

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### LAS VEGAS TOURISM

Mr. REID. Madam President, during the Presidential campaign, candidate Barack Obama came to Nevada 20 times. Most of those visits were to Las Vegas. It is a place he and I have spoken about lots of times. His staff who came with him loved Las Vegas. I want everyone to understand that when President Obama, at his press conference Monday night, said there was a need for an economic recovery plan, he was very serious about that, and he meant it.

During the question-and-answer period, the President made remarks concerning trips to Las Vegas by financial services companies and their employees. I have spoken at length with President Obama's Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel. I will speak to the President when I have that opportunity. Mr. Emanuel made it clear to me—and I know this is the case—that President Obama's criticism was aimed at the potential use of taxpayer funds for junkets.

Now, we gave a lot of money to these banks, and they shouldn't be taking junkets with any of that money, whether they go to Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Salt Lake City, New York City, or anyplace else. That was the point President Obama was making.

We all know Las Vegas is a premier destination source of the world, and people look upon it as a good place to go for a little timeout. I repeat, during the campaign President Obama was in Nevada 20 times. In fact, he just accepted my invitation to visit again this spring, early summer for the first time as our President.

Nevada has lots of hotel rooms, but Las Vegas has more than 140,000—far more than any other place in the world. We have millions of feet of visiting space. The largest convention center in the world is in Las Vegas.

As all Americans spend less as a result of our economic crisis, it is important to note that Las Vegas, with an average daily hotel rate of only \$119, is one of America's most affordable cities to visit. It is one reason nearly 6 million people came to Las Vegas to attend more than 20,000 meetings and conventions last year.

President Obama and I agree that every penny of taxpayer funds should be protected. We also agree Las Vegas is one of America's greatest destinations for tourists, families, and businesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

#### STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, earlier today the junior Senator from California was discussing President Clinton's 1993 tax hike bill that broke his campaign promise to cut taxes on

those making \$200,000 or less and instead raised taxes on those making more than \$20,000 a year. The junior Senator from California said this morning:

Charles Grassley: I do not think it takes a rocket scientist to know that this bill will cost jobs. That is what he said of the Clinton plan that created 23 million jobs.

That is the end of the quote of what this Senator said. It is an accurate quote, but I want to make sure there is a context.

I made that statement about the 1993 Clinton tax hike bill on seniors and the vast majority of other Americans. The junior Senator from California is saying that one tax hike bill in 1993 is solely responsible for the creation of 23 million jobs between 1993 and the year 2000 and, in a sense, we should ignore all other economic events, including the work of the Republican Congress, free-trade legislation, and many other factors that actually caused the job creation during that period. Other than being simply wrong, it revises fiscal history. I felt the need to respond to those remarks because the junior Senator from California called me out by name on the Senate floor.

I gave a speech on the Senate floor just yesterday that clearly rebuts her mistaken assertion that the Clinton 1993 tax hike bill was the cause of 23 million jobs. Perhaps she was involved in partisan negotiations on the stimulus bill instead of watching my speech at that time.

I will note that as one of five Senate conferees on the stimulus bill, I have been excluded from participating in conference negotiations and instead will only be invited to a photo op today scheduled at 3 p.m. which the Democrats are referring to as the one conference meeting that is required under the rules. DAVE CAMP, the only other Republican tax writer who is a conferee, has also been excluded from conference negotiations.

There will not be any negotiations, give or take, or compromise at that meeting; it will simply be to ratify a deal that Democrats and three Republicans out of 219 Republicans in the entire Congress have agreed to. In fact, there were more Democrats—11 in the House of Representatives—who voted against the stimulus package than there were the three Republicans who voted for it. This bill was handed over to the House Democratic leadership to write, and they wrote a bill that was loaded down with a lot of unnecessary—well, I shouldn't say unnecessary spending; I should say spending that goes way beyond the 2-year window of stimulus; a window that Dr. Summers, the President's economic adviser, said ought to be timely, temporary, and targeted. That is 2 years, that is not forever.

So this bill is not stimulative, then, or goes way beyond being stimulative, and it tended to include items that reward Democratic supporters such as unions and environmental groups. It has an enormous bailout of States that overspent their budgets and a lot of

spending that belongs in an appropriations bill but which has no place in a stimulus bill. Less than 34 percent of the Senate bill was tax relief, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which is the official scorekeeper on that matter. Less than 1 percent of the Senate bill was tax relief for small business, and small businesses are the engine for job growth in our economy, creating three-fourths of new jobs in our economy.

Since the junior Senator from California clearly did not hear my speech from yesterday, I wish to go over some of the key items she has overlooked. Two days ago, and again this morning, there was a lot of revision or perhaps editing of recent budget history. Our President alluded to it. I agree with the President there is a lot of revisionism in the debate. The revisionist history basically boils down to two conclusions: that all of the so-called good fiscal history of the 1990s was derived from a partisan tax increase of 1993; and No. 2, that all of the bad fiscal history of this decade to date is attributable to bipartisan tax relief plans earlier this decade.

Now, not surprisingly, nearly all of the revisionists who spoke generally oppose tax relief and support tax increases. The same crew generally support spending increases and oppose spending cuts. In the debate so far, many on this side have pointed out some key, undeniable facts. The bill before us, with interest included, increases the deficit by over \$1 trillion. The bill before us is a heavy stew of spending increases and refundable tax credits, seasoned with small pieces of tax relief. The bill before us has new temporary spending that if made permanent will burden future budget deficits by over \$1 trillion. All of this occurs—all of it occurs—in an environment where the automatic economic stabilizers are kicking in to help the most unfortunate in America with unemployment insurance, food stamps, and other benefits—things that are part of the social fabric of America that are meant to take care of people in need, and particularly right now when we are in a recession, they automatically trigger in to higher levels of spending. That antirecessionary spending, together with lower tax receipts and the TARP activities, has set a fiscal table of a deficit of \$1.2 trillion. That is the highest deficit as a percentage of the economy in post-World War II history, not a pretty fiscal picture. It is going to get a lot uglier as a result of this bill. So for the folks who see this bill as an opportunity to recover America with Government taking a larger share of the economy over the long term, I say congratulations.

If a Member votes for this bill, that Member puts us on the path to a bigger role for the Government, but supporters of this bill need to own up to

the fiscal course they are charting. That is where the revisionist history comes from. It is a strategy to divert, through a twisted blame game, from the facts before us. One can ask: How is this history revisionist? So I would take each conclusion one by one.

The first conclusion is that all of the good fiscal history was derived from the 1993 tax increase. To knock down this assertion, all you have to do is take a look at this chart—not a chart produced by the Senator from Iowa but a chart produced from data from the Clinton administration, and it is right here. It is the same chart I had up a couple of days ago. The much ballyhooed partisan 1993 tax increase accounts for 13 percent—you can say 13 percent or you can say just 13 percent, and I prefer the latter—just 13 percent of the deficit reduction through the decade of the 1990s.

The biggest source of deficit reduction, 35 percent, came from, as you can see, cuts in defense spending. Of course, that fiscal benefit originated from President Reagan's stare-down of the Communist regime in Russia before 1989, and we didn't have to spend as much on defense because the Cold War was—well, there wasn't a Cold War, I suppose you could say. The same folks on that side who opposed President Reagan's defense buildup take credit for the fiscal benefit of a peace dividend.

The next biggest source of deficit reduction, 32 percent, is other revenue. It came from various sources. Basically, this was the fiscal benefit from progrowth policies, such as the bipartisan capital gains tax cut of 1997, and the free-trade agreements President Clinton, with Republican votes, established.

The savings from the policies I have pointed out translated into interest savings. So you get the 15 percent that is from interest savings.

Now, for all the chest-thumping about the 1990s, these chest thumpers who push for big social spending didn't bring much to the deficit reduction table of the 1990s. That contribution was the 5 percent you see up there.

What is more, the fiscal revisionist historians in this body tend to forget who the players were. They are correct that there was a Democratic President in the White House. But they conveniently forget the Republicans controlled the Congress for that period, where the deficit came down and turned to surplus. They tend to forget they fought the principle of a balanced budget that was the centerpiece of our policy at that time, the Republican Party's policy.

Remember the Government shutdown in late 1995?

They ought to remember that. Remember what it was about? It was about a plan to balance the budget. Republicans paid a political price for forcing the issue. But, in 1997, President Clinton agreed. Recall, as well, all through the 1990s what the year-end

battles were all about. On one side, congressional Democrats and the Clinton administration pushed for more spending. On the other side, congressional Republicans were pushing for tax relief. In the end, both sides compromised. That is the real fiscal history of the 1990s.

Let's turn to the other conclusion of the revisionist fiscal historians. That conclusion is that, in this decade, all fiscal problems are attributable to the widespread tax relief enacted in 2001—which was a bipartisan bill—2003, 2004, and 2006.

In 2001, President Bush came into office and inherited an economy that was careening downhill. Investment started to go flat in 2000—you know, the NASDAQ bubble that lost 50 percent of its value. In February 2000, we started down the road of more than 40 months of downturn in the manufacturing index. Then we had the economic shocks that related from the 9/11 terrorist attacks and then you can add in the corporate scandals to that economic environment.

It is true, as fiscal year 2001 came to a close, the projected surplus turned to a deficit, and we have a chart that shows the start of this decade's fiscal history.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Is it possible to get 3 more minutes?

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, if the Senator would like an additional 5 minutes, that is OK with me.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I appreciate that. I have to get out of here at that time anyway. I have a radio program I have to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we have the chart that you have seen before, and nobody has disputed the chart. Maybe you can dispute the interpretations of it, but these are figures you can rely upon.

If my comments were meant to be partisan shots, I could say this favorable fiscal path from 2003 to 2007 was the only period, aside from 6 months in 2001, where Republicans controlled the White House and the Congress. But unlike the fiscal history revisionists, I am not trying to make any partisan points; I am trying to give you the fiscal facts.

We have another chart that compares tax receipts for the 4 years after the much ballyhooed 1993 tax increase and the 4-year period after the 2003 tax cut.

On a year-by-year basis, this chart compares the change in revenues as a percentage of GDP. In 1993, the Clinton tax increase brought in more revenue as compared to the 2003 tax cut. That trend, though, reversed as both policies moved along in years. You can see from the chart how the extra revenue went up over time relative to the flat line of the 1993 tax increase, which ought to make it very clear that you don't nec-

essarily bring in more revenue because you increase taxes, and you can decrease taxes, stimulate the economy, encourage business activity, encourage investment, and bring in more revenue.

The progrowth tax and trade policies of the 1990s, along with the "peace dividend" had a lot more to do with deficit reduction in the 1990s than the 1993 tax increase, which was only 13 percent of deficit reduction. In this decade, deficits went down after tax relief plans were put in full effect.

That is the past. We need to make sure we understand it. But what is most important is the future. In fact, the last election, based upon President Obama's very own statements, was about the future, not about the past. So we should not be talking about the past. People in our States sent us here to deal with future policy. They don't send us here to flog one another similar to partisan cartoon cutout characters over past policies. They don't send us here to endlessly point fingers of blame. Now let's focus on the fiscal consequences on the bill in front of us. That is what this vote, before we end this week, is all about.

President Obama rightly focused us on the future with his eloquence during the campaign. I would like to take a—paraphrase a quote from the President's nomination acceptance speech:

We need a President who can face the threats of the future, not grasping at the ideas of the past.

President Obama was right.

We need a President, and I would add Congressmen and Senators, who can face the threats of the future. This bill, as currently written, poses considerable threats to our fiscal future. Senator MCCAIN's spending trigger amendment showed us the way. We can rewrite this bill to retain its stimulative effect, but turn off the spending when the recovery occurs.

Grasping at ideas of the past or playing the partisan blame game will not deal with the threats to our fiscal future.

It is not too late to do a clean stimulus bill, which is what the American people want and need. There is a way to reach a real bipartisan compromise, not just picking off a few Senators that frequently vote with the Democrats. We can have a significant amount of infrastructure spending for roads and bridges. Even though some on our side of the aisle have issues with the making work pay credit, we could take that and expand it to cover all those making up to \$250,000—which is the level that President Obama and his surrogates said during the campaign that he wants to cut taxes for people. Instead, the making work pay credit phases out starting at \$70,000 for individual workers. So we are saying a large part of the middle class by President Obama's definition won't get the tax cut. In fact, the "we give a tax cut to 95 percent of working families" number that has been bandied about is wrong. According to the Joint Committee on

Taxation, 87 percent of workers qualify for some or all of the credit, and even less get all of the credit. So there is a way forward. It is a clean stimulus bill. All the Democratic agenda items and spending items that should go in the appropriations bill can get done in regular order. The Democrats have the votes. They don't need to push that agenda on the American people and dig a deficit ditch an additional \$1.2 trillion deeper with this bill, when interest on the bill is considered. They have the votes to push their agenda later in the year. For now, let's give the American people what they want, a clean stimulus bill, and not scare them into thinking that the Democratic agenda needs to be pushed in the stimulus bill. It is reminiscent of that famous chicken—Chicken Little, who said "The Sky is Falling." Let's do a clean stimulus bill instead.

I think this clears up the record. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I was glad to yield the additional 5 minutes to my friend from Iowa. Senator GRASSLEY has always been, as far as I could see, bipartisan in my 2 years in the Senate. I thank him for that. I often don't agree with his reasoning, but I always agree with his motive. I wish to make a couple comments—and I know he has to leave and that is fine. I wish to make some comments on his comments, and then I will talk more precisely and directly about this stimulus package that we are convinced will create millions of jobs for our economy and our country.

I was joined in a press conference today by the President of the National Association of Manufacturers, a group that rarely supports me in my campaign and rarely supports the Presiding Officer in hers, as it is a group that simply doesn't agree with us. The National Association of Manufacturers thinks this stimulus package is just right. They like the spending part, the tax cuts part; they think it is the right mix. They were resounding in their support today. Also joining Senator JACK REED and me was the president of the National Association of Realtors.

There are a lot of very important economic organizations and business groups that are supportive of this legislation. I am sorry it has become so partisan to the Republicans and that only three of them could see their way to support a bill that has gotten huge bipartisan and business support and labor support around the country and not even three people in the House of Representatives. So I have a couple comments on Senator GRASSLEY's comments.

I am incredulous when you see people stand and try to make the 1990s economy out to have not been very good and the economy of the last decade to have been better. Yet anything good that happened in the 1990s had to do with Republican policies, and anything

bad that happened in this decade had to do with Democratic policies. It goes back to something I am even more incredulous about, and that is this cottage industry that has been created in this country in the last year that Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency was a failure and that it caused the Depression and then caused the second depression and recession in 1937. It is remarkable. I am not an economic expert. I took economics courses in high school and in college, but I am a prolific reader. I don't ever recall reading—from conservative or liberal economists and people in between, such as academics or business people—that Franklin Roosevelt's economic policies were a failure, until 6 months ago when it was clear that Barack Obama was going to be President and was going to follow some of Roosevelt's ideas of direct spending to put people to work, for infrastructure, for health care, education, and a lot of things Franklin Roosevelt did, such as regulation of Wall Street, of the minimum wage and worker's compensation and unemployment compensation—all the things that Roosevelt began.

On a personal note, I add that this desk at which I stand is desk No. 88. They each have numbers on them. This desk was occupied, back in the 1930s, by future Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black, then a Senator from Alabama. Hugo Black supposedly sat at this desk when he wrote the minimum wage bill; he wrote it on the Senate floor, apparently, and it later became law.

What intrigues me is that there are Wall Street Journal columnists—no surprise—and Washington Times, Republican ideologues, and conservative think tanks funded by some of the wealthiest outsourcing kinds of corporations in America, who are trying to discredit Franklin Roosevelt's policies in order to discredit President Obama's policies. It is historical revisionism that sounds almost like, I daresay, the Soviet Union—this kind of revisionist history that I don't even get.

There is no question in any fair-minded historian's mind that what Franklin Roosevelt did mattered in a very positive way. He built a banking structure that kept us safe for 75 years, until the Republicans deregulated it in the last 8 years. He built a wage structure that created a middle class. He got us out of the Depression, along with others he worked with.

Enough of that. When I heard my friend from Iowa talk about the 1990s, that the Clinton policies didn't work and that, in 2001, the Bush policies did—where I come from, in Ohio, we say that doesn't pass the straight-face test. I don't think anybody believes them. These columnists and pundits and rightwing ideologues and think-tank academics keep saying it, so I guess they are talking to each other but not to the American public.

Let me talk about the stimulus. The Senate, yesterday, took a major step

toward revitalizing this stumbling economy.

We passed legislation that would create jobs in construction, engineering, green energy, social work, health care, the retail sector, the service sector, and the manufacturing sector—preserving those jobs now and building jobs in the future.

These are jobs that stimulate consumer spending, which stimulates economic activity, economic activity that fuels growth and gets us out of recession. When you build a bridge, you put money in the pockets of sheet metal workers and operating engineers and laborers and carpenters and electricians.

When you build an infrastructure project, that money does two things: It goes directly into the economy because these are good-paying jobs that create a middle class, and they will spend that money on homes, cars, and consumer items. It also, as I have learned in doing roundtables around Ohio—I have done 125 roundtables in all of Ohio; I have been in all the 88 counties listening to people talk. I invite 20 or 25 people in a community, a good cross-section of people. It is not just the mayors and county engineers who say we need more sewers, broadband, water systems, bridges, highways, and roads. It is also economic development directors of the communities' chambers of commerce, the plant managers, and other business people who understand that to do economic development, you need clean water for manufacturing, you need a good transportation system, bridges, water, sewer systems, broadband, and all these things. That is what this stimulus package is about—infrastructure. It creates 4 million jobs, some directly and immediately, as we set the table and build a foundation for economic development.

The bill, I also add, invests in alternative energy. That means good-paying jobs, energy innovation, and energy independence. It means fighting for global independence and fighting global warming, a force that is threatening animal species and could only jeopardize the human species as well. An overwhelming number of scientists say that.

This bill will not only stimulate our economy, it will make sure our Nation can regain its economic footing and does not do it just to lose it again in the future.

We cannot be dependent on foreign oil and hope to thrive in the global economy. We cannot let our transportation infrastructure erode. That is what has happened in the last 10 years.

At the beginning of this decade that some of my Republican friends brag about, the economic policy of the early Bush years, we had a budget surplus when he stood on the Capitol steps and took the oath of office. We had a budget surplus in this country. Then the President went to war with Iraq, spending \$3 billion a week. The President did tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

And all of a sudden, we have this huge budget deficit that my Republican friends rail against we are adding to.

When President Obama took office, the budget deficit was at \$1 trillion for that fiscal year. It went from zero to \$1 trillion. Madam President, \$1 trillion is a thousand billion; a billion is a thousand million. If you spent \$1,000 every second of every minute of every hour of every day, it would take you 33 years to spend \$1 trillion. The pages sitting in front of me average in age about half that; am I correct? Sixteen years or so? They have lived about half a billion seconds. For them to spend \$1 trillion, they would have had to spend \$2,000 every second of every minute of every hour of every day in their young lives to get to \$1 trillion. You, Madam President, would have to spend a little less, being very young but a bit older than they are.

Let me talk for a moment about what is happening with the States.

Every State in this country—unless they are energy States, unless they make money in their State treasuries from oil production, coal production, natural gas production—is faced with a huge budget deficit. My State of Ohio, for instance, as so many States, is forced to cut services. Cutting services means cutting jobs, it means laying off people, and it means hurting communities. It means all of that.

We cannot dismiss this situation. We must confront it. We must do something about it. It means as people lose their jobs, as a plant in Jackson, OH, the Meridian plant, closes or a plant somewhere else in Gallipolis or Mansfield or Toledo, OH, closes—when a plant shuts down, it is not just those workers who lose, as tragic as it is; it also puts more demands on the mental health system, more demands on the food pantry, more demands on communities that simply cannot afford it. As their tax base shrivels, they cannot afford it.

Economic recovery will not happen at the national level unless it happens at the State level. With dramatically reduced revenues, States are left with no options. They are cutting basic jobs, and they are cutting basic services. They are cutting social workers, teachers, mental health counselors, and public safety personnel. We cannot function that way. If what we do in the recovery bill adds jobs but the States take them away, we will be left treading in water.

The House-passed economic recovery bill includes dollars the States can use to weather this economic storm. And if they don't weather it, none of us will.

So I hope Senators and Representatives negotiating the final bill will agree upon the House-passed State stabilization fund. It just makes sense.

This bill, as I said earlier, is endorsed by the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Realtors, and businesses all over the Presiding Officer's State of North Carolina and my State of Ohio.

It is endorsed by small businesses, by manufacturing businesses—all those companies that create so much wealth and jobs in our society.

In my State, from Toledo to Columbus, our universities are engaging in groundbreaking research. From Cleveland to Cincinnati, regional partnerships are being formed to advance solar and wind technology. My State is well on the way to becoming the Silicon Valley of alternative energy. We are about to put wind turbines in Lake Erie—the only place in the world where wind turbines will actually be located in freshwater. We are building hydropower on the Ohio River. We have the largest solar manufacturer of any State in the country in northwest Ohio. The University of Toledo is doing all kinds of wind turbine research, fuel cells in Stark State and Canton and Rolls Royce and Mount Vernon. Fuel cell development and research is far ahead of most places in the country, with biomass, Battelle in Columbus, all kinds of coal research. We are doing things that, with this bill, we can do better.

There is \$33 billion in green energy tax incentives in this bill to grow jobs by encouraging green energy production. What value is it if we wean ourselves from foreign oil by using solar but we are not producing solar in our country?

Oberlin College, which is 15 minutes from my house, has the largest single building on any college campus in America powered fully by solar energy built 3, 4 years ago. We got those solar panels from Germany and Japan. Why do we do that? We do it because in the early part of this decade President Bush pushed through this Senate and the House—I was a Member of the House—an energy bill that dumped all of its tax incentives, subsidies and incentives, to oil and gas, not to solar, not to wind, not to fuel cells, not to biomass, not to where we should have been looking. It was the same old game, same old politics, same old “help your friends in the oil and gas industry, cash your campaign checks, and do the country wrong.” That is why this bill is so important to do something else.

Lastly, I wish to talk about another provision of the bill which probably is the strongest provision of the bill; that is, the “Buy American” provision Senator DORGAN and I worked on in the last couple of years.

In a recent survey of Americans, 84 percent support the “Buy American” provision—perhaps the strongest statement of the public on any provision in the stimulus bill. The fact is, we are asking people in North Carolina, Ohio, and around this country to reach into their pockets and come up with hundreds of billions of dollars to spend on the stimulus package. They ask three things: first, that we be accountable in doing this right; second, they ask that the jobs be in the United States; third, they ask that the materials used for

this infrastructure also be made in the United States. That is the compact we have come to, and I believe that is so very important.

I have had discussions with people at the highest levels of the Obama administration about the importance of “Buy American” and about enforcement. We have had some of these “Buy American” laws on the books since the Roosevelt years. It is part of the reason he was successful. The Bush administration simply turned its back on this law. They simply did not enforce it. They granted waivers, waivers that were not even public. For instance, the 800-mile fence along the Mexico-United States border was made with Chinese steel, probably illegally. But the Bush administration just said: OK, buy the steel wherever you want, instead of putting Americans to work.

I close with, as all of us in this body—most of us—understand, we need to get this economy back on track, we need to set the stage for a prosperous future. Partisanship at this stage is a slap in the face of unemployed Americans, families facing foreclosures, communities sinking into poverty, and, frankly, to middle-class America, who just wants an even break and wants us to get our economy back on track. Action is our only option. Let's move.

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF WILLIAM J. LYNN, III, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent now that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 14, the nomination of William Lynn to be Deputy Secretary of Defense; that there be 3 hours of debate with respect to the nomination, with 1 hour each under the control of Senator GRASSLEY and Senator MCCAIN or his designee, 1 hour under my control or my designee's, and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that upon confirmation, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, no further motions be in order, that the President then be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of William J. Lynn, III, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.