

which is going to be available until 2020. Nuclear also benefits from Price-Anderson Federal liability insurance that Congress provided. That was supposed to be a temporary measure in 1958, but this temporary measure has been renewed through 2025. Nuclear energy has also received \$74 billion of Federal research and development dollars since 1950.

Are those crony capitalist handouts? Well, nobody seems to be attacking them. Is it time to end the market distortions for nuclear power? Well, nobody is talking about that. But they are talking about wind energy.

We had a Cato study about nuclear energy that said:

In truth, nuclear power has never made economic sense and exists purely as a creature of government.

People are saying that about wind energy, but I don't hear the same people saying it about nuclear power.

I don't understand the argument that repealing a subsidy for oil and gas or nuclear energy production is a tax increase like the accusation against wind, while repealing an incentive on alternative or renewable energy is not a tax increase. So it is not intellectually honest.

As I said before, we have had wind incentives since 1992, and I am the father of that. I suppose now, after 22 years, you might say I am the grandfather of it. I know it won't go on forever. In fact, it was never meant to go on forever. And people in the wind energy even admit that today and talk about phaseouts.

I am happy to discuss a responsible multiyear phaseout of that wind tax credit. In 2012, the wind energy was the only industry to put forward such a phaseout plan. But any phaseout must be done in the context of comprehensive tax reform where all energy tax provisions are on the table, not just wind solely. And it should be done responsibly, over a few years, to provide certainty and ensure a viable industry.

It is time to put an end to the annual kabuki dance that is tax extenders. Good tax policy requires certainty that can only come from long-term predictable tax law. Businesses need the certainty in the Tax Code so they can plan and invest accordingly.

Moreover, taxpayers deserve to know that the Tax Code is not just being used as another way to dole out funds to politically favored groups. However, the only sound way to reach this goal is through comprehensive tax reform.

I agree there are provisions in extenders that ultimately should be left on the cutting room floor. But it is in tax reform—comprehensive tax reform—where we should consider the relative merits of individual provisions. Targeting certain provisions for elimination now makes little sense for those of us who want to reduce tax rates as much as possible.

Tax reform provides an opportunity to use realistic baselines that will allow the revenue generated from cut-

ting back provisions to be used to pay for reductions in individual and corporate tax rates.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future to enact tax reform and put an end to the headaches and uncertainty created by the regular expiration of tax provisions. Right now our focus must be on extending current expired or expiring provisions to give us room to work towards that goal.

It is my hope that we can move quickly to reach a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that can quickly be enacted and that includes the wind energy tax provisions. Taxpayers have already waited too long.

What really gripes me about this whole argument is that people say they are for all of the above. I am for all of the above, I can say. You know, that means fossil fuels, that means all sorts of alternative energy, it probably includes conservation, and it includes nuclear. But when I see the people fighting the wind energy tax credit coming from petroleum and natural gas and from coal, I think of these people who say they are for all of the above, they are really for all of the below but for none of the above. And that is wrong and inconsistent.

I want a consistent, uniform tax policy for all forms of energy being extended right now.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WALSH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order be modified so that the following nomination be added following Executive Calendar No. 962: Calendar No. 1008, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

Mr. WALSH. 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. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### PEPPER NOMINATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam President, it is my privilege to recommend to the Senate the Honorable

Pamela Pepper to be a U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin. Patty served with distinction and is the current chief judge of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Although not native to our State, she has set down deep roots in Wisconsin, first serving in the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, followed by private practice in Milwaukee and finally serving 9 years as a bankruptcy court judge.

Pam was born in the delta of Mississippi in a town called Leland. Her parents were both teachers and instilled in her an intellectual curiosity which has been apparent throughout her career. She migrated north for college and attended Northwestern University in Chicago, where she received a degree in theater.

After helping a friend get through the LSAT review course, she realized she might want to explore other careers and ended up taking the LSAT herself. She obviously had prepared herself well because she performed well on the LSAT and was accepted into the Cornell University School of Law.

After graduation, she clerked with distinction for Judge Frank Johnson on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals and then moved on to become a prosecutor in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Chicago.

She is widely respected within her profession, evidenced by having held offices as the president of the Milwaukee Bar Association and the chairperson of the Board of Governors of the State Bar of Wisconsin. She is an instructor of national stature and speaks frequently on trial practice and evidence. She is currently an instructor at the Federal Judicial Center.

I have had the opportunity to speak to practitioners who have appeared before her bankruptcy court. They have told me of her patience with attorneys, which is a virtue of hers they all value.

Pam possesses a great sense of humor, which she often uses to put litigants at ease. She displays compassion in making tough decisions by explaining the rationale for those decisions clearly so her reasoning is understood by all. She has shown great dexterity in reacting to difficult situations in court with calm reasoning.

Finally, Pam has been described as a practical judge who promptly resolves disputes while faithfully adhering to the rule of law.

Pam's intellectual curiosity, her demonstrated ability to learn new areas of the law and efficiently administer her office, has convinced me she will continue to excel in her new role as a Federal district court judge. Judge Pepper has my full support, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on her confirmation.

I conclude my remarks by thanking the hard-working members of our bipartisan nomination commission for their dedication and efforts.