

There are many items on the President's wish list. Some are worthwhile, but many, such as his health care plan, tax increases, and climate change, deserve a long and lively debate in front of the American people before we have any vote on any of those measures. I have four grandchildren—John, Parker, Kimbro, and Anderson—and I am very proud of all four of them. This budget will spend more money than my four grandchildren's generation will ever have a hope of paying back in their lifetimes.

This is not a temporary spike in the deficit. Despite the President's stated intention to reduce the deficit, the smallest deficit envisioned by this budget—\$533 billion in the year 2013—would still be larger than any of the annual budget deficits of the last 8 years. The last 8 years have received a lot of criticism from folks on the other side of the aisle, including our President, but the fact is that the last 8 years are going to pale in comparison, from a deficit standpoint, in the event this budget should pass.

Further, the debt held by the public doubles, from \$5.8 trillion, 41 percent of our GDP, in 2008, to \$11.5 trillion, or 66 percent of GDP, in 2013. If that were not astounding enough, by 2019 debt will have tripled from the 2008 to \$15.4 trillion, or an astonishing 67 percent of our GDP.

Unfortunately, that is not the worst of it. The CBO is expected to release its numbers for this budget tomorrow. Early reports suggest that its deficit forecast will be some 20 percent higher than the White House has expected with the numbers to which I just alluded.

I am also worried about this budget's \$1.4 trillion tax increase, which will hit our small businesses, the engines of our economy, particularly hard. More than half of small business, with 20 or more employees, will get hit with tax hikes proposed in this budget. That will have a dampening effect on the ability of the small business community to maintain the jobs it has today, much less to think about hiring additional employees.

In my home State of Georgia, fully 98 percent of the State's employers in 2006 were small businesses, according to the U.S. Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy. With a record statewide unemployment rate of 9 percent today, to say that many of them are having a hard time is an understatement. These are small businesses, such as Dixie Industrial Finishing Company in Tucker, GA, which does electroplating. Dixie's vice president, Jim Jones, is also worried. His company has been in business for nearly 50 years and has about 10 employees. Just in the past 2 weeks, because of the very difficult economic times we are in, Jim has had to lay off almost 10 percent of his workforce. Some of these employees have been with the company for 20 to 25 years and were getting close to retirement. I am afraid that, coming

during a recession, such tax increases will only add to the financial strain at Dixie as well as other small businesses and further feed the growing job losses in Georgia and elsewhere.

I am a firm believer in the optimism that birthed this great Nation. But no matter how hard we try, we cannot wish the deficit away. We cannot let ourselves throw caution to the wind and act with such fiscal irresponsibility. We are leaving our children and grandchildren in hock forever to pay for the wants of today. Now, not in 5 years or 10 years, is the time for us to exercise responsibility and enact some spending restraint to get this deficit under control. Nothing less than our country's future depends on it.

The American people understand our fiscal problem. The phone calls into my office are overwhelmingly asking the question: Where in the world is this administration taking our country? What is happening to our country from a fiscally responsible standpoint? In what direction is this country really going?

We have to be much more fiscally responsible than the President has proposed in his budget. Very simply stated, his budget spends too much, it taxes too much, and it borrows too much. That is the wrong direction in which this country needs to be going in difficult times or in good times.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

#### AIG

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank Senator CHAMBLISS from Georgia for his very fine summary. I think one of the more dramatic situations in which this Congress has found itself, in the face of a projected positive turnaround in the economy, a predicted unprecedented debt for years and years to come.

This cannot go quietly. It is a big deal. We have never seen anything like this before. I hope our Senate colleagues will focus on it. I wanted to first return again to the AIG bonus issue and expand a little bit on the remarks I made earlier in the week.

The simple fact is, we are investing a very large amount of not only money but time, energy, and bombast in how to deal with the one one-thousandth of the AIG bailout money that has gone to bonuses. I think they are utterly unacceptable. They are going to the very division of AIG that got them into trouble. They were the last people who ought to get bonuses.

Now, normally politicians who have a nation to run, Cabinet Secretaries who have an economy to manage, should not be spending a whole lot of time on a private company's bonus plan. But it has become necessary, unavoidable really, because our Government owns 80 percent of this company. We own 80 percent of the stock in AIG after investing \$173 billion to buy that stock. So no wonder people are furious.

If you are running a company, Secretary Geithner, how come we are hav-

ing bonuses given to people who ought not to be receiving bonuses?

Well, it is a difficult thing with the CEO. Why didn't he do something about it? The CEO, Chairman Liddy of AIG, was put in place by us—first, by Secretary Paulson back when he first started this misguided attempt last fall to take over this company, and he has been kept in place by Secretary Geithner, our new Secretary of the Treasury.

I would also note that Secretary Geithner was walking hand in hand with Secretary Paulson last fall when they conjured up this scheme that sought to alter the financial problems on Wall Street. In reality, Secretary Geithner is the ultimate chairman of the board of AIG. He ultimately is responsible for bonuses, pay scales, office space, whether or not they have airplanes, and all of that stuff. So, oh, what a tangled web we create when we first start to regulate, to take over a private company.

Mr. Geithner needs to get AIG and these banks—in addition to AIG—we have invested in, of which we now own large stock shares, off his portfolio, his list of things to be dealing with. He needs to be focused on the policies necessary to revive this economy.

Did anybody see Coach K from Duke? He was asked about the President saying they were going to make it to the Final Four. And Coach K did not miss a beat. He just looked up and said: Well, that is nice. But I would really feel better if he were focusing on the economy.

So would I. Distracted by these noteworthy and transient issues over bonuses, Mr. Geithner, who stands at the center of our people's concern over the economy, has not even begun assembling his staff. It is really troubling. I understand there are about 17 vacancies in his top staff. People are basically saying he is running the office himself with very little help.

But he did find time to call Mr. Liddy, the hand-picked CEO at AIG, to demand that he not give bonus payments. He found time to go over to Europe to present—a mortifying spectacle to me, of the once-proud U.S. Secretary of Treasury now urging the big-spending, quasi-socialist Government of Europe to increase their spending, to increase their stimulus package, to increase their debt, and assuring them we are going to do more and we are leading, big government, big taxes, big spending, big debt.

That does not make me proud. Some people may think that is leadership. I am not in that range. That is not my mindset today. Basically, it appeared the Europeans said no. They already thought they had spent enough. They are well below what we are spending as a percentage of their gross domestic product. They are not spending any more.

I remember when I first came here as a young Senator. It came my time to question the Chairman of the Federal

Reserve, Mr. Alan Greenspan. I was nervous about it. I am not an economist. So I read to him from an article. I asked him if he agreed with it. It basically said the reason our economy was growing more than Europe, the reason we had quite substantially less unemployment was because we had less taxes, less spending, and less regulation.

So I asked him: Is it less taxes, less spending, and a greater commitment to the free market the reason we are doing better than Europe?

He looked up at me and he said: I absolutely agree with that.

So I have taken that as sort of my marching orders. I still think that is a sound philosophy: to keep our regulations low, keep our taxes low, keep our spending as low as possible. Do not waste money, and we will get through a lot of these difficult issues.

I would also note that I assume that Secretary Geithner at least had some role in this phenomenal, gargantuan proposal the President has just sent over here to us that proposes—get this—budget deficits higher than anything we have ever seen before.

Last year, President Bush, his budget deficit was a record \$455 billion, and he was criticized for that. He was criticized for a \$412 billion budget deficit back on 9/11, the time when that recession hit us. He reduced it to \$161 billion in 2007, and it jumped to \$455 billion last year.

This year, with the stimulus package and other things we are doing, the projected deficit—as of September 30—will be \$1.8 trillion. Next year, it will be \$1.1 trillion. It is projected to reach its lowest point in 4 years, according to the President's own plan. The lowest point is at \$533 billion, well above the highest amount in the history of the Republic.

In year 10, it would be over \$700 billion. As Senator CHAMBLISS just noted to us, those figures are not accurate. Our own Congressional Budget Office is going to calculate the assumptions given to us by the White House, and everybody is pretty firmly convinced the numbers are going to come in higher and worse than that.

It cannot be so that we will pass a budget that assumes a \$700 billion deficit 10 years from now, when they are also assuming a nice growth, not a recession or anything, but a nice growth at that time. Well, that is a general situation. It is not good. I just cannot believe this Congress would pass such a budget. I believe we will have to push back.

I know a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are uneasy about it. The more they learn about it, I am confident the more uneasy they are going to be. It is just fact. I mean, you can talk and testify and you can spend, but when you send out a budget in a slick binder, with a blue cover on it, and it is the official projection for the next 10 years from the President of the United States, when they project these kind of numbers, I think the Congress

and the American people will rally and do something about it and not accept it.

I just wanted to say that. Now, with regard to AIG, this is a matter of great importance. In addition to teaching us a lesson about the danger of taking over private companies in general, there are some specific special problems with this bailout that I believe are worthy of discussion, and in some points, real investigation.

It was highlighted by the Wall Street Journal in their lead editorial 2 days ago. They pointed out that the bonus flap we have been talking about is a deflection from—a neat deflection—they say, from the “larger outrage, which is the 5-month Beltway cover-up of who benefitted the most from the AIG bailout.”

First, they note that the Federal takeover of this once proud insurance company, AIG, was never approved by the AIG shareholders.

Normally a company that merges or sells or changes its corporate makeup goes through some sort of vote by stockholders. They have proxy votes, solicitations. They attempt to get approval of the stockholders. We just took it over.

The Wall Street Journal notes that, in effect, AIG was used as a conduit, a funnel to bail out others not mentioned. Since September 16, 2008, AIG has sent \$120 billion of their \$173 billion of taxpayer money to banks, municipal governments, and “other derivative counterparties” around the world, not only in the United States.

The Journal goes on to say that this includes at least \$20 billion to European banks and, they wryly note, “charity cases like Goldman Sachs which received at least \$13 billion.”

They further note:

This comes after months of claims by Goldman that all of its AIG bets were adequately hedged and that it needed no “bailout.” Why take the 13 billion then?

Then the Wall Street Journal, not one to needlessly dump unfairly on the Wall Street business crowd they often speak up for when they believe they are abused, declares importantly:

This needless cover-up is one reason Americans are getting angrier as they wonder if Washington is lying to them about these bailouts.

Then they ask the most critical question. Remember, Congress was told last fall that we had to bail out the banks because they were too large to fail and that their failure would pose a systemic risk to our economy. They said they were going to buy toxic assets. They never said they were going to buy stock. They never hinted they would buy stock in an insurance company.

This is what the Wall Street Journal said about the systemic risk question:

Given the government has never defined “systemic risk,” we’re also starting to wonder exactly which system American taxpayers are paying to protect. It’s not capitalism, in which risk-takers suffer the consequences of bad decisions and in some cases

it’s not even Americans. The U.S. government is now in the business of distributing foreign aid to offshore financiers, laundered through a once-great American company.

That is fundamentally true. It is not good. I don’t think we ever should have started down that road.

The Wall Street Journal concludes:

Whether or not these funds ever come back to the Treasury, regulators should now focus on getting AIG back into private hands as soon as possible, and if Treasury and the Fed want to continue bailing out foreign banks, let them make that case honestly and directly, to the American people.

I thank the Wall Street Journal for writing the truth on this complex issue. I don’t like the way it was done. These decisions to hand out billions of dollars were not made in public. Until a few days ago, we didn’t even know who got this money. These banks, these foreign banks, Goldman Sachs, the ones that have been listed as getting money, we didn’t know their names. Our Secretaries of the Treasury, the two of them, have been passing out this money to these banks through AIG and not even saying where the money went. That is no good. And how do they decide how much to give them? Was there a hearing somewhere where people came, such as in the Senate—poor as we are at it—raised their hands under oath or, much preferred, was there something like a bankruptcy proceeding where a Federal judge calls all the people in, collects the data, figures out what the income is and the debts are, and makes people testify under oath and lawyers cross-examine them and they get down to what the real facts are and then decisions are made about how to handle a company like this?

No, apparently they went in and got down on Mr. Geithner’s rug and Mr. Paulson’s carpet and asked for \$20 billion. And he said: How about 10?

No, I need more.

OK, you get 13.

Of course, they knew one another. That is just a fact. I am not making it up. Where did Secretary Paulson come from? He came from Goldman Sachs. I wonder what it would have looked like if he had given Goldman Sachs \$13 billion publicly.

I am not happy about it. I don’t think the previous administration handled it well. I am disappointed that this administration has taken Mr. Paulson’s right-hand adviser—some say the architect of his plan—and put him in charge of it. He is continuing this indefensible process. I opposed it at the time. I said we are giving too much power to one man. In the history of the Republic, we have never given this kind of power to one man to pass out this kind of money. This is the Senate. It is taxpayers’ money. We threw him \$700 billion and said: Do whatever you think is right. He told us he was going to buy toxic mortgages. Remember that? Within a week, he decided he wasn’t going to buy toxic mortgages. He bought stock; not only in banks, he bought stock in insurance companies.

It is a dangerous thing. When you get into owning these companies, people start wanting to know about what kind of bonuses they have, what kind of car the CEO drives, whether they should have a jet plane. The Secretary of the Treasury ought to be involved in other things besides managing corporate affairs. He needs to get us out of these companies as soon as possible.

I talked to some people from a very solid Main Street bank, big Main Street bank, who were pressured to take money at the time they came up with this scheme. They want to pay the money back and get out from under the Federal boot. They are not agreeing yet to do that. I am not happy about that.

I understand another bank may be the same. Others are worried about whether they will be allowed to pay this money back and get out. This bank told us, the people I was talking to: We are ready to get out. We think we will do better. Our stock will go up, if the people know we are not indebted to the government. We are strong enough. We are not happy about this.

They are getting the impression and the fear they have—along with other banks in a similar situation—is that there is a resistance from the Treasury Department to have them do that, which would be unthinkable to me.

I hope we will find out more about it. If there is wrongdoing of a more serious nature than incompetence and bad judgment, I hope it will be pursued. Hopefully not; I hope there is no more than bad judgment. I hope as Americans we learn a lesson that it is not easy and there are all kinds of unanticipated ramifications from the act of taking over private companies.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of this Wall Street Journal editorial, as well as the list of companies benefitting from AIG's bailout.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 17, 2009]

#### THE REAL AIG OUTRAGE

President Obama joined yesterday in the clamor of outrage at AIG for paying some \$165 million in contractually obligated employee bonuses. He and the rest of the political class thus neatly deflected attention from the larger outrage, which is the five-month Beltway cover-up over who benefited most from the AIG bailout.

Taxpayers have already put up \$173 billion, or more than a thousand times the amount of those bonuses, to fund the government's AIG "rescue." This federal takeover, never approved by AIG shareholders, uses the firm as a conduit to bail out other institutions. After months of government stonewalling, on Sunday night AIG officially acknowledged where most of the taxpayer funds have been going.

Since September 16, AIG has sent \$120 billion in cash, collateral and other payouts to banks, municipal governments and other derivative counterparties around the world. This includes at least \$20 billion to European

banks. The list also includes American charity cases like Goldman Sachs, which received at least \$13 billion. This comes after months of claims by Goldman that all of its AIG bets were adequately hedged and that it needed no "bailout." Why take \$13 billion then? This needless cover-up is one reason Americans are getting angrier as they wonder if Washington is lying to them about these bailouts.

Given that the government has never defined "systemic risk," we're also starting to wonder exactly which system American taxpayers are paying to protect. It's not capitalism, in which risk-takers suffer the consequences of bad decisions. And in some cases it's not even American. The U.S. government is now in the business of distributing foreign aid to offshore financiers, laundered through a once-great American company.

The politicians also prefer to talk about AIG's latest bonus payments because they deflect attention from Washington's failure to supervise AIG. The Beltway crowd has been selling the story that AIG failed because it operated in a shadowy unregulated world and cleverly exploited gaps among Washington overseers. Said President Obama yesterday, "This is a corporation that finds itself in financial distress due to recklessness and greed." That's true, but Washington doesn't want you to know that various arms of government approved, enabled and encouraged AIG's disastrous bet on the U.S. housing market.

Scott Polakoff, acting director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, told the Senate Banking Committee this month that, contrary to media myth, AIG's infamous Financial Products unit did not slip through the regulatory cracks. Mr. Polakoff said that the whole of AIG, including this unit, was regulated by his agency and by a "college" of global bureaucrats.

But what about that supposedly rogue AIG operation in London? Wasn't that outside the reach of federal regulators? Mr. Polakoff called it "a false statement" to say that his agency couldn't regulate the London office.

And his agency wasn't the only federal regulator. AIG's Financial Products unit has been overseen for years by an SEC-approved monitor. And AIG didn't just make disastrous bets on housing using those infamous credit default swaps. AIG made the same stupid bets on housing using money in its securities lending program, which was heavily regulated at the state level. State, foreign and various U.S. federal regulators were all looking over AIG's shoulder and approving the bad housing bets. Americans always pay their mortgages, right? Mr. Polakoff said his agency "should have taken an entirely different approach" in regulating the contracts written by AIG's Financial Products unit.

That's for sure, especially after March of 2005. The housing trouble began—as most of AIG's troubles did—when the company's board buckled under pressure from then New York Attorney General Eliot Spitzer when it fired longtime CEO Hank Greenberg. Almost immediately, Fitch took away the company's triple-A credit rating, which allowed it to borrow at cheaper rates. AIG subsequently announced an earnings restatement. The restatement addressed alleged accounting sins that Mr. Spitzer trumpeted initially but later dropped from his civil complaint.

Other elements of the restatement were later reversed by AIG itself. But the damage had been done. The restatement triggered more credit ratings downgrades. Mr. Greenberg's successors seemed to understand that the game had changed, warning in a 2005 SEC

filings that a lower credit rating meant the firm would likely have to post more collateral to trading counterparties. But rather than managing risks even more carefully, they went in the opposite direction. Tragically, they did what Mr. Greenberg's AIG never did—bet big on housing.

Current AIG CEO Ed Liddy was picked by the government in 2008 and didn't create the mess, and he shouldn't be blamed for honoring the firm's lawful bonus contracts. However, it is on Mr. Liddy's watch that AIG has lately been conducting a campaign to stoke fears of "systemic risk." To mute Congressional objections to taxpayer cash infusions, AIG's lobbying materials suggest that taxpayers need to continue subsidizing the insurance giant to avoid economic ruin.

Among the more dubious claims is that AIG policyholders won't be able to purchase the coverage they need. The sweeteners AIG has been offering to retain customers tell a different story. Moreover, getting back to those infamous bonuses, AIG can argue that it needs to pay top dollar to survive in an ultra-competitive business, or it can argue that it offers services not otherwise available in the market, but not both.

The Washington crowd wants to focus on bonuses because it aims public anger on private actors, not the political class. But our politicians and regulators should direct some of their anger back on themselves—for kicking off AIG's demise by ousting Mr. Greenberg, for failing to supervise its bets, and then for blowing a mountain of taxpayer cash on their AIG nationalization.

Whether or not these funds ever come back to the Treasury, regulators should now focus on getting AIG back into private hands as soon as possible. And if Treasury and the Fed want to continue bailing out foreign banks, let them make that case, honestly and directly, to American taxpayers.

#### ATTACHMENT A—COLLATERAL POSTINGS UNDER AIGFP CDS<sup>1</sup>

[\$ billion]

Counterparty	Amount Posted
Soiote Generale .....	\$4.1
Deutsche Bank .....	2.6
Goldman Sachs .....	2.5
Merrill Lynch .....	1.8
Calyon .....	1.1
Barclays .....	0.9
UBS .....	0.8
DZ Bank .....	0.7
Wachovia .....	0.7
Rabobank .....	0.5
KFW .....	0.5
JPMorgan .....	0.4
Banco Santander .....	0.3
Danske .....	0.2
Reconstruction Finance Corp .....	0.2
HSBC Bank .....	0.2
Morgan Stanley .....	0.2
Bank of America .....	0.2
Bank of Montreal .....	0.2
Royal Bank of Scotland .....	0.2
Top 20 CDS Total .....	\$18.3
Other .....	4.1

#### Total Collateral Postings .....

<sup>1</sup>The collateral amounts reflected in Schedule A represent funds provided by AIG to the counterparties indicated after September 16, 2008, the date on which AIG began receiving government assistance. The counterparties received additional collateral from AIG prior to this date, and AIG's SEC report relating to ML III reflects the aggregate amount of collateral that counterparties were entitled to retain pursuant to the terms of the ML III transaction.

ATTACHMENT B—MAIDEN LANE III PAYMENTS TO AIGFP  
CDS COUNTERPARTIES  
[\$ billions]

Institution (Counterparty may differ)	Maiden Lane III Payments Made to Counterparties	Maiden Lane III Payments Made to AIGFP
Deutsche Bank	\$2.8	
Landesbank Baden-Wuerttemberg	0.1	
Wachovia	0.8	
Calyon	1.2	
Rabobank	0.3	
Goldman Sachs	5.6	
Société Générale	6.9	
Merrill Lynch	3.1	
Bank of America	0.5	
The Royal Bank of Scotland	0.5	
HSBC Bank USA	1.0	
Deutsche Zentral-Genossenschaftsbank	1.0	
Dresdner Bank AG	0.4	
UBS	2.5	
Barclays	0.6	
Bank of Montreal	0.9	
Other payments to AIGFP under Shortfall Agreement	\$2.5	
Total	27.1	2.5

<sup>1</sup> Amount rounds to zero.ATTACHMENT D—PAYMENTS TO AIG SECURITIES LENDING COUNTERPARTIES  
9/18/08-12/12/08

Institution	Payments to Counterparties by Institution U.S. Securities Lending	[\$ billions]
Barclays	\$7.0	
Deutsche Bank	6.4	
BNP Paribas	4.9	
Goldman Sachs	4.8	
Bank of America	4.5	
HSBC	3.3	
Citigroup	2.3	
Dresdner Kleinwort	2.2	
Merrill Lynch	1.9	
UBS	1.7	
ING	1.5	

Institution	Payments to Counterparties by Institution U.S. Securities Lending
Morgan Stanley	1.0
Societe Generale	0.9
AIG International Inc.	0.6
Credit Suisse	0.4
Paloma Securities	0.2
Citadel	0.2
Total	143.7

<sup>1</sup> Amounts may not total due to rounding.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
MARCH 23, 2009, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m., Monday, March 23, 2009.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:49 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2009, at 2 p.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

KATHLEEN A. MERRIGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE CHARLES F. CONNER, RESIGNED.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

APRIL S. BOYD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE NATHANIEL F. WIENECKE, RESIGNED.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

MICHELLE DEPASS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE JUDITH ELIZABETH AYRES, RESIGNED.

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PETER CUNNINGHAM, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE LAUREN M. MADDOX.

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BRIAN VINCENT KENNEDY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE KRISTINE ANN IVERSON, RESIGNED.

## IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

## To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES K. GILMAN  
BRIG. GEN. PHILIP VOLPE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

## To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM B. GAMBLE  
COL. RICHARD W. THOMAS

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, Thursday, March 19, 2009:

## EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JOHN P. HOLDREN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JANE LUBCHENCO, OF OREGON, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ELENA KAGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

## IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENT P. BAUER AND ENDING WITH MARK S. MACKEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2009.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CORINNA M. FLEISCHMANN AND ENDING WITH KELLY C. SEALS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2009.