

something we can put off for another 3, 4, 5 years. We must deal with it now. We know that entitlements are the biggest part of the budget. Yes, discretion is important. We have to deal with discretionary and we have to deal with defense. We overspend in defense in so many wasteful programs, but the big issue is going to be entitlement spending.

Congressman RYAN put out a very bold budget the other day—the first person to come forward with a bold proposal to deal with entitlement spending in this country. The President's debt commission put out a proposal, but the President, unfortunately, ignored his own debt commission and didn't put any of their recommendations in his budget. But both Republicans and Democrats are going to have to deal with this spending problem—this spending binge we have been on—otherwise we are not going to have the same United States of America we have all been enjoying our entire lives. We are literally going to become an economy that cannot exist the way we exist today because we cannot afford it. Our debt will literally collapse the economy of the United States.

A recent study came out, done by two incredible economists named Rogoff and Reinhart. These are viewed by both sides of the aisle as well-respected studies. They studied sovereign debt over the last 200 years of about 64 countries. What they found is any time the debt reaches 90 percent of the economy, or 90 percent of the GDP, it causes a net decrease of about 30 percent of economic growth going forward.

Those are numbers. But what does it mean? It means a loss of jobs. In the United States, we have over a million jobs that will be lost, that would otherwise be created. So this is real stuff. Where are we in the United States? Currently, we are about 94 percent of GDP. So we are already there, and it is going to get worse and worse.

That is why this debate we are having over spending is so critical, and critical that we get it under control. We need to forget about which party is going to have a political advantage. I am one of those Senators—and there are quite a few of us—who is not running for reelection. Everybody in this body needs to forget about whether they get reelected and do what is right for the country. It is so critical right now that we put our country first.

House Republicans have sent over a proposal that would do a couple of things. One, it would fund the troops. Let's not let our military come to work and not get paid. That would be ridiculous. Let's at least fund the troops and pass this 1-week spending proposal that would fund the government. It does cut \$12 billion out. The only significant rider in there is the DC abortion rider that says DC can have funds to provide abortions. This is something that was in law and that President Obama signed, in a bill that

many Democrats on the other side have signed, so it should not be that controversial.

In the meantime, since we have agreed on the spending number, we can work out some of these other controversial things in the next week. I believe that is the right thing to do to keep the government open, so people can continue to get their paychecks, so people can continue to visit national parks, and on and on and on. I think we all know the problems if the government shuts down.

I think it is critical that we start doing what is right for the country instead of what is right for somebody's reelection. Let's sit down and make the serious and tough choices so we can put this country on the right path.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:10 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUMENTHAL).

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are now in morning business. I ask if there is a time constraint when making speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators are limited, under morning business, to 10 minutes each.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President. We are facing a moment in the issue that all Americans are looking at and wondering: What is happening here? What is going to come about? What are we going to do?

But I wish to remind everyone, in 1773, a tea party was held in Boston Harbor. It was to protest a yoke of oppression that hobbled the start of freedom in our new Nation and that new Americans wanted removed. Those here then wanted the liberty to choose their own customs and their way of life.

While that was 238 years ago, we again struggle to keep a fringe group from taking away the rights of a majority of American citizens who treasure choices they are free to make in our democracy. Although these attacks are marked in the cloak of fiscal responsibility, it is very clear that this group, unlike our forebears, is determined to restrict the freedoms most Americans choose to protect.

So while we are not latter-day Paul Reveres, we sound the alarm for the

American people to beware. I come to the floor to warn every parent and grandparent to beware for the well-being of your loved ones. If you want your children and your grandchildren to have the best health care American research can produce, beware.

If your chest swells with pride when your 2-year-old repeats numbers or words learned at a Federal Head Start schoolhouse, beware.

If your child suffers when toxic air overwhelms them and they are gasping for a breath of fresh air, beware. Look at your family, and if you have a son or a daughter anxious, ready, and able to go to college and you cannot afford to help, beware.

If you are a woman dependent on Planned Parenthood, where every year women receive tests for breast or cervical cancer that could endanger their health and maybe their lives, beware.

If you are a retiree who believes Medicare is freely available to help you live longer or function better, beware. Watch out. Tea party Republicans have seized control of the House of Representatives and will use their power to eliminate current services to children, adults, and retirees from the government, as promised.

They are continuing to brew a toxic tea, a sleight of hand trick to push pain on America's most vulnerable citizens, as we look at this placard: "House GOP Brewing a Toxic Tea for Americans."

Across our country, millions are worried sick about losing jobs, losing homes, and losing an established way of life for their children's futures. What do the tea party Republicans propose? Cut their programs to protect the wealth of the richest among us. But tea party Republicans do not want to solve problems. Instead, they are trying to use the budget process to push an extreme ideology that they believe is the only way others should live their lives. Do it their way or no way.

They are willing to shut down the government to prove a point, to change the condition we have operated so well under for many years. They are willing to sacrifice America's financial standing to impose their extreme views on millions who do not agree with these radical extremists.

They refuse to step up, compromise, and move ahead, so America can continue leading the world as it has been. The President and the Senate Democrats have come to the negotiating table with a responsible plan that protects our country's fragile economy, economic recovery, and invests in our future.

But the toxic tea Republicans in the House would rather recklessly shut down the government than budge off their foul scheme. Last week, they stood outside the Capitol and chanted: "Shut it down. Shut it down." That was their mantra, shut down the government.

When Speaker BOEHNER told them to prepare for a shutdown, they gave him

an ovation. That is where they stand: Cut it off. Cut off the health America needs to maintain some financial leadership. These are elected lawmakers who are supposed to guard our government, not kill it.

They want to deceive our people, talking about arithmetic and accounting, but that is not their real aim. Their aim is to have the government decide what is right or wrong in people's homes and families so they can govern others' behavior. Make no mistake. They do not care if their cuts hurt children. They have shown that all along. They want to chase more than 200,000 children out of Head Start, where children learn how to learn, and modest-income families have no other way to provide that education.

We see it on this placard: "House Republicans Hold Back 218,000 Head Start Kids." That is not going to help our country in the future. Tea party Republicans ignore the fact that children who attend Head Start have higher test scores and are more likely to graduate from high school and go on to college.

They should visit Head Start classrooms to see those little ones. Maybe their tough hearts will mellow instead of just saying: No. Sorry. With American wealth, we cannot help you.

But Head Start is only a beginning. Look at what tea party Republicans want to do to higher education. They want to reduce Pell grants, which help millions of Americans go to college. Do they not understand they are not just saying no to hard-working young students, they are also saying no to American employers, telling them: Too bad our country does not have the skilled workers. Ship those jobs overseas or bring foreigners here. They will work for much less anyway.

They are saying no to the millions of hard-working parents who dream of seeing their kids living better than their parents because they received a college education. This chart tells a tragic story about the opportunities for smart kids who depend on Pell grants to afford college. Look at what it says: "As College Costs Rise, House GOP Slash Pell Grants." We can see it here. Rising tuition and less help is the way they would like to see America go.

Do we want to force students to take on more debt in order to attend college or kick them off our country's campuses altogether?

I learned the value of a government investment in college education firsthand. I attended Columbia University on the GI bill after serving in the Army during 1944 and 1945. Later, I cofounded ADP. That is one of America's most successful companies, now employing 45,000 people. America built the "Greatest Generation" by enabling 8 million veterans to attend college free for their service in wartime.

Even as we currently continue losing lives in wars that have also injured thousands, they are willing to shut down the government, no matter what, if it takes away a payday for soldiers on the battlefield.

The assault on our children's future does not end there. The tea party Republicans want to cripple our ability to provide the clean air our people need to breathe without fear by eliminating the Clean Air Act, putting polluter's profits ahead of our children's health.

It is an outrageous assault on a landmark law that the Supreme Court ruled on in 2007, that it is the government's responsibility to protect children from toxic chemicals in the air and illnesses such as asthma, lung cancer, among other life-threatening diseases.

I wish our GOP colleagues would be straight with the millions of parents who are concerned about their children's health and explain why tea partiers are asking families to be patient and maybe their children will outgrow asthma.

One of my grandsons suffers from this disease. He is an athletic child, and every time he goes to a soccer game, my daughter first checks to see where the closest emergency room is. No parent should have to worry about their children playing outside.

Look at this picture. Soot is ugly when it is pouring from a smokestack, but it is even uglier inside a child's lungs.

Tea party Republicans say you can not restrict polluters with regulations because it is too cumbersome.

By their logic, we should rid ourselves of traffic signals, too. Those red lights are a real inconvenience.

And while we are at it, maybe our Republican colleagues would like us to get government bureaucrats out of the air traffic control towers.

Can anyone believe the Republicans are going after medical research, at the same time?

The National Institutes of Health are making strides in fighting childhood diseases. But the Republicans want to reduce NIH's ability to do research by taking \$1 billion of their budget.

That is funding that could find a cure for childhood cancer or just maybe identify the cause of autism or other autoimmune diseases.

If the government shuts down, NIH will have to stop admitting new patients for 640 clinical trials, 60 of which involve children with cancer.

And what about the toxic tea Republicans are trying to serve to women? Willing to put women at risk with their health.

They want to wipe out Planned Parenthood, one of the Nation's leading providers of health services for women.

Disadvantaged women turn to Planned Parenthood for family planning services, breast exams and cervical cancer screenings.

And make no mistake: Cancer screenings save lives.

Since the 1950s, cervical cancer screenings have cut mortality rates by more than 70 percent.

So why would we want to take cancer screenings away from women?

But it is not just women's health at risk, health care for America's seniors

and retirees is also on the tea party Republicans' chopping block.

They just revealed a scheme to end Medicare as we know it by turning it into a voucher program.

The problem is, when your voucher runs out, you will have to dig into your own pocket to pay for health care.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office could not have been clearer this week when it reported "Under [this] proposal, most elderly people would pay more for their health care than they would pay under the current Medicare system."

Is this what America wants, forcing seniors to spend more on medicine and treatment, and get less in return?

The bottom line is the Republican leaders in the House should stop the toxic tea lawmakers from hijacking the deficit debate.

We cannot allow them to "ransom" Head Start, the Clean Air Act, Planned Parenthood and Medicare.

We cannot negotiate away the health and well-being of America's children, women and seniors.

This is not how we solve our financial problems.

I was a CEO for many years, and I know that you cannot run a company, or a country, without sufficient revenues.

I voted last year to end the Bush tax cuts for the top 2 percent of wage earners because I know windfalls for the wealthy will not guarantee jobs, reduce the deficit or help us invest in our future.

I am one of the most fortunate people on Earth, and it is time for those of us who have been fortunate to pay our fair share.

So I call on every Member of Congress to reject the toxic tea that the House Republicans want to serve America's most vulnerable citizens.

Let's protect the future of our country, not poison it.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MR. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today, as the Federal Government is on the verge of a government shutdown, in the hope that both sides will come together and pass a resolution which not only keeps the government functioning but also fully funds our troops for the remainder of the fiscal year and enables the troops to have the support they deserve. It is not sensible—it is not practical; it is not morally defensible—to send our troops to fight for us in Afghanistan and Iraq and now in Libya without giving them the resources they deserve. They should not have to worry about their loved ones back home, whether they will be able to meet their rent payments, make their mortgage payments, put food on their tables, while they are fighting for our country.

I find it extraordinary that our President, the Commander in Chief, has issued a veto threat on the troop funding bill passed in the House yesterday

and on the calendar in the Senate today. Looking at the Statement of Administration Policy, the President doesn't talk about concerns over the legislation, doesn't talk about concerns over the spending or the riders, he simply says:

This bill is a distraction from the real work that would bring us closer to a reasonable compromise.

I am not quite sure what that means except by not stating any objections to the legislation other than saying it is a distraction, it is not responsible for our troops and our military. To be honest, I am far less concerned that passing this bill will be a distraction to the Congress and to the President than I am concerned that not passing the bill will be a distraction to those troops who are putting their lives on the line for us overseas every day.

As we all know, we should not be having this discussion. We are talking about funding for this fiscal year only because the Senate and the House of Representatives last year didn't get their work done. In fact, for the first time since 1974, when the Budget Act was made law, the Congress did not pass a budget in either House. That is why we are here. That is why the continuing resolutions are necessary, these so-called short-term measures. It is too bad, because Congress not getting their work done last year means we have to clean up the mess this year when we should be focused on a much bigger issue.

My colleague just talked about some of his concerns about the spending reductions in H.R. 1. I remind us that not having gotten our work done last year, we are also facing the biggest deficit in the history of the country and a debt that is unprecedented, over \$14 trillion. If we are truly worried about our kids and grandkids and the next generation, we have to focus on that.

For today, what we are talking about is something very simple. It is just to pass a short-term measure to keep government in operation and to provide funding for the troops. I hope we can do that today. We are talking about actually a relatively small part of the bigger problem. Even adding up all of the spending reductions in H.R. 1, it is less than 2 percent of our Federal budget at a time when our Federal budget deficit is over 40 percent.

So what we are debating today in the Senate and what is being negotiated behind closed doors in the Congress and at the White House is such a small part of the issue.

But here we are. So what do we do to make things better, not make them worse? The short-term measure the House has already passed yesterday is unfortunately the only thing we can agree on today because, given the process of this place, the House and the Senate, it is the only option we have to move things forward. We need to send it to the President while we are working on longer term legislation. Again, it does provide for our troops, which is

incredibly important to us at this time with three wars and so much concern and anxiety among the military. This measure would reduce nondefense discretionary budget authority by about \$13 billion, again while funding the military fully for the rest of the year.

Many of these reductions were included in the President's budget and are not particularly controversial. In terms of actual outlays, it reduces non-defense spending by \$3.9 billion. In the context of our overall Federal budget, that is .1 percent. So we are talking about a .1-percent spending adjustment for the rest of the fiscal year. Yet we still can't seem to get together to fund our troops and keep the government open. Some call that .1 percent extreme. We just heard some of that. I don't think it is extreme. I think it is only a very small step we have to take, if we are truly concerned about the future for the next generation and concerned about our economy. If we don't get this record deficit and this debt that is growing out of control under control, it will continue to harm the economy today and our prospects for getting this economy back on track in the future.

Let's allow these negotiations to continue. In the meantime, let's fund the troops and avoid the unnecessary disruption of a government shutdown. We can do that right now as a body by passing the legislation the House passed yesterday, send it to the President for signature, and take care of our fighting men and women for the rest of this year and keep the government from shutting down.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I have long believed we have to be serious about the deficit, and I was 1 of about 14 Senators who held back their vote on the debt ceiling last year to make sure we actually created the fiscal commission, which did very good work this year. That work is being taken by a small group of Democratic and Republican Senators to come up with long-term solutions for the debt. I strongly believe that is what we have to do. I also believe we have a responsibility to govern.

Allowing a shutdown when we are this close in negotiations, when a number has been agreed upon and all it comes down to is a disagreement on politics, is just wrong. What makes this situation so troubling is that we have reached this standstill not over dollars at its essence but over politics that I don't believe have a place in the debate.

With a bipartisan deal within reach, it would be irresponsible to shut down the government and punish our constituents solely to score political points. This impending shutdown has broad consequences. While we have now seen 13 straight months of private sector job growth, adding 1.8 million jobs in that time, the economy is still frag-

ile. Everyone knows that in their own States. Too many Americans continue to struggle.

According to an analysis from Goldman Sachs, a government shutdown will cost the economy around \$8 billion per year or nearly .2 percent of GDP for each week of the shutdown, all because of a disagreement over social issues not over dollars—because last night there was actually agreement on the dollars.

Economists and business leaders agree that a government shutdown at this time will hurt our recovery, hurt businesses, and slow economic growth. Even Speaker BOEHNER has admitted it will cost more than it saves.

If a shutdown were to occur, the Small Business Administration would cease to process applications for business loan guarantees, curtailing lending to small businesses already squeezed by tight credit markets. Last year the Small Business Administration supported more than \$212 billion in lending to small businesses through its two largest loan programs. At these levels we would see over \$400 million a week in small business lending put on hold because of a shutdown.

Our government also provides vital support for businesses seeking to export their products and services and conducting business abroad. The U.S. Commercial Service, a part of the Department of Commerce's International Trade Administration, has offices and embassies and consulates in over 80 countries worldwide and utilizes its global network of trade professionals to connect U.S. companies with international buyers. Every year they help thousands of U.S. companies export goods and services worth billions of dollars.

If the Federal Government shuts down, these services will end and sales and contracts will be lost. If we look at the shutdown in 1995, we can see evidence of how damaging a disruption of services like these can be. During that shutdown, approximately \$2.2 billion in U.S. exports couldn't leave the country because the Department of State and the Bureau of Export Administration were unable to issue export licenses.

Finally, I wish to make a point about visas since I chair the Subcommittee on Export Promotion, Competitiveness and Innovation, which includes tourism. During the last shutdown, approximately 20,000 to 30,000 applications by foreigners for foreign tourist visas were unprocessed each day, and the U.S. tourist industries and airlines reportedly sustained millions of dollars in losses. With the average foreign visitor spending over \$4,000 per visit, it is easy to see how fast these losses add up for businesses. These are just a few examples, but the sum total will be much greater.

I am on a bill with Senator CASEY and Senator HUTCHISON to continue funding our troops. Of course, we will do that; of course, they should get their paychecks. But let's look at what this shutdown would do on a day-to-day basis to provide some perspective.

In northwestern Minnesota, volunteers are taking time off from their jobs and from school to help fill sand bags and build temporary levees as we watch the Red River of the north rise to its eventual crest. The flood fight takes all hands on deck in North Dakota and Minnesota, with local, State, and Federal Government working together to protect these communities. Earlier this week, to help in this fight, Governor Dayton declared a state of emergency for 46 Minnesota counties. North Dakota has also been declared a state of emergency.

FEMA has said it will have all the resources it would need to maintain its capabilities during a shutdown. However, if the Federal Government closes its doors, FEMA will not be able to process in a timely manner paperwork and applications that Minnesotans will be submitting for assistance once the waters recede. I have been through these flood fights before. The whole community comes together. The whole community fights that flood. They take days and days and days. Some of them have lost their houses, and they are still out there helping their fellow citizens. I see that and I wonder to myself: And we in this body and in this Congress can't come together when we are this close, when there actually was agreement on a number last night. We can't come together while these volunteers across the Red River are coming together on a flood fight? That is absurd.

I urge my colleagues who are holding this up to reconsider their all-or-nothing stance so we can move forward with the real work that must be done. A setback now would simply prevent the growth needed to address our country's long-term fiscal imbalances.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add 4 additional minutes to my 10 minutes.

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

LIBYA

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I am aware that most of my colleagues are taking the floor today to speak about the potential shutdown of the government, and very appropriately so. I am strongly opposed to a government shutdown, as we all are. I especially want to note its adverse effects on our men and women in uniform.

Of course, I have joined so many of my colleagues in cosponsoring the Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act of 2011. The last thing our men and women and their families need to worry about is how to make ends meet while they are taking up arms to defend the Nation's interests.

I rise to talk about the deteriorating situation in Libya which could have more profound effects than the crisis we are in. It is a very serious, very de-

teriorating situation and one which is fraught with severe implications for America's national security interests.

I remain a strong supporter of the President's decision to take military action in Libya. It averted what was an imminent slaughter in Benghazi and has given us a chance to achieve the goal of U.S. policy as stated correctly by the President: to force Qadhafi to leave power. I am also grateful we have capable friends, our Arab partners, and NATO allies, who are making critical contributions. But that is not a substitute for U.S. leadership. Right now that is the main missing ingredient in the coalition's efforts in Libya—the willingness of the administration to take decisive actions, together with our partners, so that we can accomplish our goal as quickly as possible rather than look to our allies to do it all themselves, which I fear the evidence is mounting they cannot do.

The administration has chosen to stop flying strike missions against Qadhafi's forces, even though they continue to threaten Libyan civilians and even though our NATO allies cannot match our unique capabilities in this regard. The administration correctly declared that forcing Qadhafi from power is a goal of U.S. policy, but our military mission is not working toward that goal by actively seeking to degrade Qadhafi's forces, thereby increasing the pressure on him to leave power.

At a time when Qadhafi's forces are adapting to NATO's tactics and capabilities and concealing themselves in populated civilian areas, the administration has grounded our most effective aircraft, the A-10 and the AC-130, which are the only planes—the only planes—that are capable of conducting the kinds of precise air-to-ground operations now required to protect civilians under the current circumstances. Not surprisingly, Qadhafi's forces are now regaining the momentum on the ground.

We cannot succeed with half-measures. Right now, our actions are not adding up to a strategy that appears capable of achieving our goals. To the contrary, we seem to be failing to prevent the situation on the ground in Libya from sliding into a stalemate.

Just yesterday, GEN Carter Hamm, the commander of U.S. Africa Command, who led Operation Odyssey Dawn in Libya, told the Armed Services Committee that a stalemate in Libya, where Qadhafi remains in power to pose an even greater threat to the world and to the Libyan people, is not in America's interest or in anyone's interest. But in the same hearing yesterday, General Hamm also conceded that the situation on the ground in Libya is “more likely” of becoming a stalemate now than when this intervention began. I am afraid I agree with the general.

I would like to highlight some of the news my colleagues may have missed.

Yesterday, there was an airstrike that, unfortunately—the Washington

Post: “NATO's credibility takes a hit in Libya.”

Forces loyal to Libyan leader Moammar Gaddafi went back on the offensive . . . as questions continued to mount about the credibility and effectiveness of NATO's no-fly zone and campaign of airstrikes.

A senior U.S. general described the situation in Libya as a stalemate, while Turkey said it was talking to both sides working on a “road map” for a cease-fire. In the meantime, Gaddafi is seeking what military advantage he can get and probing for gaps in NATO's resolve. . . .

The day also ignited new confusion and outrage among rebels in Ajdabiya after warplanes strafed rebel forces and killed at least five people, including two doctors. Rebels first accused NATO of targeting them. . . . By Thursday night, it was still unclear who attacked. . . .

Abdul Fattah Younis, the rebel's commander, told reporters that if NATO had attacked their tanks, it was a mistake, and if Gaddafi's airplanes had been allowed to strike them, it was an “even bigger mistake.”

Quoting the New York Times:

As for the current air war, NATO is especially sensitive to the criticism that came most scathingly from the leader of the Libyan opposition forces, Gen. Abdul Fattah Younes. He said in Benghazi late Tuesday that “NATO blesses us every now and then with a bombardment here and there, and is letting the people of Misurata die every day.”

So we relieved a humanitarian—let's get this straight, my friends—we relieved a humanitarian disaster in Benghazi, and now, because of either ineptitude or lack of resolve or lack of capability or all of the above, we are now watching a massacre—certainly human suffering of enormous proportions in Misurata.

There is another article from the Guardian: “NATO lacking strike aircraft for Libya campaign.”

There is a New York Times editorial today. Interestingly, the New York Times says:

There is a much better option: the American A-10 and AC-130 aircraft used earlier in the Libya fighting and still on standby status. President Obama should authorize these planes to fly again under NATO command. Unlike the highflying supersonic French and British jets now carrying the main burden of the air war, these American planes can fly slow enough and low enough to let them see and target Colonel Qaddafi's weapons without unduly endangering nearby populations.

Facts are stubborn things. The fact is that now the situation is deteriorating. The suffering goes on, and America and our allies appear to be showing that we are incapable or unwilling to address a third-rate military power, ruled by a man who has the blood of 190 Americans on his hands, who has been involved in terrorist activities throughout the world, who went outside of Benghazi and said: We will go house to house and kill every one of you. And the situation is deteriorating into stalemate.

So what do we need to do?

First, we need to get U.S. Armed Forces, especially our A-10s and AC-130s, back in the business of flying strike missions against Qadhafi's