

To say that Barbara is “retiring” somehow doesn’t seem quite right. It would be more accurate to say that she is redirecting her energies. I have no doubt that Barbara will remain involved in her community and committed to the many causes in which she believes so deeply. She will also have the opportunity to spend more time with her family: her husband Robert F. Carr III—better known as Tad their six children, and 11 grandchildren.

I join the residents of Chicago, the “city in a garden,” in thanking Barbara Whitney Carr for helping to create a garden in our city that makes us all proud.

RESCUERS FROM EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it gives me great pride to salute three brave young airmen stationed at Eielson Air Force Base in Alaska. SSGT Bryan Fletcher, SrA Elicia Greer, and SrA John Rogers displayed remarkable heroism—and saved a life—on the evening of June 16, 2007.

The three airmen were riding recreational vehicles near Jet Ski Lake in Fairbanks when they heard a woman scream. They immediately stopped to help, and saw an unconscious man about to drown in the lake. Staff Sergeant Fletcher dove into the water first, followed by Senior Airman Greer. They proceeded to pull the man out and began cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Senior Airman Rogers, who was riding a distance away, soon arrived to help in this effort.

Airmen Fletcher, Greer, and Rogers spent several minutes administering CPR to Joseph Mead before they registered any response. All three took turns performing mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and compressing Mead’s heart. They continued CPR until the University of Alaska Fire Department

arrived to take over. Mead was safely revived, taken to the hospital, and released the next day with no lasting injuries.

The lakeside rescue is not the first time these individuals have displayed tremendous heroism—each has also served in Iraq with distinction. As veterans of U.S. Army combat convoy duty, they were tasked with dangerous and difficult work in the most demanding of circumstances. Like their recent rescue of Joseph Mead, however, no challenge has yet proven too difficult for them to overcome.

Staff Sergeant Fletcher hails from McCloud, TX; Senior Airman Greer is from Bozeman, MT; and Senior Airman Rogers is from Cumberland Gap, TN. They are currently assigned to the 354th Logistics Readiness Squadron at Eielson Air Force Base, where they serve Alaska and our Nation with honor.

A few days after the rescue, Joseph Mead’s cousin, Ben Saylor, said, “This is a reminder that there are good people in this world.” He is right. These airmen epitomize the kind of quiet professionalism and unassuming valor our men and women in uniform demonstrate on a daily basis. I join all Alaskans in commending their courageous actions.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to submit to the Senate the first budget scorekeeping reports for the 2008 budget resolution. The reports, which cover fiscal years 2007 and 2008, were prepared by the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended.

The reports show the effects of congressional action through June 25, 2007. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic as-

sumptions of S. Con Res. 21, the 2008 budget resolution.

For 2007, the estimates show that current level spending equals the budget resolution for both budget authority and outlays while current level revenues exceed the budget resolution by \$4.2 billion. For 2008, the estimates show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$928.1 billion for budget authority and \$586.7 billion for outlays while current level revenues exceed the budget resolution level by \$34.6 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters and accompanying tables from CBO be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2007.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2007 budget and is current through June 25, 2007. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Pursuant to section 204(a) of S. Con. Res. 21, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 1 of Table 2 of the report). This is my first report for fiscal year 2007.

Sincerely,
PETER R. ORSZAG,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007, AS OF JUNE 25, 2007

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution ¹	Current level ²	Current level over/under (–) resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	2,255.5	2,255.5	0.0
Outlays	2,268.6	2,268.6	0.0
Revenues	1,900.3	1,904.5	4.2
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays ³	441.7	441.7	0.0
Social Security Revenues	637.6	637.6	0.0

¹ S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as adjusted pursuant to section 207(f), assumed approximately \$120.8 billion in budget authority and \$31.1 billion in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110–28 (see footnote 1 of table 2), budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

² Current level is the estimated effect on revenue and spending of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations, even if the appropriations have not been made.

³ Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007, AS OF JUNE 25, 2007

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,904,706
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,347,423	1,297,059	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	1,480,453	1,543,072	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–571,507	–571,507	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous session	2,256,369	2,268,624	1,904,706

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007, AS OF JUNE 25, 2007—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget au- thority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted this session:			
Appropriation Acts: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) ¹	-794	9	-166
Total, enacted this session	-794	9	-166
Entitlements and mandatories: Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-30	0	0
Total Current Level ²	2,255,545	2,268,633	1,904,540
Total Budget Resolution	2,376,348	2,299,749	1,900,340
Adjustment to the budget resolution for emergency requirements ³	-120,803	-31,116	0
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,255,545	2,268,633	1,900,340
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	0	0	4,200
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	0	0	n.a.

¹ Pursuant to section 204(a) of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2007, which are not included in the current level total, are as follows: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28)—Budget Authority, 120,803; Outlays, 31,116; Revenues, n.a.

² Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

³ S. Con. Res. 21, as adjusted pursuant to section 207(f), assumed \$120,803 million in budget authority and \$31,116 million in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1), budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2007.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Sen-
ate Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2008 budget and is current through June 25, 2007. This report is sub-
mitted under section 308(b) and in aid of sec-

tion 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, out-
lays, and revenues are consistent with the
technical and economic assumptions of S.
Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on
the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as approved
by the Senate and the House of Representa-
tives.

Pursuant to section 204(a) of S. Con. Res.
21, provisions designated as emergency re-

quirements are exempt from enforcement of
the budget resolution. As a result, the en-
closed current level report excludes these
amounts (see footnote 1 of Table 2 of the re-
port). This is my first report for fiscal year
2008.

Sincerely,

PETER R. ORSZAG,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008, AS OF JUNE 25, 2007

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution ¹	Current level ²	Current level over/ under (–) resolu- tion
On-budget			
Budget Authority	2,350.2	1,422.1	-928.1
Outlays	2,353.8	1,767.1	-586.7
Revenues	2,015.8	2,050.5	34.6
Off-budget			
Social Security Outlays ³	460.2	460.2	0.0
Social Security Revenues	669.0	669.0	0.0

¹ S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, as adjusted pursuant to section 207(f), assumed approximately \$0.6 billion in budget authority and \$48.6 billion in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1 of table 2), budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison. Additionally, section 207(c)(2)(E) of S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$145.2 billion in budget authority and \$65.8 billion in outlays for overseas deployment and related activities. Pending action by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on the Budget has directed that these amounts be excluded from the budget resolution aggregates in the current level report.

² Current level is the estimated effect on revenue and spending of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for enti-
tlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations, even if the appropriations have not been made.

³ Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008, AS OF JUNE 25, 2007

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous session:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,050,796
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,410,115	1,351,590	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	419,862	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-575,635	-575,635	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous session	834,480	1,195,817	2,050,796
Enacted this session:			
Appropriation Acts: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28) ¹	1	42	-335
Total, enacted this session	1	42	-335
Entitlements and mandatories: Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	587,601	571,260	0
Total Current Level ²	1,422,082	1,767,119	2,050,461
Total Budget Resolution	2,495,957	2,468,215	2,015,841
Adjustment to the budget resolution for emergency requirements ³	-605	-48,639	n.a.
Adjustment to the budget resolution pursuant to section 207(c)(2)(E) ⁴	-145,162	-65,754	n.a.
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,350,190	2,353,822	2,015,841
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	34,620
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	928,108	586,703	n.a.

¹ Pursuant to section 204(a) of S. Con. Res. 21, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. The amounts so designated for fiscal year 2008, which are not included in the current level total, are as follows: U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 110-28)—budget authority, 605; outlays, 48,639; revenues, n.a.

² Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

³ S. Con. Res. 21, as adjusted pursuant to section 207(f), assumed \$605 million in budget authority and \$48,639 million in outlays from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforce-
ment of the budget resolution. Since current level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in P.L. 110-28 (see footnote 1), budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the
amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

⁴ Section 207(c)(2)(E) of S. Con. Res. 21 assumed \$145,162 million in budget authority and \$65,754 million in outlays for overseas deployment and related activities. Pending action by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Sen-
ate Committee on the Budget has directed that these amounts be excluded from the budget resolution aggregates in the current level report.

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

NOMINATION OF LIEUTENANT
GENERAL DELL LEE DAILEY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the confirmation of Lieutenant General Dell Lee Dailey as the Coordinator in the State Department's Office of Counterterrorism.

Lieutenant General Dailey has had a distinguished military career. There can be no question about that. He is a graduate of West Point and has served as a battalion commander, regiment commander, and assistant division commander both at posts in the United States and abroad. Most recently, he served as director at the Center for Special Operations at MacDill Air Force Base. He has received numerous awards for his excellence including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, two Defense Superior Service Medals, three Army Commendation Medals and six Meritorious Service Medals. He has spent his entire life defending this nation and I thank him for service.

The position to which he was confirmed last Friday is that of the State Department's Coordinator for the Office of Counterterrorism. While I did not object to Lieutenant General Dailey's confirmation, as a member of both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence, I would like to register my concerns.

While the nomination of a military official to a civilian post does not by itself cause concerns, this particular position requires an ability to develop and implement interagency strategies and to encourage the use of and mobilize non-DOD assets. In the context of this administration's tendency to employ military options against strategic problems, or to assign nonmilitary functions to the Department of Defense, it is particularly important that the Coordinator for Counterterrorism demonstrate a commitment to expanding and utilizing the resources of the State Department, USAID and other agencies of the U.S. Government.

I have talked with General Dailey and reviewed his writings, including a 2006 article in which he wrote that Special Operations forces, "doing what they do best," are "developing links within the population that will provide ongoing intelligence and personal relationships that will cement ties with allies around the world." When it comes to military engagements, Special Operations forces may, in fact, have this role. But in most of the countries and regions of the world where we are fighting al-Qaida and seeking to deny it safe haven, these activities should not fall to the Department of Defense. Indeed, "developing links within the population" and "cement[ing] ties with allies around the world" are the jobs of our diplomats. And, in far-flung regions of the world, where a U.S. diplomatic presence or foreign aid program can help deny terrorist organizations safe haven, we should be working to expand those efforts, not deferring to the Department of Defense. This is critical

for four reasons. First, our diplomats and foreign assistance professionals have the background and training to conduct these activities. Second, regardless of the skills of Special Operations forces, the very fact that uniformed officers are at the forefront of local diplomacy can be counterproductive by encouraging or reinforcing perceptions that U.S. policy is driven by our military. Third, if policy is to guide counterterrorism efforts—and that is the whole point of the Coordinator position—then diplomats, not soldiers, need to be leading the way. And, finally, we need our military to do what it does best in the struggle against al-Qaida and its allies, and that is conduct tactical operations as well as work directly with host country militaries and regional peacekeeping forces. The overextension of Special Operations or other military forces for other missions takes away from these efforts.

We need only look at Africa, where strategic counterterrorism policies are desperately needed, to understand the challenges ahead. In Somalia, DOD operations have been conducted in a near policy vacuum. Tactical efforts have not, and will not, address the conditions that have allowed terrorist organizations safe haven. Yet violence and instability continue to fester, at great cost to our national security, without adequate diplomatic, humanitarian or foreign assistance efforts. Elsewhere on the continent, in regions where extremism can take hold and where terrorist organizations might find sympathetic populations, neither the State Department nor USAID has sought to maintain a presence. Finally, AFRICOM's recent difficulties in finding a willing host country illustrate how diplomatic initiatives must precede efforts to expand our military footprint. I have supported AFRICOM and believe that African nations will recognize what the command may have to offer, but we must acknowledge that governments and local populations alike remain skeptical of initiatives that seem driven by our military.

It is in this context that I sought from General Dailey an understanding of this critical position, one whose primary mission is "to forge partnerships with non-state actors, multilateral organizations, and foreign governments to advance the counterterrorism objectives and national security of the United States." At his nomination hearing, I asked him the following question:

What points of collaboration do you see for the relative roles of U.S. military action, military assistance and nonmilitary assistance in the war against international terrorism?

Lieutenant General Dailey's response was:

The military has a huge source of non-lethal, non-kinetic resources that Department of State and the other agencies, I think, can rely on to be successful in that portion of the war on terror that gets to the hearts and

minds of the people. Civil affairs operations, public diplomacy—right now the Special Operations organizations have about 15 or 20 teams that help in public diplomacy that work specifically for the ambassadors in the embassies. That's just a small snapshot of what the military can bring to the table.

Unfortunately, this response appears to reflect the mindset of someone who sees combating terrorism through a military, or at least Department of Defense, prism. This answer suggests a lack of appreciation for the need to incorporate and balance civil, intelligence, and military initiatives when coordinating a U.S. counterterrorism strategy. It is not that the answer is wrong; it indicates a keen understanding of what the Department of Defense can bring to the table. But the Department of Defense does not need more champions in the interagency process. What is needed is a champion for the role of other agencies and departments, for aggressive diplomacy, for expanded foreign assistance efforts, for antipoverty and anticorruption programs that complement broader counterterrorism strategies, for effective public diplomacy, and for multilateral cooperation, including strengthening regional organizations in places like Africa and rediscovering the common ground with our allies in Europe and elsewhere that we had immediately after September 11.

I recognize that these challenges present an extremely high bar for any nominee. I also recognize that this nomination is colored by the failure of this administration to develop and implement effective interagency counterterrorism strategies. But it is precisely because of the critical importance of this position and the need for the nominee to resist this administration's overemphasis on military options that I have regarded General Dailey's nomination with such scrutiny. I do not register these concerns lightly and now that he has been confirmed, I look forward to working with General Dailey on developing coherent and comprehensive counterterrorism strategies, coordinating true interagency efforts and promoting the use of our diplomatic and other nonmilitary resources that are so critical to success in the fight against al-Qaida and its affiliates.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG
THOMAS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senator Craig Thomas was a very good friend. He served in the Senate with great honor and respect for the institution.

I got to know Senator Thomas best through the work of the Finance Committee. Senator Thomas was an active and dedicated participant in the business of the committee from tax policy, to health care, Social Security and international trade. When I was chairman of the committee, I could always count on his diligent, steadfast and