of division C of Public Law 105–277 (112 Stat. 2681–599; 113 Stat. 104; 118 Stat. 335) and subject to subsection (c), the Administrator may offer to enter into a binding agreement with the City, as soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, under which the Administrator may convey to the City, through a deed of release or other appropriate instrument, any reversionary interest retained by the United States in the Parcel, and all other terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions imposed, in connection with the conveyance of the Parcel.

(2) SURVEY.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the exact acreage and legal description of the Parcel shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Administrator.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (b), the City shall pay to the Administrator an amount not less than the appraised fair market value of the Parcel, as determined by the Administrator pursuant to an appraisal conducted by a licensed, independent appraiser, based on the highest and best use of the Parcel, as determined by the Administrator.

(2) TREATMENT.—The determination of the Administrator under paragraph (1) regarding the fair market value of the Parcel shall be final.

(d) COST OF CONVEYANCE.—The City shall be responsible for reimbursing the Administrator for the costs associated with implementing this section, including the costs of each applicable appraisal and survey.

(e) PROCEEDS.—

(1) DEPOSIT.—The net proceeds from the conveyance under this section shall be deposited in the Federal Buildings Fund established by section 592(a) of title 40, United States Code.

(2) EXPENDITURE.—The amounts deposited in the Federal Buildings Fund under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Administrator, in amounts specified in appropriations Acts, for expenditure for any lawful purpose consistent with the authority of the Administrator.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator may establish such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (b) as the Administrator considers to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) NO EFFECT ON COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act affects or limits the application of or obligation to comply with any environmental law, including section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)).

CAMPUS FIRE SAFETY MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 104.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 104) designating September 2011 as ''Campus Fire Safety Month.''

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, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 104

Whereas, each year, States across the Nation formally designate September as Campus Fire Safety Month;

Whereas, since January 2000, at least 143 people, including students, parents, and children have died in campus-related fires;

Whereas 85 percent of those deaths occurred in off-campus residences;

Whereas a majority of college students in the United States live in off-campus residences;

Whereas a number of fatal fires have occurred in buildings in which the fire safety systems had been compromised or disabled by the occupants;

Whereas automatic fire alarm systems provide the early warning of a fire that is necessary for occupants and the fire department to take appropriate action;

Whereas automatic fire sprinkler systems are a highly effective method of controlling or extinguishing a fire in its early stages, protecting the lives of the building's occupants;

Whereas many college students live in off-campus residences, fraternity and sorority housing, and residence halls that are not adequately protected with automatic fire sprinkler systems and automatic fire alarm systems;

Whereas fire safety education is an effective method of reducing the occurrence of fires and reducing the resulting loss of life and property damage;

Whereas college students do not routinely receive effective fire safety education during their time in college;

Whereas it is vital to educate young people in the United States about the importance of fire safety to help ensure fire-safe behavior by young people during their college years and beyond; and

Whereas, by developing a generation of fire-safe adults, future loss of life from fires may be significantly reduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2011 as ''Campus Fire Safety Month''; and

(2) encourages administrators of institutions of higher education and municipalities across the country—

(A) to provide educational programs to all students during September and throughout the school year;

(B) to evaluate the level of fire safety being provided in both on- and off-campus student housing; and

(C) to ensure fire-safe living environments through fire safety education, installation of fire suppression and detection systems, and the development and enforcement of applicable codes relating to fire safety.

NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 254) designating August 16, 2011, as ''National Airborne Day.''

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, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 254) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 254

Whereas the airborne forces of the Armed Forces have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the United States' experiment with airborne operations began on June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations, such as the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas included in these divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities that provide the lineage and legacy of many airborne units throughout our Armed Forces;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne forces during World War II prompted the evolution of those forces into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, United States airborne forces, which include members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, and special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, together with other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne force also includes other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and para-rescue teams;

Whereas of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with their special skills and achievements, distinguishes such members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in former days, glider troops;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2011, as ''National Airborne Day''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

NATIONAL CHESS DAY

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to S. Res. 255.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 255) designating October 8, 2011, as ''National Chess Day'' to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr ROCKEFELLER: Mr. President, I rise today in support of this resolution to designate National Chess Day as October 8, 2011. I greatly appreciate the support of my colleague, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee.

National Chess Day is designed to enhance awareness and encourage students and adults to engage in a game known to enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

There are 76,000 members of the Chess Federation and half of them are students. Studies indicate that chess programs can help with students improving in math and reading. Engaging students in such activities can make learning fun and help them develop a lifelong pastime to engage their skills.

Engaging students in chess is a wonderful opportunity to promote education, and I hope as school begins in a few weeks, more students will join the Chess Federation and learn this historical game.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 255) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 255

Whereas there are more than 76,000 members of the United States Chess Federation (referred to in this preamble as the ''Federation''), and unknown numbers of additional people in the United States who play the game without joining an official organization;

Whereas approximately ½ of the members of the Federation are scholastic members, and many of the scholastic members join by the age of 10;

Whereas the Federation is very supportive of the scholastic programs and sponsors a

Certified Chess Coach program that provides the coaches involved in the scholastic programs training and ensures schools and students can have confidence in the programs;

Whereas many studies have linked chess programs to the improvement of student scores in reading and math, as well as improved self-esteem;

Whereas the Federation offers a school curriculum to educators to help incorporate chess into the school curriculum;

Whereas chess is a powerful cognitive learning tool that can be used to successfully enhance reading and math concepts; and

Whereas chess engages students of all learning styles and strengths and promotes problem-solving and higher-level thinking skills: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 8, 2011, as ''National Chess Day''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe ''National Chess Day'' with appropriate programs and activities.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 95, 230, 232, 254, 255, 256, 257, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 275, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 288, and Calendar Nos. 291 through 323, and nominations placed on the Secretary's Desk in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions 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; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for the second year in a row, the Senate has failed to take significant steps before the August recess to address the serious crisis of judicial vacancies on courts around the country. Last August, Senate Republicans left 17 judicial nominations pending and consented to confirm only four Federal circuit and district court nominations before the recess. I noted at that time what a serious blow that was to our ability to make progress addressing the judicial vacancies crisis that had already persisted for well over a year. Today, as the Senate recesses with judicial vacancies still near 90 as they were a year ago, the Senate is doing even worse, confirming only 4 judicial nominations of the 24 nominees already considered by the Judiciary Committee and awaiting a Senate vote.

Last week, I urged the Senate to confirm the two dozen judicial nominations already fully considered by the Judiciary Committee and ready for final action by the Senate. Of them, 20 were unanimously reported, without a single negative vote. Many have been pending without final action for months. I am, again, disappointed as Senate Republicans continue to delay these much needed and long awaited confirmations.

Even though Federal judicial vacancies have remained near or above 90 for more than 2 years, the Senate's Republican leadership has refused to consent to vote on these qualified, consensus nominations, leaving 16 of the 20 unanimously reported nominees in limbo. This is not the way to make real progress. The American people should not have to wait more weeks and months for the Senate to do its constitutional duty and ensure the ability of our Federal courts to provide justice to Americans around the country.

In the past, we were able to confirm consensus nominees more promptly. They were not forced to languish for months. In the second year of the Bush administration, in 2002, before the August recess the Senate moved ahead to confirm a dozen judicial nominees. The next year, with a Republican Senate majority, Senate Democrats consented to seven confirmations before the August recess. With the delays that have been backlogging confirmations for years now, we have 20 unanimously reported judicial nominees who could all have been confirmed before this recess. Regrettably, 16 will not go forward today because Republicans refuse to consent.

At a time when judicial vacancies remain near 90, these needless delays perpetuate the judicial vacancies crisis that Chief Justice Roberts wrote of last December and that the President, the Attorney General, bar associations, and chief judges around the country have urged us to join together to end. The Senate can and should be doing a better job working to ensure the ability of our Federal courts to provide justice to Americans around the country.

Just last week, the Congressional Research Service released a report that confirms what many of us have been saying for some time: This is the longest sustained period of historically high vacancy rates on the Federal judiciary in the last 35 years.

This is hardly surprising. Republican obstruction kept the total confirmations in the first year of the President's term to the lowest total for a first year in more than 50 years, when only 12 judicial nominees were allowed to be considered. Republican obstruction kept the 2-year total of confirmations to the lowest total in 35 years, for the first 2 years of a President's term, with only a total of 60 Federal circuit and district court nominations confirmed during the course of those entire first 2 years of the Obama administration. Accordingly, judicial vacancies have perpetuated needlessly and caused needless delay on consensus nominees.

We are seeing it, again, this week as we approach the August recess in the third year of the Obama administration. In the 17 months I chaired the Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first term, the Senate confirmed 100 of his Federal circuit and district court nominees. It looks like it will take twice as long to reach 100 confirmations of President Obama's Federal circuit and district court nominees. President Obama has been in office for 31 months and only 95 of his Federal circuit and district court nominees have been confirmed. There are two dozen more that are stalled, awaiting final Senate action. By the August recess in the third year of the Bush administration, the Senate had confirmed 143 Federal circuit and district court judges. This year, the comparable number is only 95.

It is not accurate to pretend that real progress is being made in these circumstances. Vacancies are being kept high, consensus nominees are being delayed and it is the American people and the Federal courts that are being made to suffer. This is another area in which we must come together for the American people. There is no reason Senators cannot join together to finally bring down the excessive number of vacancies that have persisted on Federal courts throughout the Nation for far too long.

I have always taken seriously the responsibility of the Senate to make sure that the Federal judiciary has the resources it needs. Senate Republicans had pocket-filibustered more than 60 of President Clinton's judicial nominations and refused to proceed on them while judicial vacancies skyrocketed to more than 110. Despite that, in the 17 months I chaired the Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first 2 years in office, the Senate proceeded to confirm 100 of his judicial nominees; during the next 24 months, with a Republican majority in the Senate, confirmed 105 more, for a total of 205 confirmed judges during President Bush's first term. We have a long way to go for the Senate to be as productive as we were during President Bush's first term.

We were able to lower vacancies dramatically during President Bush's years in office, cutting them in half during his first term. The Senate has reversed course during the Obama administration, and with Republican objections slowing the pace of confirmations, judicial vacancies have been at crisis levels for over 2 years. Over the 8 years of the Bush administration, from 2001 to 2009, we reduced judicial vacancies from 110 to a low of 34. They now stand at 88 vacancies. The vacancy rate—which we reduced from 10 percent to 6 percent by this date in President Bush's third year, and ultimately to less than 4 percent in 2008—is back above 10 percent.

Time and time again over the last 2½ years, I have urged the Senate to come together and work to address this crisis. At the beginning of this year, I called for a return to regular order in the consideration of nominations. We

have seen that approach work on the Judiciary Committee. I have thanked the Judiciary Committee's ranking member, Senator GRASSLEY, many times for his cooperation with me to make sure that the committee continues to make progress in the consideration of nominations. His approach has been the right approach. Regrettably, it has not been matched on the floor, where the refusal by Republican leadership to come to regular time agreements to consider nominations has put our progress—our positive action—at risk.

Republican obstruction has led to a backlog of two dozen judicial nominations pending on the Senate's Executive Calendar. More than half of the judicial nominations on the calendar would fill judicial emergency vacancies. Yet, due to Republican objections, we have lost another opportunity to make progress by confirming consensus nominations.

Before the Memorial Day recess, I urged that the Senate to take up and vote on the many consensus judicial nominations then on the calendar and ready for final action. But Republican Senators would not agree to consider a single one. With nearly 20 judicial nominees available to the Senate for final action, only 1 was considered before the July 4 recess. In fact, the Senate has now considered only 11 nominations in the last 10 weeks and has only confirmed a total of 18 judicial nominees who had their hearings this year.

Senate Republicans have departed from the Senate's traditional practice by refusing to confirm even unanimous, consensus nominees. I still await an explanation from the other side of the aisle why these nominations could not be considered and confirmed. Republican leadership should explain to the people and Senators from Tennessee, South Carolina, Florida, Texas, Missouri, Louisiana, Maine, New York, Arkansas, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania why there continue to be vacancies on the Federal courts in their States that could easily be filled if the Senate would do its constitutional duty and vote on the President's nominations. These judicial nominees have the support of Republican home State Senators. In fact, there are multiple nominees still pending from Louisiana and Pennsylvania. Yet those nominees still wait for months on the Senate's calendar without explanation for the damaging delays, leaving the people of those States to bear the brunt of having too few judges.

All 24 of the judicial nominations on the calendar have been favorably reported by the Judiciary after a fair but thorough process. We review extensive background material on each nominee. All Senators on the committee, Democratic and Republican, have the opportunity to ask the nominees questions at a live hearing. Senators also have the opportunity to ask questions in writing following the hearing and to meet with the nominees. All of these nominees have a strong commitment to the rule of law and a demonstrated faithfulness to the Constitution. They should not be delayed for weeks and months needlessly after being so thoroughly and fairly considered by the Judiciary Committee.

Last week, the president of the American Bar Association, Stephen Zack, wrote to the Senate leaders ''to urge [them] to redouble [their] efforts to fill existing judicial vacancies promptly so that the federal courts will have the judges they need to uphold the rule of law and deliver timely justice.'' He wrote:

> As lawyers who practice in federal courts across this nation, ABA members know firsthand that long-standing vacancies on courts with staggering caseloads impede access to the courts and create strains that will inevitably reduce the quality of our justice system and erode public confidence in the ability of the courts to vindicate constitutional rights or render fair and timely decisions.

Mr. Zack's concerns echo those of Chief Justice Roberts, the President, the Attorney General, bar associations, and chief judges around the country who have also urged us to join together to end the judicial vacancies crisis. The Senate can and should be doing a better job working to ensure the ability of our Federal courts to provide justice to Americans around the country.

The four nominees the Senate will consider today like so many others left on the calendar have the strong support of their home State Senators—Republicans and Democrats—and all were reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Kathleen Williams was first nominated over a year ago to fill a judicial emergency vacancy in the Southern District of Florida. Her nomination has the support of both of her home State Senators—Senator BILL NELSON, a Democrat, and Senator RUBIO, a Republican—and was reported without objection by the Judiciary Committee on May 12. Ms. Williams has been the Federal public defender for the Southern District of Florida for 15 years, having been appointed five times by the Eleventh Circuit, most recently earlier this year. Ms. Williams was previously a Federal prosecutor in the Southern District of Florida, and she also worked in private civil litigation. Her balance of experience as a prosecutor and as a public defender providing legal services to thousands of defendants who cannot afford their own attorney will serve her well on the Federal bench.

Sara Darrow was nominated over 8 months ago to fill a judicial vacancy in the Central District of Illinois. Ms. Darrow has the bipartisan support of her home State Senators, Senator DURBIN, a Democrat, and Senator KIRK, a Republican. Ms. Darrow has been a prosecutor for over 12 years, working as a State's Attorney for Illinois and later as a Federal prosecutor in Illinois and Iowa. She is currently chief of the violent crimes unit in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of Illinois. Her nomination was reported by the Judiciary Committee without objection on May 12.

Nelva Gonzales Ramos was nominated in January of this year to fill a judicial emergency vacancy in the Southern District of Texas. Her nomination has the strong support of both her Republican home State Senators, Senators CORNYN and HUTCHISON, and was reported by the Judiciary Committee without objection May 12. She has served for over 12 years as a State judge in Texas, where she has presided over more than 1,200 cases. Judge Ramos has been reelected twice by the people of Texas to serve as a State judge. Prior to joining the bench, she also had a successful career as a litigator in private practice.

Richard Brooke Jackson was first nominated over 10 months ago to fill a judicial emergency vacancy in the District of Colorado. He is currently the chief judge for the First Judicial District in Colorado, where he has served for over 13 years, earning recognitions as the ''Best State Judge in Colorado'' in 2010. Prior to joining the bench, Judge Jackson practiced law for 26 years in Denver, CO, where he was made a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers. Judge Jackson's nomination has the strong support of both of his home State Senators, Senator UDALL and Senator BENNET, and was reported by the Judiciary Committee without objection on May 12.

The Senate's failure to take action and vote on 20 of the 24 judicial nominees reviewed by the Judiciary Committee and reported favorably to the Senate is yet another in a long line of missed opportunities to come together for the American people. This is not how the Senate has acted in years past with other Presidents' judicial nominees. Vacancies are being kept high, consensus nominees are being delayed, and it is the American people and the Federal courts that are being made to suffer.

I hope that when we return from the August recess, Senators can finally join together to begin to bring down the excessive number of vacancies that have persisted on Federal courts throughout the Nation for far too long. We can and must do better.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent letter from the President of the American Bar Association and a recent column by Professor Carl Tobias be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, July 28, 2011.

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

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the

American Bar Association, I am writing to urge you to redouble your efforts to fill existing judicial vacancies promptly so that the federal courts will have the judges they need to uphold the rule of law and deliver timely justice.

There is no priority higher to the Association than to assure that we have a fully staffed and fully operating federal bench. That is why I have used my position as ABA president this past year to speak out repeatedly about the urgent need to fill existing vacancies.

We commend the Congress for starting the session by instituting procedural changes and approaching the confirmation process with a fresh sense of urgency, which has helped restore regular order to the process. As a result, the President has made 87 judicial nominations and the Senate has regularly scheduled up-or-down votes and confirmed 31 nominees this session.

However, no significant reduction in the high number of vacancies has been achieved: there are only 4 fewer vacancies on the federal bench today than there were January 1 of this year, and 10 percent of the authorized judgeships remain vacant. During the past two years—since August 2009—the vacancy rate has fluctuated, but it has never dropped below 10 percent.

Thirty-eight of the present vacancies have existed for so long and created such untenable workloads for the remaining judges on the courts that the seats have been declared judicial emergencies by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. As lawyers who practice in federal courts across this nation, ABA members know firsthand that longstanding vacancies on courts with staggering caseloads impede access to the courts and create strains that will inevitably reduce the quality of our justice system and erode public confidence in the ability of the courts to vindicate constitutional rights or render fair and timely decisions. In Arizona, for example, the Speedy Trial Act has been temporarily waived, and criminal defendants wait up to 6 months for a trial, while businesses and individuals wait up to 2 years before their cases are heard.

We realize that the aging of our federal judiciary has contributed to the growing vacancy crisis. In July alone, 10 new vacancies were created through death, retirement and elevation, and we already know that an additional 11 vacancies will arise before the end of this year solely as a result of planned retirements. According to Department of Justice estimates, 60 new vacancies will be created through attrition each year for the next decade. Obviously, progress toward reducing vacancies requires a confirmation rate that outpaces the attrition rate; at present, it is barely keeping abreast of it.

The inescapable conclusion is that despite good intentions and modest progress, the current pace of nominations and confirmations is inadequate to the job. To achieve a significant and lasting reduction in the vacancy rate, both the Administration and the Senate need to engage in a concerted and sustained effort to expedite the process; there is an obvious starting point.

We believe the positions of both Senator Leahy and Senator Grassley with regard to the pending consensus nominees provide useful guidance: Senator Leahy has long urged swift action and up-or-down votes on all consensus nominees, and Senator Grassley, recently attesting to Republican ''cooperation and positive action,'' observed, ''We are moving forward on the consensus nominees.''

At present there is a backlog of 24 nominees awaiting a floor vote, 20 of whom were reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee on voice vote with no recorded opposition. We urge you as Majority and Minority Leaders to schedule immediate up-or-down votes on these 20 consensus nominees before the Senate adjourns for the upcoming August recess.

Swift confirmation of these nominees would provide immediate relief to some of the most overburdened courts and would lower the vacancy rate to approximately 8 percent. Longterm permanent progress, however, will require more than this one-time fix. To effect lasting change, we also continue to urge the President and members of the Senate to act with common purpose to fill judicial vacancies promptly throughout this Congress so that the federal courts will not be deprived of the judges they need to do their important work.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN N. ZACK.

[From FindLaw, Aug. 1, 2011]

CONFIRMING CIRCUIT JUDGES IN THE 112TH SENATE

(By Carl Tobias)

When President Barack Obama was inaugurated, the United States Courts of Appeals experienced vacancies in fourteen of the 179 judgeships. Thus, it was critical that the administration promptly fill those openings. The White House has instituted many practices to facilitate appointments. However, numerous seats remain vacant and more have opened, as judges have retired or assumed senior status, so the total is presently nineteen. A trenchant example is the August 2009 Sixth Circuit nomination of Nashville practitioner Jane Branstetter Stranch. Because the empty appellate seats undermine the judiciary's expeditious, economical and fair disposition of appeals and Ms. Stranch had waited thirteen months for a floor vote, the Senate ultimately approved her last September. Now that the 112th Senate has concluded its first seven months and Obama has proffered nominees for ten of the appeals court openings, he must swiftly nominate excellent candidates for the remaining vacancies, while the upper chamber must expeditiously confirm the appellate nominees. Indeed, Senator Mitch McConnell (R–Ky.), the Minority Leader, should agree on a floor debate and vote for Sixth Circuit nominee Bernice Donald before the August recess because she is a well qualified, uncontroversial District Judge whom Obama nominated last December 1.

There are a few reasons for the empty judgeships. For instance, President George W. Bush ineffectively attempted to fill Sixth Circuit openings. He rarely consulted with senators from jurisdictions with vacancies or tapped consensus picks. Two Michigan Sixth Circuit posts lacked judges for a decade and were only filled when the parties reached a 2008 compromise.

Obama has invoked several measures to promptly fill all the current openings. He rapidly consulted home-state elected officials before actual nominations. Most officers have cooperated with the White House and promptly suggested candidates who are very smart, ethical, independent and diligent and have balanced temperament. The White House specifically consulted Tennessee Republican Senators Lamar Alexander and Bob Corker, who agreed to support Ms. Stranch. The President nominated the lawyer in August 2009, while the Judiciary Committee afforded her an October hearing at which the Tennessee senators appeared and voiced their support. The committee reported Stranch on a 15–4 vote in November 2009. The nominee then languished on the Senate floor for ten months.

Senator Patrick Leahy (D–Vt.), the Judiciary Committee Chair, worked on securing Ms. Stranch's Senate floor consideration. For instance, Leahy cooperated with Senator Alexander in requesting that Senator McConnell work with Senator Harry Reid (D–Nev.), the Majority Leader, to swiftly arrange the nominee's debate and vote. On July 20, 2010, Senators Leahy and Alexander worked together on the floor. Leahy lauded Ms. Stranch's capabilities, emphasized her protracted wait and sought unanimous consent to consider the nominee. Senator Alexander agreed that ''Jane Stranch is a well-qualified nominee [and] is the longest pending circuit court nominee'' and asked for a prompt vote. Senator McConnell stated that some Republicans voted against Ms. Stranch in committee and that he would attempt to have the Senate act on her soon. One week later, President Obama asked that McConnell cooperate in filling the ''vacancies that continue to plague the judiciary'' and seemingly alluded to Ms. Stranch when he observed that nominees have been ''waiting up to eight months to be confirmed.''

Obama meticulously picked Stranch as his first nominee for the Sixth Circuit, which includes Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Tennessee, because she had assembled a stellar record as a Nashville attorney over three decades. The nominee earned the highest ABA ranking of well qualified from a minority of its committee and a rating of qualified from a substantial majority. Notwithstanding Stranch's excellent background, the chamber failed to hold her floor debate and vote before the Senate recessed last August. However, the chamber agreed to schedule a vote the day that the Senate returned. After brief debate, senators finally approved Stranch 71–21.

Openings in more than ten percent of the federal appellate judgeships show that President Obama must expeditiously proffer nominees for all nineteen vacancies and the Senate ought to swiftly confirm them. Jane Branstetter Stranch's experience demonstrates that there is no reason for delay. Senator McConnell must specifically agree to a floor vote for Judge Donald prior to the August recess because she has been waiting eight months. Quickly filling the empty posts is essential because the courts need all of their judges to deliver justice.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate will confirm four nominees to be U.S. district judge. Three of these seats, the vacancy for the Southern District of Texas, the vacancy for the Southern District of Florida and the vacancy for the District of Colorado, have been designated as judicial emergencies. With the votes today, we will have confirmed 33 article III judicial nominees. Twenty-one of those confirmed have been for judicial emergencies.

We continue to make great progress in processing President Obama's judicial nominees. As we head into our August recess, the Senate has confirmed 62 percent of President Obama's nominees since the beginning of his Presidency. That is not including the two the Supreme Court Justices nominated by President Obama. As my colleagues are aware, those nominations consumed a considerable amount of time in the committee and on the Senate floor.

During this Congress, the Judiciary Committee has held hearings on more than 75 percent of the President's judicial nominees. During the comparable time period for President Bush, only 70 percent of President Bush's nominees

had hearings by this time. We have also reported 61 percent of the judicial nominees, which is comparable to President Bush's nominees.

I support these nominations and congratulate each of them. I would like to say a few words about each one of the nominees.

Sara Lynn Darrow is nominated to be U.S. district judge for the Central District of Illinois. Ms. Darrow graduated from Marquette University in 1992 and received her J.D. degree from St. Louis University School of Law in 1997. From 1997 to 1998, Mrs. Darrow worked in the law offices of Clarence Darrow, a small general practice firm in Rock Island, IL. She became an assistant State's attorney in 1999, where she handled juvenile, misdemeanor, and felony traffic cases. Upon promotion in 2000, she handled felony cases and serious juvenile abuse cases. In 2003, Mrs. Darrow began work as an assistant U.S. attorney, prosecuting Federal crimes including drug conspiracy, gun, racketeering, child exploitation, fraud, and bankruptcy. She has prosecuted approximately 300 defendants and tried 10 cases to verdict before a jury.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has given Ms. Darrow a unanimous ''Qualified'' rating.

Nelva Gonzales Ramos is nominated to be U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Texas. After graduation from the University of Texas School of Law in 1991, Judge Ramos began her career as an attorney at Meredith & Donnelly in Corpus Christi. She worked primarily in personal injury litigation, employment litigation, and insurance defense. In 1997, she resigned from the firm to enter duty as a municipal court judge. During her campaign for district court judge during 1999 to 2000, she briefly worked as a solo practitioner. During this time, she practiced primarily personal injury but also family and criminal law. While in private practice, she tried approximately 17 cases to judgment or verdict.

Judge Ramos was appointed as a municipal court judge for Corpus Christi in 1997 where she had a criminal docket. She presided over 500 cases that went to verdict or judgment. When she announced her candidacy for district court judge in 1999, she resigned from this position as required by the city charter. In 2001 she was elected as district court judge for the 347th Judicial District. She was reelected in 2004 and in 2008. As district court judge, she has presided over 1,200 cases that went to verdict or judgment. While serving as a district court judge she helped establish a domestic violence court, and served as the local administrative judge for the Nueces County district courts. In this capacity she presided over meetings of the district court judges, ensured compliance with local rules, appointed committees regarding court management, and handled assorted other administrative tasks regarding the court.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave her a split rating of ''Qualified''—substantial majority—and ''Well Qualified''—minority.

Kathleen M. Williams is nominated to be U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Florida. She received her B.A. in 1978 and her J.D. in 1982 from the University of Miami School of Law. Ms. Williams began her legal career in 1982 as an associate attorney at Fowler, White, Burnett, Hurley, Banick & Strickroot. At Fowler White, she participated in insurance defense litigation defending insurance companies, city and county interests, hospital trusts and corporations.

From 1984 to 1988, Ms. Williams served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Southern District of Florida. While an assistant U.S. attorney, she prosecuted individuals on charges ranging from simple narcotics and weapons matters to complex money-laundering and RICO Litigation. In 1988, Ms. Williams returned to the private sector as an associate attorney for Morgan, Lewis & Bockius. While at Morgan, Lewis, & Bockius, she represented financial institutions, government contractors, and multinational corporations in labor litigation and white collar criminal defense matters.

In 1990, Ms. Williams joined the Federal Public Defender's office as the chief assistant public defender, where she represented persons accused of violating Federal criminal statutes but who cannot afford to retain an attorney. In 1995, she was appointed to be the public defender for the Southern District of Florida, where she continues to serve. As a Federal public defender she has litigated a wide range of matters including immigration, complex fraud, and national security. She was also appointed to be the acting Federal public defender for the Middle District of Florida from 1999 to 2000.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has given her the rating of majority ''Well Qualified'' and Minority ''Qualified.''

Richard Brooke Jackson is nominated to be U.S. district judge for the District of Colorado. Judge Jackson received his A.B., magna cum laude, from Dartmouth College in 1969 and his J.D., cum laude, from Harvard Law School in 1972. Following law school, Judge Jackson joined the firm of Holland & Hart as an associate, where he focused on a combination of commercial litigation and personal injury litigation. In 1978, he became a partner and opened the Washington, DC, office of the firm. Additionally, he served on a number of committees within the firm and was chairperson of the litigation department. His pro bono work focused on personal injury claims and occasional representation in criminal defense and family law matters.

In 1998, he was appointed to serve as district judge for the First Judicial District of Colorado. As a district judge, he handled a mixed docket of criminal, civil, and domestic relations cases. In 2003, he was appointed chief judge.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has given Judge Jackson the rating of unanimous ''Well Qualified.''

NOMINATION OF SARA DARROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Sara Darrow to serve as a district court judge for the Central District of Illinois.

Sara Darrow is a superb nominee, and she will make an excellent addition to the Federal bench.

Her nomination is not controversial. She had her hearing before the Judiciary Committee in April and was reported out of the committee by unanimous voice vote on May 12.

Sara Darrow's name was recommended to me by a bipartisan merit selection committee that I established to consider applicants for judicial vacancies.

I was proud to recommend her name to the President last year, and I was pleased to see the President nominate her to fill the Central District judgeship that was vacated when Judge Joe Billy McDade took senior status last year.

I want to thank Chairman PAT LEAHY of the Judiciary Committee for moving Ms. Darrow's nomination through the committee. I also want to thank Senator MARK KIRK for his support of this nomination.

Once the Senate confirms Sara Darrow, we will finally have a full complement of judges for the Central District of Illinois. Last year there was only one judge in this district—Chief Judge Mike McCuskey—and three judgeships were vacant.

These vacancies left the Central District in a dire situation. Cases were grinding to a halt, and Judge McCuskey had to drive all across the State to try to keep the dockets moving.

Fortunately, earlier this year the Senate confirmed Judge Jim Shadid and Judge Sue Myerscough to serve in the Central District. They are serving on the bench now.

And with Sara Darrow on the bench as well, the Central District will finally be operating at full strength. That is good news for the people who live in the 46 Illinois counties that make up the Central District.

Sara Darrow has a distinguished record, including her service as a prosecutor both at the State and Federal level.

She currently serves as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Illinois Central District, where she has worked since 2003. She works out of the Rock Island branch of the U.S. Attorney's Office.

She has investigated and prosecuted hundreds of defendants for various Federal crimes including gang offenses, drug conspiracies, gun crimes, bank robbery, money laundering, and fraud. She has also written and argued numerous appeals.

Since 2007, Ms. Darrow has served as the violent crimes chief for the U.S. Attorney's Office. She has also served as the office's project safe neighborhoods coordinator.

Before becoming a Federal prosecutor, Ms. Darrow worked in private practice in Rock Island, and she also worked as a prosecutor in the Henry County State's Attorney's Office.

She served as an assistant State's attorney in Henry County from 1999 to 2000, and then as first assistant State's attorney from 2000 to 2003.

While serving at the State's Attorney's Office she prosecuted a wide range of State felony cases. She also was responsible for supervising staff attorneys and managing the office's caseload.

Ms. Darrow enjoys an excellent reputation among the legal community in the Central District. She will serve the people of Illinois well in her new capacity as a Federal judge.

In addition to her impressive professional accomplishments, Sara Darrow is an impressive person with a wonderful family.

She is a graduate of Marquette University and Saint Louis University School of Law.

While a college student at Marquette, she interned in Washington, DC, for Senator CARL LEVIN. It was on Capitol Hill where Sara met and began dating her husband Clarence, who was then working for Congressman Lane Evans.

Sara and Clarence are now blessed to be the proud parents of six children: Connor, age 14; Lilia, 13; Augie, 12; Anna Grace, 10; Ella, 8; and Danny, 5.

And Sara Darrow also has an impressive record of service in the community of Rock Island, IL. She is truly a credit to this community.

In short, Ms. Darrow has the experience, qualifications and temperament to be an excellent Federal judge.

I enthusiastically support her nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

NOMINATION OF GARY LOCKE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure to congratulate and pay tribute to Gary Locke, who has been the Secretary of Commerce since March 2009 and was recently confirmed by the Senate to be the U.S. Ambassador to China. Secretary Locke has been a truly outstanding public servant, and I applaud him as he continues his service to our country in China. His service truly makes our country a better place.

As Secretary of Commerce, Gary Locke has been an aggressive leader at the Department of Commerce, and has earned a reputation as a strong manager and an innovator.

Among his many successes at Commerce, he has helped innovators by pushing the Patent and Trademark Office to streamline the process to get a patent.

Secretary Locke worked with the Economic Development Administration to streamline its approval process. The EDA is a crucial program, which makes business-development grants to distressed communities. Programs such as EDA help ordinary Americans and small businesses and will help move the economy forward. I appreciate Secretary Locke's commitment to programs such as EDA and helping these communities.

In this time of fiscal austerity, he brought the 2010 census in 25 percent under budget, saving taxpayers $1.9 billion. He led an organization that still got the census information that we need to get a true picture of the makeup of our Nation.

I also appreciate his hard work to meet the Obama administration's goal to double exports within 5 years. Currently, only 1 percent of American companies export, and Secretary Locke understands the crucial need for expanded U.S. exports as part of our economic recovery.

I know we will look back and say that Secretary Locke's time at the Department of Commerce was the beginning of America's return to prominence as an export nation. As he said, ''It is almost like [we're] building the foundation of a house or an office tower. All the foundation work takes a long, long time. You don't really see it. It is all happening below the street level. . . . After that, then things really begin to take off''

Thank you, again, Gary, now Ambassador Locke. You are a true public servant, and that is one of the highest compliments I can convey. I wish you luck as you continue to serve this great Nation in your new post.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

David Bruce Shear, of New York, 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 Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jennifer A. Di Toro, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Yvonne M. Williams, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

David V. Brewer, of Oregon, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2013.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

Barbara Jeanne Ells, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring October 18, 2016.

Deborah Downing Goodman, of Oklahoma, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring October 18, 2014.

Cynthia Chavez Lamar, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2016.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Dan Arvizu, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

Alan I. Leshner, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

William Carl Lineberger, of Colorado, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2016.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Aaron Paul Dworkin, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2014.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Eric S. Edelman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Clayton D. Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the term of four years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Derek J. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be Special Representative and Policy Coordinator for Burma, with the rank of Ambassador.

Jeffrey DeLaurentis, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Jeffrey DeLaurentis, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations.

David S. Adams, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs).

Frankie Annette Reed, of Maryland, 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 the Fiji Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nauru, the Kingdom of Tonga, Tuvalu, and the Republic of Kiribati.

Paul D. Wohlers, 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 Republic of Macedonia.

William H. Moser, of North Carolina, 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 Moldova.

Earl Anthony Wayne, of Maryland, 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 Mexico.

Arnold A. Chacon, 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 Guatemala.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Matthew G. Olsen, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Alan F. Estevez, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

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 general

Gen. William M. Fraser, III

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Donald P. Dunbar

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. Stephen L. Hoog

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. Janet C. Wolfenbarger

The following Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Verle L. Johnston, Jr.

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. Leonard A. Patrick

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brigadier General Trulan A. Eyre
Brigadier General Mark R. Johnson
Brigadier General Bruce W. Prunk
Brigadier General Harold E. Reed
Brigadier General Roy E. Uptegraff, III

To be brigadier general

Colonel Patrick D. Aiello
Colonel Aaron J. Booher
Colonel Kevin W. Bradley
Colonel David T. Buckalew
Colonel Peter J. Byrne
Colonel Paul D. Cummings
Colonel Vyas Deshpande
Colonel Brian T. Dravis
Colonel Brent J. Feick
Colonel Mark K. Foreman
Colonel David R. Fountain
Colonel Timothy L. Frye
Colonel Paul D. Gruver
Colonel Michael A. Hudson
Colonel Salvatore J. Lombardi
Colonel Stephen E. Markovich
Colonel Richard L. Martin
Colonel Brian A. Miller
Colonel William W. Pond
Colonel Jonathan T. Wall
Colonel Jennifer L. Walter

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 152 and 601:

To be general

Gen. Martin E. Dempsey

The following named officer for appointment as the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 3033:

To be general

Gen. Raymond T. Odierno

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. Keith C. Walker

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. Charles T. Cleveland

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. Michael Ferriter

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. Robert L. Caslen, 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

Maj. Gen. David G. Perkins

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. Brian R. Copes

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. Bert K. Mizusawa

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. Fred W. Allen

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

Lt. Gen. Charles H. Jacoby, Jr.

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brigadier General Stephen E. Bogle
Brigadier General Dominic A. Cariello
Brigadier General David J. Elicerio
Brigadier General Sheryl E. Gordon
Brigadier General Ronald W. Huff
Brigadier General Gerald W. Ketchum
Brigadier General William L. Seekins
Brigadier General Richard E. Swan
Brigadier General Joe M. Wells

To be brigadier general

Colonel Matthew P. Beevers
Colonel Joel E. Best
Colonel Michael E. Bobeck
Colonel Joseph M. Bongiovanni
Colonel Brent E. Bracewell
Colonel Allen E. Brewer
Colonel Leon M. Bridges
Colonel Eric C. Bush
Colonel Scott A. Campbell
Colonel William R. Coats
Colonel Albert L. Cox
Colonel Sylvia R. Crockett
Colonel Terry A. Ethridge
Colonel Kevin R. Griese
Colonel John J. Jansen
Colonel Donald O. Lagace, Jr.
Colonel Louis J. Landreth
Colonel William S. Lee
Colonel Jerry H. Martin
Colonel Robert A. Mason
Colonel Craig M. McGalliard
Colonel Christopher J. Morgan
Colonel Todd M. Nehls
Colonel Kevin L. Neumann
Colonel Michael J. Osburn
Colonel Lannie D. Runck
Colonel George M. Schwartz
Colonel Terence P. Sullivan
Colonel Alicia A. Tate-Nadeau
Colonel Thomas P. Wilkinson
Colonel Wilbur E. Wolf, III
Colonel David C. Wood

The following Army National Guard of the United States 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 David B. Enyeart

To be brigadier general

Colonel Randy A. Alewel
Colonel Karen D. Gattis
Colonel Catherine F. Jorgensen
Colonel Blake C. Ortner
Colonel Timothy P. Williams
Colonel David E. Wilmot

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. Gina D. Seiler

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. Michael A. Calhoun

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. Kaffia Jones

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5033:

To be admiral

Adm. Jonathan W. Greenert

The following named officer for appointment as the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154:

To be admiral

Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Personnel, United States Navy, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5141:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Scott R. Van Buskirk

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5035:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Mark E. Ferguson, III

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 vice admiral

Rear Adm. Scott H. Swift

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 vice admiral

Vice Adm. Harry B. Harris, Jr.

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 vice admiral

Vice Adm. Michael A. LeFever

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 (lower half)

Capt. Luke M. McCollum

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN497 AIR FORCE nominations (79) beginning LAUREN F. AASE, and ending DEBRA S. Z1NSMEYER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2011.

PN787 AIR FORCE nomination of Mary F. Hart-Gallagher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN788 AIR FORCE nomination of Raymond S. Collins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN790 AIR FORCE nominations (50) beginning WADE B. ADAIR, and ending ELIJIO J. VENEGAS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN791 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning JOHNATHAN M. COMPTON, and ending BENJAMIN J. MITCHELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

IN THE ARMY

PN719 ARMY nomination of Thomas B. Murphree, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011.

PN720 ARMY nominations (3) beginning PEDRO T. RAGA, and ending MATTHEW H. VINNING, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011.

PN765 ARMY nominations (2) beginning Nicholas M. Cruzgarcia, and ending Joseph P. Lynn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN766 ARMY nomination of Luisa G. Santiago, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN767 ARMY nominations (4) beginning TROY W. ROSS, and ending CARLOS E. QUEZADA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN768 ARMY nominations (6) beginning JAMES L. ADAMS, JR., and ending ROBERT M. THELEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN769 ARMY nominations (36) beginning MATTHEW B. AHN, and ending GREGORY S. THOGMARTIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN793 ARMY nomination of Cindy B Katz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN794 ARMY nomination of Wiley C. Thompson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN795 ARMY nomination of Marshall S. Humes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN796 ARMY nomination of Cyruss A. Tsurgeon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN797 ARMY nominations (2) beginning COLLEEN F. BLAILES, and ending CURTIS T. CHUN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN798 ARMY nominations (2) beginning BRAD M. EVANS, and ending JAY S. KOST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN799 ARMY nominations (2) beginning MATTHEW J. BAKER, and ending RUSSELL B. CHAMBERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN800 ARMY nominations (6) beginning JOSEPH B. RUSINKO, and ending PAULA S. OLIVER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN801 ARMY nominations (55) beginning CHARLESPAUL T. ANONUEVO, and ending TRACY E. WALTERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN802 ARMY nominations (12) beginning DAVID H. BURNHAM, and ending RANDALL S. VERDE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN803 ARMY nominations (326) beginning MICHAEL A. ADAMS, and ending PAULA YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN804 ARMY nominations (582) beginning GEOFFREY R. ADAMS, and ending D005579, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN805 ARMY nominations (347) beginning ALISSA R. ACKLEY, and ending D003185, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN806 ARMY nominations (284) beginning THOMAS H. AARSEN, and ending D010899, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN421 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (275) beginning Ross Ellis Hagan, and ending Willem H. Brakel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 8, 2011.

PN756 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (160) beginning Timothy C. Cannon, and ending Mark Jeffrey Hipp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN369 MARINE CORPS nomination of Carroll J. Connelley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 30, 2011.

PN370 MARINE CORPS nomination of Samuel H. Carrasco, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 30, 2011.

IN THE NAVY

PN721 NAVY nomination of Troy D. Carr, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011.

PN722 NAVY nominations (32) beginning DAWN C. ALLEN, and ending JENNIFER L. TIETZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 22, 2011.

PN770 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JAMES S. BROWN, and ending HEATHER J. WALTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN771 NAVY nominations (98) beginning CHRISTOPHER A. ALFONZO, and ending SARA B. ZIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN772 NAVY nominations (23) beginning RAUL L. BARRIENTOS, and ending HAROLD S. ZALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN773 NAVY nominations (67) beginning DAVID L. AGEY, and ending LAURA L. V. WEGEMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN774 NAVY nominations (12) beginning ROBERT P. ANSELM, and ending PAUL A. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN775 NAVY nominations (29) beginning RANDY E. ASHMAN, and ending TAMMY L. WEINZATL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN776 NAVY nominations (45) beginning DEANGELO ASHBY, and ending LAGENA K. G. YARBROUGH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN777 NAVY nominations (20) beginning DENNIS K. ANDREWS, and ending BRIAN K. WAITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN778 NAVY nominations (26) beginning ROBERTO M. ALVARADO, and ending JOSEPH W. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 11, 2011.

PN807 NAVY nomination of Mathew R. Loe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN808 NAVY nomination of Michael J. O'Donnell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN809 NAVY nomination of Lawrence Brandon, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN810 NAVY nominations (2) beginning Robert A. Slaughter, and ending Robert Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN811 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ANTHONY DIAZ, and ending JANE E. MCNEELY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN812 NAVY nominations (3) beginning CARISSA L. GAREY, and ending DANIEL G. NICASTRI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN813 NAVY nominations (8) beginning TIMOTHY M. DERBYSHIRE, and ending CHRISTINA J. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN814 NAVY nominations (17) beginning JEREMIAH E. CHAPLIN, and ending PAMELA A. TELLADO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN815 NAVY nominations (21) beginning PAIGE H. ADAMS, and ending ANDREW F. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN816 NAVY nominations (17) beginning ROBERT S. BAIR, and ending PATRICIA R. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN817 NAVY nominations (58) beginning KIRKLAND M. ANDERSON, and ending MARTHA A. WITTOSCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN818 NAVY nominations (202) beginning CHERYL E. AIMESTILLMAN, and ending JON E. ZATLOKOWICZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN819 NAVY nominations (24) beginning ARCHIE L. BARBER, and ending ZAVEAN V. WARE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN820 NAVY nominations (42) beginning MYLENE R. ARVIZO, and ending ASHLEY S. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN821 NAVY nominations (4) beginning AMELIA F. DUDLEY, and ending BRANDON D. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN822 NAVY nominations (18) beginning RICHFIELD F. AGULLANA, and ending CHIEH YANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

PN823 NAVY nominations (4) beginning CHARITY C. HARDISON, and ending STEPHANIE B. MURDOCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 20, 2011.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 114, 115, 116, and 117; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that President Obama 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:

THE JUDICIARY

Sara Lynn Darrow, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois.

Richard Brooke Jackson, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Kathleen M. Williams, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Nelva Gonzales Ramos, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

NOMINATION DISCHARGED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of PN–741, which is Deborah A. P. Hersman of Virginia to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for 2 years.

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, there be no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to this matter be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

REPORTING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Senate's recess, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters on Tuesday, August 30, from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.

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

APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

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

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that from Tuesday, August 2, through Tuesday, September 6, the majority leader and Senator ROCKEFELLER be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

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

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, AUGUST 5 THROUGH TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess and convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate recess until the following pro forma session:

Friday, August 5, at 10 a.m.; Tuesday, August 9, at 11 a.m.; Friday, August 12, 12 p.m.; Tuesday, August 16, 11 a.m.; Friday, August 19, at 10 a.m.; Tuesday, August 23, 2:30 p.m.; Friday, August 26, at 11:15 a.m.; Tuesday, August 30, at 10 a.m.; Friday, September 2, at 10 a.m.; and that the Senate adjourn on Friday, September 2, until 2 p.m., Tuesday, September 6; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session, under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the next rollcall vote will be at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 6. The first vote will be on the confirmation of Bernice Bouie Donald to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, and the second vote will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1249, the patent reform bill.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:43 p.m., recessed until Friday, August 5, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ADALBERTO JOSE JORDAN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT, VICE SUSAN H. BLACK, RETIRED.

MIRANDA DU, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA, VICE ROGER L. HUNT, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DAVID B. BARLOW, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE BRETT L. TOLMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

CATHARINE FRIEND EASTERLY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE A. NOEL ANKETELL KRAMER, RETIRED.

COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NANCY MARIA WARE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE PAUL A. QUANDER, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

ERNEST MITCHELL, JR., OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE KELVIN JAMES COCHRAN, RESIGNED.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

IRVIN CHARLES MCCULLOUGH III, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ASHTON B. CARTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE WILLIAM J. LYNN III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

GREGORY HOWARD WOODS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE SCOTT BLAKE HARRIS, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ALLYSON R. SOLOMON

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. GARY W. KEEFE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL FREDERIK G. HARTWIG
COLONEL DONALD L. JOHNSON
COLONEL KENNETH W. WISIAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

LARRY W. DOTSON
MARK G. ELAM
TROY D. GALLOWAY
MARY K. JONES
DEEDRA E. THOMBLESON
DAMIAN K. WADDELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JACK M. MARKUSFELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

STEPHEN R. TAYLOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HAL D. BAIRD

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JOHN N. DESVERREAUX

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination by unanimous consent and the nomination was held at the desk:

DEBORAH A. P. HERSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 2, 2011:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID BRUCE SHEAR, OF NEW YORK, 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 SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.

THE JUDICIARY

SARA LYNN DARROW, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

RICHARD BROOKE JACKSON, OF COLORADO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO.

KATHLEEN M. WILLIAMS, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

NELVA GONZALES RAMOS, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JENNIFER A. DI TORO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

YVONNE M. WILLIAMS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

DAVID V. BREWER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2013.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

BARBARA JEANNE ELLS, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2016.

DEBORAH DOWNING GOODMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2014.

CYNTHIA CHAVEZ LAMAR, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 19, 2016.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

DAN ARVIZU, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2016.

ALAN I. LESHNER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2016.

WILLIAM CARL LINEBERGER, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 10, 2016.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

AARON PAUL DWORKIN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2014.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

ERIC S. EDELMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CLAYTON D. JOHNSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEREK J. MITCHELL, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE AND POLICY COORDINATOR FOR BURMA, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

JEFFREY DELAURENTIS, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

JEFFREY DELAURENTIS, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

DAVID S. ADAMS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS).

FRANKIE ANNETTE REED, OF MARYLAND, 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 THE FIJI ISLANDS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NAURU, THE KINGDOM OF TONGA, TUVALU, AND THE REPUBLIC OF KIRIBATI.

PAUL D. WOHLERS, 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 REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA.

WILLIAM H. MOSER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, 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 MOLDOVA.

EARL ANTHONY WAYNE, OF MARYLAND, 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 MEXICO.

ARNOLD A. CHACON, 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 GUATEMALA.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

MATTHEW G. OLSEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MADELYN R. CREEDON, OF INDIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

ALAN F. ESTEVEZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

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 general

GEN. WILLIAM M. FRASER III

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. DONALD P. DUNBAR

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. STEPHEN L. HOOG

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. JANET C. WOLFENBARGER

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. VERLE L. JOHNSTON, JR.

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. LEONARD A. PATRICK

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL TRULAN A. EYRE
BRIGADIER GENERAL MARK R. JOHNSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRUCE W. PRUNK
BRIGADIER GENERAL HAROLD E. REED
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROY E. UPTEGRAFF III

To be brigadier general

COLONEL PATRICK D. AIELLO
COLONEL AARON J. BOOHER
COLONEL KEVIN W. BRADLEY
COLONEL DAVID T. BUCKALEW
COLONEL PETER J. BYRNE
COLONEL PAUL D. CUMMINGS
COLONEL VYAS DESHPANDE
COLONEL BRIAN T. DRAVIS
COLONEL BRENT J. FEICK
COLONEL MARK K. FOREMAN
COLONEL DAVID R. FOUNTAIN
COLONEL TIMOTHY L. FRYE
COLONEL PAUL D. GRUVER
COLONEL MICHAEL A. HUDSON
COLONEL SALVATORE J. LOMBARDI
COLONEL STEPHEN E. MARKOVICH
COLONEL RICHARD L. MARTIN
COLONEL BRIAN A. MILLER
COLONEL WILLIAM W. POND
COLONEL JONATHAN T. WALL
COLONEL JENNIFER L. WALTER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. MARTIN E. DEMPSEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3033:

To be general

GEN. RAYMOND T. ODIERNO

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. KEITH C. WALKER

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. CHARLES T. CLEVELAND

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. MICHAEL FERRITER

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. ROBERT L. CASLEN, 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

MAJ. GEN. DAVID G. PERKINS

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. BRIAN R. COPES

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. BERT K. MIZUSAWA

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. FRED W. ALLEN

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

LT. GEN. CHARLES H. JACOBY, JR.

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES 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 STEPHEN E. BOGLE
BRIGADIER GENERAL DOMINIC A. CARIELLO
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID J. ELICERIO
BRIGADIER GENERAL SHERYL E. GORDON
BRIGADIER GENERAL RONALD W. HUFF
BRIGADIER GENERAL GERALD W. KETCHUM
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM L. SEEKINS
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD E. SWAN
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOE M. WELLS

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MATTHEW P. BEEVERS
COLONEL JOEL E. BEST
COLONEL MICHAEL E. BOBECK
COLONEL JOSEPH M. BONGIOVANNI
COLONEL BRENT E. BRACEWELL
COLONEL ALLEN E. BREWER
COLONEL LEON M. BRIDGES
COLONEL ERIC C. BUSH
COLONEL SCOTT A. CAMPBELL
COLONEL WILLIAM R. COATS
COLONEL ALBERT L. COX
COLONEL SYLVIA R. CROCKETT
COLONEL TERRY A. ETHRIDGE
COLONEL KEVIN R. GRIESE
COLONEL JOHN J. JANSEN
COLONEL DONALD O. LAGACE, JR.
COLONEL LOUIS J. LANDRETH
COLONEL WILLIAM S. LEE
COLONEL JERRY H. MARTIN
COLONEL ROBERT A. MASON
COLONEL CRAIG M. MCGALLIARD
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER J. MORGAN
COLONEL TODD M. NEHLS
COLONEL KEVIN L. NEUMANN
COLONEL MICHAEL J. OSBURN
COLONEL LANNIE D. RUNCK
COLONEL GEORGE M. SCHWARTZ
COLONEL TERENCE P. SULLIVAN
COLONEL ALICIA A. TATE-NADEAU
COLONEL THOMAS P. WILKINSON
COLONEL WILBUR E. WOLF III
COLONEL DAVID C. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES 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 DAVID B. ENYEART

To be brigadier general

COLONEL RANDY A. ALEWEL
COLONEL KAREN D. GATTIS
COLONEL CATHERINE F. JORGENSEN
COLONEL BLAKE C. ORTNER
COLONEL TIMOTHY P. WILLIAMS
COLONEL DAVID E. WILMOT

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. GINA D. SEILER

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. MICHAEL A. CALHOUN

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. KAFFIA JONES

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES NAVY AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5033:

To be admiral

ADM. JONATHAN W. GREENERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be admiral

ADM. JAMES A. WINNEFELD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, UNITED STATES NAVY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5141:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. SCOTT R. VAN BUSKIRK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES NAVY AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5035:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. MARK E. FERGUSON III

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 vice admiral

REAR ADM. SCOTT H. SWIFT

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 vice admiral

VICE ADM. HARRY B. HARRIS, JR.

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 vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL A. LEFEVER

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 (lower half)

CAPT. LUKE M. MCCOLLUM

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAUREN F. AASE AND ENDING WITH DEBRA S. ZINSMEYER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2011.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MARY F. HART-GALLAGHER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RAYMOND S. COLLINS, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WADE B. ADAIR AND ENDING WITH ELIJIO J. VENEGAS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHNATHAN M. COMPTON AND ENDING WITH BENJAMIN J. MITCHELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS B. MURPHREE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PEDRO T. RAGA AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW H. VINNING, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS M. CRUZGARCIA AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH P. LYNN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LUISA G. SANTIAGO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TROY W. ROSS AND ENDING WITH CARLOS E. QUEZADA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES L. ADAMS, JR. AND ENDING WITH ROBERT M. THELEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW B. AHN AND ENDING WITH GREGORY S. THOGMARTIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CINDY B. KATZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WILEY C. THOMPSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARSHALL S. HUMES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CYRUSS A. TSURGEON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COLLEEN F. BLAILES AND ENDING WITH CURTIS T. CHUN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRAD M. EVANS AND ENDING WITH JAY S. KOST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW J. BAKER AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL B. CHAMBERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSEPH B. RUSINKO AND ENDING WITH PAULA S. OLIVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLESPAUL T. ANONUEVO AND ENDING WITH TRACY E. WALTERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID H. BURNHAM AND ENDING WITH RANDALL S. VERDE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH PAULA YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEOFFREY R. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D005579, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALISSA R. ACKLEY AND ENDING WITH D003185, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS H. AARSEN AND ENDING WITH D010899, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF CARROLL J. CONNELLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SAMUEL H. CARRASCO, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF TROY D. CARR, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAWN C. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JENNIFER L. TIETZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 22, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES S. BROWN AND ENDING WITH HEATHER J. WALTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER A. ALFONZO AND ENDING WITH SARA B. ZIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAUL L. BARRIENTOS AND ENDING WITH HAROLD S. ZALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. AGEY AND ENDING WITH LAURA L. V. WEGEMANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT P. ANSELM AND ENDING WITH PAUL A. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANDY E. ASHMAN AND ENDING WITH TAMMY L. WEINZATL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEANGELO ASHBY AND ENDING WITH LAGENA K. G. YARBROUGH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS K. ANDREWS AND ENDING WITH BRIAN K. WAITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERTO M. ALVARADO AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH W. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MATHEW R. LOE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. O'DONNELL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LAWRENCE BRANDON, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. SLAUGHTER AND ENDING WITH ROBERT THOMAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY DIAZ AND ENDING WITH JANE E. MCNEELY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARISSA L. GAREY AND ENDING WITH DANIEL G. NICASTRI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY M. DERBYSHIRE AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINA J. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEREMIAH E. CHAPLIN AND ENDING WITH PAMELA A. TELLADO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAIGE H. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ANDREW F. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT S. BAIR AND ENDING WITH PATRICIA R. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KIRKLAND M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH MARTHA A. WITTOSCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHERYL E. AIMESTILLMAN AND ENDING WITH JON E. ZATLOKOWICZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARCHIE L. BARBER AND ENDING WITH ZAVEAN V. WARE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MYLENE R. ARVIZO AND ENDING WITH ASHLEY S. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AMELIA F. DUDLEY AND ENDING WITH BRANDON D. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHFIELD F. AGULLANA AND ENDING WITH CHIEH YANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARITY C. HARDISON AND ENDING WITH STEPHANIE B. MURDOCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 20, 2011.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROSS ELLIS HAGAN AND ENDING WITH WILLEM H. BRAKEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 8, 2011.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY C. CANNON AND ENDING WITH MARK JEFFREY HIPP, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 11, 2011.

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.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on August 2, 2011 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

LEON RODRIGUEZ, OF MARYLAND, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, VICE PAUL DECAMP, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 5, 2011.