

believe will be responsible, will protect our forces, and will be better for our military families, and it will achieve the spending cuts the Secretary has said he believes are necessary.

We need to make the tough decisions. I am offering a way forward. I am offering commonsense cuts that will assure we will be able to meet the needs of our military, the security of our military, the security of the American people, and a respect for this enormous deficit. We can cut back on this deficit with responsible spending.

I have outlined some of these concerns in today's Politico magazine, and I ask unanimous consent that my op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Politico, July 13, 2010]

(By Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison)

MILITARY'S FOUNDATION MUST BE MADE IN U.S.A.

For the future security posture of U.S. military forces and for the fiscal health of our nation, our military construction agenda should be guided by these words: build in America.

At the end of the Cold War, the U.S. military determined that our armed forces would be best trained and equipped for service when stationed on U.S. soil. Thus, our military adopted a "force projection" strategy that allows service members to deploy from home, rather than being based primarily overseas.

The Overseas Basing Commission reaffirmed the force projection strategy in 2005. It lauded the insights and vision behind Defense Department initiatives to transform the military and re-station tens of thousands of military personnel back on U.S. soil. Congress has legislated and appropriated accordingly.

We've now invested more than \$14 billion to build housing, stationing, training and deployment capacities at major military installations. Deployment of U.S. forces from Germany to Iraq, for example, was complicated by denials of air and ground routes through several European countries. We have proved we can best deploy from the United States—and we can do it more cost effectively.

However, the DoD's current military construction proposal would set in motion a worldwide transformation of U.S. basing that would expand our overseas presence. DoD is pursuing expensive, and in some cases duplicative, military construction projects in Europe, South Korea and Guam, without demonstrating adequate cost efficiencies, projected costs or a broader basing strategy.

This shift in global posture fundamentally disconnects with stateside basing capabilities and reverses the Overseas Basing Commission's recommendations.

In Germany, massive plans are under way to move U.S. Army headquarters from Heidelberg to Wiesbaden—though European and African commands already have substantial infrastructure in Stuttgart, where more efficiencies would be available.

Not only would the projects create thousands of foreign jobs; they would also require continuous taxpayer funding to maintain facilities and training capabilities. This is a poor investment given the serious limitations to U.S. military training and deployment capabilities overseas. And it would create duplicate headquarters at several locations.

It costs nearly 15 percent less to build in the United States than in Germany. In addition, the U.S. military has invested \$1.4 billion in German infrastructure from 2006 to 2010, while Germany's contribution has averaged \$20 million per year—or less than 10 percent.

Our troops must have access to training areas where they can maneuver freely, conduct live-fire exercises and work with night-vision devices. Many overseas locations prohibit such intensive training. Others allow only certain aspects of the training to be done under closely circumscribed conditions.

These limitations hinder the readiness of our troops, while taxing our citizens.

Deployment impediments also exist in Europe. During times of peace and war, our troops face restrictions traveling through many countries.

In 2003, for example, our NATO ally Turkey refused to let U.S. troops travel through its territory, even in its airspace, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Merely having troops forward-deployed is no guarantee that they will be available when and where we need them.

DoD is also planning to spend millions to build deployment facilities in South Korea. The Pentagon proposes shifting deployments from one year to three years, including troops' families. This expands the U.S. presence from 30,000 service personnel to approximately 84,000, counting dependents. It will require substantial taxpayer funding to build adequate, housing, schools, hospitals, fitness centers, child care facilities and commissaries.

Investing these resources in South Korea makes no sense when we are already building up infrastructure and deployment capabilities at U.S. bases, where amenities for military families are well-established.

Similarly, plans to shift Marines now stationed in Japan to the tiny island of Guam are problematic. This proposal is fraught with significant environmental concerns, insufficient infrastructure, an implausible timeline—and staggering costs, now estimated at \$16 billion. With these considerable barriers, better basing alternatives should be explored.

Some argue that the U.S. overseas presence provides assurance to our allies and deterrence to our adversaries. History has shown otherwise.

Having U.S. troops in Europe did not deter the Russians from conducting military operations against Georgia in 2008. More recently, the U.S. military in South Korea did not deter North Korean aggression against a South Korean naval vessel.

We should assure our allies and deter our enemies with strong military capabilities and sound policy, not merely by keeping our troops stationed overseas.

Instead of breaking ground on military projects abroad—and advancing DoD's new goal of building "partnership capacity"—we should be building American infrastructure.

After World War II, the U.S. constructed bases in Europe to establish a strong presence as nations rebuilt. We stayed in Europe and placed bases in South Korea to protect the interests of America and its allies during the Cold War.

The world has changed—and with it, our nation's military priorities. Our military construction investment should reflect our strategic principles, meet the needs of military families, maximize the force flexibility of our modern military and demonstrate the fiscal discipline that taxpayers rightly expect.

I hope the Defense Department will continue to build the foundation of our military right here on American soil.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the opportunity

to lay out the strategy I am offering to the administration. I hope we can come back to the strategy adopted by Congress over the last 10 years that would have American troops in America, would create American jobs in military construction, will save taxpayer dollars, and will assure that when our troops go into harm's way, they will not be blocked by European countries that do not allow us to use airspace or train troops on the ground. We cannot afford that kind of luxury in this kind of environment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

REMEMBERING GEORGE STEINBRENNER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today America heard the sad news that George Steinbrenner, one of Major League Baseball's most influential team owners, died at the age of 80. I rise today to express my condolences to George's family and share my intention of offering a resolution today, along with Senators GILLIBRAND, BILL NELSON, and LEMIEUX to honor his memory.

He is survived by his beloved wife Joan, his sisters Susan and Judy, his children Hank, Jennifer, Jessica, and Hal, and his 13 grandchildren.

Like New York and like the Yankees, George Steinbrenner was a champion. He was someone about whom you can truly say there will never be another one like him.

Before we even get into baseball, George Steinbrenner was a very accomplished man. He served his country for 2 years in the Air Force. He was the owner of the American Ship Building Company, the dominant shipbuilding company in the Great Lakes region during its existence. He donated his time and money to countless charitable causes and was a driving force in the U.S. Olympic Committee, where he made sure America's athletes could reach their full potential, bringing home gold medals and making sports fans around this great country proud of our athletes.

Many of us know George as being a giant in Major League Baseball. There is no denying he changed the face of baseball forever.

Before George Steinbrenner, the New York Yankees were in shambles. The once great franchise had become moribund.

I have always been a Yankees fan, even though I am from Brooklyn. By the time I was old enough to appreciate baseball, the Dodgers had just left for Los Angeles, and it would be several years before the Mets were created. So the Yankees were the only team in town, and like most of my friends on the streets of Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn, I became a rabid Yankee fan.

Those were the glory years of Mantle, Maris, Ford, Howard, and Berra. But by the midsixties, my heroes began

to retire, and the once great Yankees began to slide.

Those were not easy years to root for the Yankees. People forget. Throughout the late sixties and early seventies, the Yankees were consistently one of the worst performing teams in Major League Baseball.

But all that changed when George Steinbrenner bought the team in 1973. He brought to the Yankees a new hope that turned around this period of decline. By 1976, the Yankees were back in the World Series, and in 1977 and 1978, we brought the championship back home to New York.

Since then, the Yankees have once again become a household name in New York and around the country. They have won 11 American League pennants and 7 World Championships. The Yankees went, the day George Steinbrenner took them over, from being a mediocre team to the pre-eminent sports franchise in the world.

George Steinbrenner did that. He turned a scrappy group of baseball players into a team New Yorkers are proud to support.

The Yankees of his day are reminiscent of the Yankees of the twenties, thirties, forties, fifties, and the early sixties. All New Yorkers and baseball fans owe George Steinbrenner a huge thank you for changing the face of American baseball.

He was even beloved in Florida. Legends Field, the Yankees' spring training facility in Tampa, was renamed Steinbrenner Field in March 2008 in his honor by the Hillsborough County Commission and the Tampa City Council.

He was a giant in baseball innovation, making baseball a truly global game.

I, along with millions of Yankee fans—many not even in the State of New York—are thankful for the countless hours of joy we have experienced watching his team at the stadium or following them on television or radio. George Steinbrenner was truly a New York icon.

My thoughts and my condolences go out to his loved ones, to the whole Yankee family, and to the millions of New York baseball fans. We have lost our giant.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FREEZING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have a statement that I would like to make, first on a letter and announcement that all the Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee have sent to the chairman of the committee today.

Because Federal spending and debt are at crisis levels, Republican Senators on the Senate Appropriations Committee are asking our Democratic colleagues to join us in supporting the Sessions-McCaskill freeze on discretionary Federal spending. Every Republican—every one of us—and 17 Democratic Senators already have voted for the Sessions-McCaskill amendment this session several times.

The amendment would basically freeze Federal discretionary appropriations—both military and nonmilitary—which constitute about 38 percent of the Federal budget. This action by the Senate members of the Appropriations Committee is especially important this year because the Democratic Congress has refused to produce a budget.

Here we are, at a time when almost every American is deeply worried about the level of Federal debt and the level of Federal spending, and the first thing we would expect the Congress to do before it plans for next year is to produce a budget that would be able to restrain this spending—both the discretionary part of it, the kind we appropriate year after year—and begin to deal with the entitlements—the mandatory spending that is on automatic pilot. The Democratic Congress has not produced that budget for next year, and it indicates it will not. So it, therefore, is the first job of the members of the Appropriations Committee to decide how much we can spend.

Year in and year out we decide where and how we spend the money. That is the constitutional responsibility of Congress under article I, and that is the job we do. Perhaps we haven't paid as much attention to the first responsibility as we should. Perhaps we have relied too much on the Budget Committee. Well, not this year. What we are saying is, if we are going to be members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and if our responsibility is to deal with Federal spending, then the first question we should decide is how much Federal spending.

At a time when Federal spending and debt is at crisis levels, when the President's 10-year budget, up through the year 2018, would double the debt and triple the debt, it is our responsibility to get this under control.

So our recommendation—and it is a serious recommendation, and one we hope and believe our colleagues who are Democrats on the Appropriations Committee will be able to accept because it is a bipartisan proposal that has already, as I mentioned, received

between 16 and 18 Democratic votes on the floor of the Senate, and every single one of the 41 Republican Senators—is that we essentially freeze spending in the discretionary accounts, both military and nonmilitary, between this year and next year.

The Federal debt is a crisis that is imposing a burden on our children and our grandchildren that they will not be able to pay. It is our responsibility to deal with it and to begin to deal with it now. A Sessions-McCaskill freeze on Federal discretionary spending for next year is an important first step. The next step would then be getting entitlement spending under control, which we should move on as rapidly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter from Republican members of the Senate Appropriations Committee which I referred to earlier in my remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2010.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Republican members of the Appropriations Committee, we are writing to express our views regarding the Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations process.

The Committee is operating in a particularly difficult environment during this Congress. The enormity of the Federal debt poses a direct threat to our national security and demands restraint of Federal spending. Developing a consensus approach to funding the operations of the Federal government in such an environment is a significant challenge.

Despite the clear need for a long term plan that would bring our nation's debt under control, it is apparent that Congress will be denied the opportunity to debate a Federal budget this year. Our Committee will instead be compelled to choose a discretionary top-line number outside the context of a comprehensive budget resolution.

Over the last two years discretionary spending has increased by 17%, not including stimulus spending. With stimulus spending included the increase soars to 84%. We note that a bipartisan majority of the Senate has voted several times in recent months on the Sessions-McCaskill proposal to impose a discretionary top-line for Fiscal Year 2011 that essentially freezes non-defense spending, and which would result in significant reductions in spending from the President's budget proposal. This is a clear indication of the broad concern that exists about levels of Federal spending.

We are confident that, working together, our Committee can produce bills that responsibly address fundamental government needs in a fiscally responsible manner. We will not, however, be able to support appropriations bills that do not conform to this top-line number.

Sincerely,

Mitch McConnell, Thad Cochran, Judd Gregg, Lamar Alexander, Susan Collins, Bob Bennett, Kit Bond, Richard Shelby, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Sam Brownback, George V. Voinovich, Lisa Murkowski.

NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 40 years ago, at the time of the first