

homegrown ethanol. For over 100 years, the fossil fuel industry has had a monopoly on our transportation fuel. They built the market. They own the infrastructure. They weren't about to use a product they didn't manufacture, own or profit from. So Congress created a tax incentive to encourage big oil to use the product and make it available to their consumers. It was paired with an import tariff to make sure that only domestic ethanol receives the benefit of the tax incentive.

So the tax incentive and the tariff worked together to do two things: The incentive exists to encourage the use of domestic ethanol. The tariff exists to ensure that we aren't giving a tax incentive to already subsidized foreign ethanol.

In other words, wouldn't it be silly to have a tax incentive for the production of a domestic alternative energy and then allow the import of it, which would have taxpayers subsidizing an alternative form of energy coming in from another country? Well, that wouldn't make sense.

Together, these two approaches ensure that we don't replace our dependence on foreign oil with a dependence upon foreign ethanol. The incentive was created to encourage big oil to use a domestically produced product and a renewable product. In 2005, Congress created the Renewable Fuels Standard. The standard was created to ensure a minimum amount of renewable fuels was used in the fuel supply. It was strongly opposed by big oil, but it was enacted over their opposition.

In 2007, it was greatly expanded. It mandates the use of 36 billion gallons of renewable fuel annually by 2022. But that decision, made in 2007, also limited the amount of ethanol that can be made from grain to 15 billion gallons.

One of the criticisms I hear occasionally is that the ethanol receives both an incentive and a mandate. So I think we should address that point.

First, while the mandate requires that the fuel be used, it does not mandate that the ethanol be produced domestically. The incentive acts as an encouragement to use homegrown products. It increases economic activity at home and works to reduce our dependence upon foreign oil. It doesn't do any good if you are importing a domestic renewable fuel if it can be done here locally, creating the jobs here.

Secondly, the mandate acts as a floor to ethanol use. Without the incentive, we would consume a bare minimum. The incentive encourages ethanol use beyond the mandate.

Some in the environmental community are quick to raise objections to the biofuels mandate as well as the incentive. I would like to suggest to them that this is a clear example of limitless hypocrisy and intellectual dishonesty in this town. Many of the loudest voices against these policies are the same voices who lobby me for tax incentives and also mandates for wind, solar, geothermal, and other renewable energy.

I happen to be a strong supporter of electricity generated from wind and other renewable sources. I first authored the production tax credit for wind in 1992. Over the years, it has been expanded to include other types of resources. Since as far back as 2003, environmental advocacy groups have been pushing for a renewable portfolio standard, which is a mandate that utilities around the country use a certain amount of wind or other types of alternative energy instead of coal in the production of electricity.

So now what do we hear? They want the production tax credit for wind and other renewable electricity and a mandate that it be produced. Yet they oppose these same policies for biofuels. That is an inconsistency. That seems to be an intellectually dishonest approach; that they would like to have this Senator support mandates for wind as well as a tax incentive for wind but lobbying against this Senator's approach to having a tax incentive for other alternative energies as well as a mandate.

I have been a champion of ethanol and biofuels for a long time. I am well aware of the positive role ethanol is playing to create a cleaner environment. It is improving our economic and national security and it is creating jobs and economic activity in rural America. In 2010, nearly 90 percent of all gasoline sold in the United States contained some ethanol. The 13 billion gallons of ethanol produced in the United States reduced our oil imports by 445 million barrels of oil.

After domestic oil production and imports from Canada, U.S. ethanol production is the third largest source of transportation fuel—what we use in internal combustion engines. U.S. ethanol production is larger than what we import from Saudi Arabia or even from Hugo Chavez's Venezuela. Without domestic biofuels, we would be on bended knees even more than we are today, begging others for oil.

Just think what has developed in the 2 weeks of Libya. We have OPEC having to go to Saudi Arabia to make up the difference, just because of 2 percent of the oil production being affected. Why would we want to be more dependent upon foreign sources of energy, particularly for our national security?

Without domestic biofuels it seems to me that we would be on bended knees even more than we are today, begging others for oil. Ethanol is the only reliable, legitimate alternative to crude oil. Domestic ethanol currently accounts for nearly 10 percent of our transportation fuel. There is no other renewable fuel that comes close to achieving the economic, environmental, and national security benefits currently delivered by this biofuel that we call ethanol.

There are other well-funded misinformation campaigns underway to undermine the only alternative to crude oil. Big oil has been joined in recent years by opportunistic grocery manu-

facturers who hope to find a scapegoat in their desire to increase profits and raise food prices. They did this just 2 years ago, when corn was \$7. They scapegoated ethanol. They needed a cover to raise the price of food and then, within 7 months, when the price of corn was down to half that price, \$3.50 per bushel, did you see the price of food come down? No. You are going to find the same thing now.

These people continue to perpetuate the same tired, baseless arguments to try to undermine our efforts toward energy independence. They are more interested in protecting market share and profits than national economic security.

Over the next few weeks I am going to do everything I can to talk about this issue, to educate the public on the benefits of domestic biofuels. I am not going to sit quietly while the energy, environmental, and national security benefits of ethanol are scoffed at. I intend to beat back every false attack. The American public deserves an honest, fact-based discussion about the benefits of reducing our dependence on people such as Hugo Chavez and Muammar Qadhafi. They deserve to hear the benefits of reducing our dependence on dirty fossil fuel.

I look forward to continuing this effort and invite dialog from any of my colleagues.

BIENNIAL BUDGETING

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for instituting biennial budgeting within the U.S. Government. We should reform the Federal budget process by converting it from an annual spending process to a 2-year cycle, with 1 year for appropriating Federal dollars and the following year devoted to oversight of Federal programs.

Under the current budget process, Congress almost never finishes the appropriations bills by October 1 and is forced to consider omnibus legislation composed of individual appropriations bills that were never considered on the Senate floor. Worse still is that we are often unable to amend an omnibus appropriations bill and are forced to accept provisions that may be objectionable. Because we are constantly racing against the clock to finish appropriations, authorizing committees are hampered in their ability to conduct effective oversight. This means that we have trouble learning about what spending programs work and which must be modified or eliminated. Budget reforms are much needed and long overdue.

The amendment that I filed today would require the President to submit a 2-year budget at the beginning of the first session of a Congress. Members of Congress would then need to adopt a 2-year budget resolution, a reconciliation bill if necessary and 2-year appropriations bills during that first session. The legislation ensures the enactment

of 2-year appropriations bills by providing a new majority point of order against consideration of an appropriations bill that fails to cover 2 years. The second session of a Congress would then be devoted to the consideration of authorization bills and oversight of Federal programs. The result is enhanced oversight that will provide greater accountability of government programs and a superior budget process.

Each year, approximately 40 percent of Congress's debating time is spent on appropriations, on the resolution and on the reconciliation process. In some years, that number is as high as 60 percent, not even reflecting the time that the budget process consumes the entire Federal bureaucracy. Moreover through February 18 of this year, House lawmakers spent 61 hours over 4 days debating 162 of the nearly 600 amendments filed on the 359-page measure to fund government until September. And after all the debate and consideration last year, Congress failed to adopt the budget or pass any of the 13 appropriations bills for the first time since the landmark Budget Act of 1974.

It is no wonder that the American people are dismayed because all they have seen is the chaotic nature of the budgetary process and the failure of Congress time and time again to meet statutory deadlines.

It is important to have a biennial budget because it will allow the President—as well as Congress—in the second year to fine-tune the budget, revisit issues, improve oversight activities, and—if necessary—respond to a downturn in the economy, such as a recession. And it would also immeasurably add to accountability to the American taxpayer. If you ask the American taxpayer, “Do you think your Federal dollars are being spent wisely and efficiently?”—the response is a resounding “no” as reflected in many polls and public opinion surveys. Only if we improve oversight activities and examine every program and agency, will we restore the confidence of the American taxpayer in how government spends hard-earned tax dollars.

Unfortunately, the battle to get the biennial budget passed is not new. I have been advocating for budget reform for years and have pursued shifting the federal budgeting process to a biennial system throughout my tenure in the Senate. In 1997—the year that led to record surpluses—I cosponsored the Biennial Budgeting and Appropriations Act, S. 261, to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to revise the Federal and congressional budget processes by establishing a two-year budgeting and appropriations cycle and timetable. That bill sat dormant in a Senate committee—as did the next four bills of this kind that I have cosponsored since.

So we find ourselves with record deficits, a complicated and time consuming budget process that gives

Americans little confidence in their government, lack of congressional oversight over the many programs and agencies that dispense taxpayer's funds, and the surpluses of the 1998–2001 nowhere to be found. If that does not tell us that the system is broken, I do not know what does.

The biennial budget would free up Senate floor time for other matters, help us avoid having to consider an end-of-year omnibus bill, and provide authorizing committees more time to carry out their oversight responsibilities. Biennial budgeting would make us more effective legislators and enable us to make more informed choices on behalf of our constituents.

Biennial budgeting is necessary to return us to the path of fiscal sustainability and to allow Congress time to engage in meaningful oversight of government spending. As such, this legislation is long overdue and it is my hope that Congress will finally institute this much needed reform.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING C. RAY BAKER

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I honor the life of C. Ray Baker, a devoted champion of Fort Smith, AR.

Ray Baker was a lifelong cheerleader of Fort Smith, proving his love for the community through serving its citizens for 20 years as mayor.

Dedicating countless hours volunteering for civic service organizations, he brought an unmatched, contagious energy to ribbon cuttings, groundbreaking, awards ceremonies and special community events. His commitment to Fort Smith inspired the “Ray Baker Lifetime Achievement Award.”

He shared his enthusiasm for the community with the generations of students he taught over his 46 years as an educator. His legacy is far reaching beyond the halls of Southside High School where he taught for 44 years.

He received numerous awards and commendations for his years in the classroom including being named Arkansas PTA Teacher of the Year, a Milken Family National Educator, Arkansas Teacher of the Year and Daughters of the American Revolution National American History Teacher of the Year.

Ray is a true American hero who not only taught what it means to participate in the government, but also showed his students and the citizens by the example he set.

Ray Baker's legacy will live on for future generations to experience the projects he supported encouraged to the lives he touched in the classroom and civic outings all across the region.

His energetic spirit has given us all strength, and we are fortunate to have had his leadership. During the opportunities I had to share the stage with Mayor Baker, I often had to follow his

passionate and enthusiastic addresses. I would joke with the audience that I needed to spend a few days with the mayor so I could learn how to become as animated as he was.

We all came to know and say his famous words he would recite after his speeches and proclamations, “Life's worth living in Fort Smith, Arkansas.” I am confident this will always be a motto for the community, and thanks to Ray Baker's determination, perseverance and dedication, he certainly made Fort Smith a place worth living. ●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-825. A communication from the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Commodity Futures Trading Commission Strategic Plan Fiscal Years 2011–2015”; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-826. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation account of the Department of the Army and was assigned case number 08-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-827. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that occurred within the Operation and Maintenance account of the Department of the Army and was assigned case number 08-04; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-828. A communication from the Deputy Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Presidential Library Facilities; Correction” (RIN3095-AA82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2011; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON):

S. 494. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a national screening program at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States the option to increase screening in the United States population for the prevention, early detection, and timely treatment of colorectal cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 495. A bill to expend and enhance existing adult day programs for individuals with neurological diseases or conditions, including multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, and other similar diseases or conditions, to support and improve access to respite services for family