

teach and share the legal framework that protects our resources could not have been more critical to preserving our Western way of life.

David Getches left a lasting impression on the demographic composition of CU Law School. He was committed to a student body composed of people from many different backgrounds and cultures, and that commitment made an indelible impact on the school and on Colorado's legal community. In 2008, the Hispanic Bar Association awarded him their Community Service Award for increasing Hispanic enrollment, and he also assembled one of the most diverse administrative teams of any law school in the country. He didn't stop there, however. He then created a commission to produce a groundbreaking report on diversity in the legal profession and how to increase diversity in law firm recruitment. The highly skilled and diverse alumni of the CU Law School reflects his efforts and successes.

David Getches also built a legacy of legal access to legal education for all. He worked to expand scholarships and financial aid awarded by the law school to worthy students regardless of their financial background, increasing scholarship awards from \$600,000 in 2004 to a hefty \$2.1 million in 3 short years by 2007.

In 2008, he worked with the Colorado State Legislature to pass a law allowing public universities to offer loan repayment assistance grants to graduates practicing public interest law and more recently founded an endowment to award grants to CU Law School graduates in the public sector.

What Dean Getches did by reducing the cost of law school was make public service a viable alternative to private practice for bright, idealistic graduates of the law school. Without question, those students, CU Law School, the State of Colorado, and I would venture to say the country will reap the benefits in the future from David Getches' foresight and thoughtful investments.

At the heart of why I wanted to come to the floor today was that I think we know we can all learn from Dean David Getches' passion for giving back to whatever community in which he found himself. He led a life of service, and he also compiled an impressive academic record as well as serving as the dean of CU Law School. He was, at his core, committed to the future of his children, our children, our grandchildren, and his grandchildren, and he had a deep love for the Rocky Mountain Western way of life. He was an avid outdoorsman, he was fit, and he faced any and all physical challenges just like he faced intellectual and emotional challenges. As I said in the beginning of my remarks, he was a mentor to all of us, and he always had his eye on the future. I know, as painful as it is for all of us who knew him to lose him so suddenly, he would want us to be focused on the future.

Dean Getches did this and much more for Colorado and our country, and

I just want to close with this, Mr. President. We have lost a unique man and a towering Colorado figure.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the situation involving the need for a budget and the situation involving the need to raise the debt limit for the United States is getting more and more crucial, it seems, by the hour. I have been a firm and consistent critic of this idea that has been developing the last several years in the Congress that a few people meet in closed, secret meetings and somehow reach a decision that I am supposed to assume is good and decent and ought to be confirmed by a vote here in the Senate.

I feel that there are 100 Senators—and some a lot smarter and more capable than I—but I feel a personal sense of obligation and duty to ensure that when I vote on an important piece of legislation my constituents care about, that I know what is in it and that I understand what is in it, and it is hard to know. When you have a bill that comes out that proposes to have changes in the trillions of dollars, involving Federal spending for a decade, in a budget or some other fashion, it requires us to be careful about that.

So I would express again my dissatisfaction and belief that this Senate—not the House—has failed in its duty to participate in an open process concerning our budget. The House of Representatives did. The Republican House promised to have open hearings. They had a bill on the floor—a budget. They passed it within the time required—by April 15. It completely changed the debt trajectory of America and put us on sound footing. It reduced spending by \$6 trillion—not \$2 trillion but \$6 trillion—and it didn't raise taxes on the American people. In fact, it reduced taxes in a way they felt would engender better economic growth, which is the best way to engender more tax revenue—having more people make more money and pay more taxes. So I really believe the House fulfilled their constitutional duty.

In the Senate, we have now gone well over 800 days without a budget. We didn't have a budget when our Democratic colleagues had 60 Senators—the highest number one party has had in probably 70, 80 years, maybe longer. They didn't pass a budget. You can pass a budget with 51 votes—with the Vice President, 50 votes. It is a simple majority. It is an expedited procedure. Budgets have been passed when parties have only had one-vote majorities in the Senate.

So I would say it is odd that we have gone 2 years without a budget, but it is not odd—in part because of having no budget—that we have seen the largest surges of debt the Nation has ever seen. President Bush was criticized for run-

ning up debt. He had, in 1 year—his last year—a \$450 billion deficit, and he was roundly criticized for that. Some of that was TARP money, which they scored as monies spent, and it was properly and accurately scored. So it came out to \$450 billion. The year before, it was a \$160 billion deficit. President Obama's first budget deficit was \$1,200 billion. His next budget was \$1,300 billion. This year's budget, by September 30, is projected to be around \$1,500 billion. We haven't had a budget. Is anything connected there?

So I want to say, first of all, one of the ways you act responsibly is when you do it out in front of the people.

I noticed at the press conference today that President Obama, when asked about some of these matters, pushed back and said: Well, we want to have an agreement right now. We don't want to wait any later, close to the election.

He was basically saying—it is pretty clear, really, and I am not exaggerating anything—when you get close to the election, Senators and Congressmen don't like to vote for more debt and they do not like to vote for more taxes. What is wrong with that? The American people don't want debt. They do not want taxes. They want us to bring this government under control. But what is being suggested is, oh, it is politics. There is something corrupt politically if you believe you shouldn't bail out the big spenders in Washington by taking more money from hard-working Americans and taking it out of the private sector to give to the public sector that has mismanaged the money they have.

Some might say: Well, JEFF, we have these big deficits because you all cut taxes.

We haven't cut taxes in years. President Bush cut taxes with revenues much higher today than when those taxes were cut. We have gone into an economic decline, and this recession has reduced our income. That is true. It is not so much the rate of taxes. It is the rate of profit. It is the rate of income. It is the rate of money people are being paid, so they do not have as much money and they are not paying as much in taxes. Now, we can run around and find everybody who is left with money and try to tax them, but at some point that begins to be self-defeating.

So I guess I am trying to raise the point, How did we get here? Well, there is another way we got here with these huge deficits we have. In the Keynesian philosophy of economics, we had a big spending bill called a stimulus bill. I opposed it. I remember reading a piece by the Nobel laureate, Professor Becker, from the University of Chicago, not long before the vote saying it was not going to create jobs; that it was not sufficiently stimulative to be a good stimulus bill, in fact, in his mind, as a Nobel Prize-winning economist. And that is exactly what happened. It didn't create jobs. It went to social

programs, it went to State aid, and it went to things other than the infrastructure that we were told it was going for. Only 4 percent of that money went to roads and bridges—4 percent out of \$850 billion. Every penny borrowed will be to create or to stimulate jobs, they said. We are going to redo our infrastructure, they said. It was not done that way. It was social spending overwhelmingly, and it didn't create growth in the economy.

Another reason we have the debt is because the baseline spending has surged under the Democratic leadership and President Obama. Defense Department has gone up 3 or so percent the last couple of years in spending. Nondefense discretionary spending—the things we do such as energy programs and road programs and aid and grants and things we like to spend around here—went up 24 percent in 2 years. We were having a drop off in income, a drop off in tax revenue, and we increased spending dramatically.

We never had 10, 12 percent increases in spending per year. But hold your hat. The budget the President submitted to us in February of this year—several months ago—proposed increases for the Education Department of 10.5 percent, proposed increases for the State Department of 10.5 percent, with 9.5 percent for the Energy Department and a 60-percent increase for transportation—the high-speed rail projects. But we don't have the money. All of that would have been borrowed. We couldn't sustain flat spending without borrowing money, we are so far in debt. Forty cents of every dollar we spend today is borrowed.

So I have been a big critic of this scheme to meet behind closed doors and not tell the rest of the Congress or the American people what we are doing and to plop down on the floor of the Senate some proposed deal that we have to sign at the eleventh hour or the government is going to shut down. Why haven't we been talking about this? They talked about it in the House. They voted on it. They reduced spending \$6 trillion. In the phantom budget that has been talked about by our Democratic colleagues, one they never produced so it could actually be accounted for, they are claiming it would reduce spending \$2 trillion and are patting themselves on the back about how great they are. But when you take out the interest savings that occur, it is only \$1.4 trillion in actual reduction of spending and it is a 2.7-percent, we estimate, increase in taxes.

Senator CONRAD, the chairman of the Budget Committee, does a good job. He is a smart man. I think he understands the threat America faces. I thought he did, although this phantom secret budget that they just leak out descriptions of whenever it is convenient has not impressed me. Really, it just hasn't been impressive. Is it a vision? Is it a specter of some kind of a budget that nobody can ever grasp their hands around, and it is only what the people

who are holding it close to their vest say it is and all the rest of us have to accept that? I don't think so. I have become very uneasy about what we hear in this city of Washington about plans and policy.

When President Obama announced his budget, it was the most irresponsible budget this country has ever been presented with by a President. I don't think anybody can dispute that. I am prepared to defend that against anybody who says so. It increased spending, it increased taxes. Over a decade, it increased taxes and increased spending and made the deficit worse than if we hadn't done anything, at a time when the Nation should have been working from January until today figuring out how to bring this government under control and contain the growth in spending and contain the debt. This is what he said, and his budget director in our committee said—Mr. Lew—that: Our budget calls on us to live within our means and pay down the debt.

The Congressional Budget Office scored the budget. They analyzed it over 10 years. The lowest single annual deficit that was occurring during that time was \$750 billion, the lowest deficit, almost half again higher than President Bush's highest deficit. And it starts going up in the outyears 8, 9, and 10—to over \$1 trillion in the 10th year annual deficit. Interest on that debt that would be accrued by such an irresponsible budget would go from around \$200 billion last year, \$240-some-odd billion this year, to \$930 billion in 2021. That would be larger than Medicare, larger than Social Security, larger than the defense budget including the war—much larger than those. So interest is a danger.

Senator CONRAD talked this afternoon about his phantom budget, and he told us a lot of things he wanted us to know about it, and he articulated it in a way that made you think that it is not such a bad idea. But we have real numbers people. Just like President Obama said his budget was going to pay down the debt and cause us to live within our means when it had no deficit lower than \$740 billion—he said it is a blueprint. He said it is a framework. But he didn't say it was a budget because it is not a budget. A budget is a document that can be read, ascertained, evaluated, and scored.

So they leak it to the Washington Post—not to Members or colleagues of the Senate here—they leak to the Washington Post some of the good things he wanted to get out, and then they talk about some of the good things here today. Forgive me if I am not impressed. If it is such a good budget, why don't you print it out and propose it to us? That is what the House of Representatives did. They are prepared to defend their budget.

Senator CONRAD said this: that he thought it could play a part in this big deal the President is talking about to change our debt trajectory in a posi-

tive way. Well, those words are good words, just like the President's statement that he had a budget that was going to cause us to live within our means and pay down our debt. That is what he said. That is what his budget director said. Well, you can say things, but it doesn't make them true. I can say I don't have a desk in my hand, but I have a desk in my hand, reality being what it is. So that was not a good budget he submitted, and I am worried about this phantom budget we are hearing about today.

The way we calculate this phantom budget and the things that have been released about it, it would raise taxes as much as \$2.8 trillion and cut spending about 4 percent over the 10 years—this is a 10-year budget—at a time when we are projected to add, under the President's plan, \$13 trillion to our national debt. So we are going to reduce the debt by 4 percent from \$13 trillion—an utterly unsustainable figure. The House budget would cut discretionary spending \$6 trillion. The Toomey plan would have cut spending \$8 trillion.

Senator CONRAD actually said on the Senate floor that his budget—which raises taxes, as I indicated—would reduce taxes by \$700 billion. He said it would reduce taxes by \$700 billion. Now, how is this accounting—this trick, I will suggest—accomplished? Well, to get to that number, he is obviously comparing it to a CBO baseline which assumes that every single tax rate from the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts that has been in place now almost a decade is going to expire and all those rates go up. So he is saying that if he keeps a few of them from going up, he has cut taxes. Only in Washington can you raise taxes dramatically, change the tax rates that have been in place for a decade, see taxes go up dramatically, and call that a tax cut.

By the way, baseline is very important. We don't know what baseline the chairman of the Budget Committee is using. He understands it very well. He is one of the most knowledgeable, capable Members of our body, and he understands these well. I believe the phrase he used was that it is a plausible baseline—a plausible baseline.

Well, let me tell you the baseline we should use. The baseline, when you talk about whether spending increases or whether spending decreases, should be what you are spending today. If you are spending \$100 billion today and if you spend \$102 billion, you have spent \$2 billion more. If you spend \$98 billion, you are spending \$2 billion less, right? Well, what they do in Washington and the reason this country is so close to bankruptcy is they assume growth rates, baseline growth rates. Then when you reduce the baseline growth rate, and it is going up \$10 billion next year and you reduce that increase to \$9 billion, you claim you cut spending by \$1 billion and it went up \$9 billion. Now, that is the kind of logic that has put us in the difficult position we are in.

So I have decided and told my staff on the Budget Committee that when we get numbers, we are going to compare them to the only thing that is solid, and that is a level baseline—does it go up or does it go down? In fact, the Ryan House budget that cut \$6 trillion still increases spending. It is not a real cut.

So you do have to figure out how much you are talking about and what baseline you are using to know what the numbers are. The best way to do that and the most objective way to do that is to use a flatline number and see whether we are up or down, and then we can communicate. But if you get to choose your baseline—and CBO has one, the President has another one, and it looks as though the Senate Democrats have chosen another one they call a plausible baseline. I don't know what that means. The debt commission that had their recommendation for reducing debt chose another baseline. It makes it confusing, and it makes it harder to understand.

So when you talk about a budget that is supposed to really make a difference in our economy and you propose \$2 in tax increases for every \$1 in spending cuts and suggest this is the kind of thing you are working with the President on in their negotiations, maybe we can begin to understand why the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate who have been in these meetings have been walking out of these meetings and saying: All they want to do is raise taxes.

The President himself said several months ago that he thought \$3 of spending cuts and \$1 of tax increases would be a good mix. But what we are hearing today is \$2 of tax increases to \$1 of spending cuts. That is not acceptable and has no chance of passage. And if the American people have time to read that kind of legislation and find out that is what is in it, they are not going to be happy with anybody that supports it, in my view. So perhaps that is the reason they want to wait until the eleventh hour, claim the country is about to shut down, and try to force it through. As the President suggested, you don't want to get it too close to the election when people might remember what you did to them.

Goodness gracious, they talk about a \$900 billion cut in the Defense Department. That is part of their plan too. Well, let me just tell you how that gimmick works. You propose a \$900 billion cut in the Defense Department and you know that almost 20 percent cut is not going to become law, but you go out and tell the public you saved \$900 billion and you plan to cut it from the Defense Department, and you can't cut that much money from the Defense Department. So no wonder our retiring fine Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, after the Democratic discussion of this, was moved to say he was worried about what such a budget would do to our national security. Well, he should be.

I have been on the Armed Services Committee. I don't deny that the mili-

tary has to tighten its belt. Just like every other department in this government, it may even have to take a real reduction in spending. But we are not going to have an 18-percent, 20-percent reduction. Are we going to have our men and women who place their lives on the line for us have to pay for profligacy in Washington? I don't think so.

Mr. President, I would ask Majority Leader REID, who I believe is the strategist in the Senate who told our chairman, Senator CONRAD, that he should not bring up a budget—I think Senator CONRAD and I were prepared to bring up a budget. He was working on one. His staff was working on one. We were within days of a markup. He was going to produce a budget, and those of us on the Republican side had amendments to offer, and we were preparing for a debate, and they decided all of a sudden not to have a markup. Later, Senator REID said it would be foolish to produce a budget.

I would say it would be foolish for the Congress of the United States to take a paycheck to operate the way we are operating when 40 cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed. That is unthinkable. How did we get in this position where we are spending \$3,700 billion and taking in only \$2,200 billion and all the difference is borrowed?

Finally—this is important—a lot of us have heard these numbers but it has not resonated with us about how important they are. Professors Rogoff and Reinhart have written a book called "This Time It's Different," studying eight centuries of sovereign governmental default on their debts, the kind of thing Greece is going through today. They have analyzed how it happens and the consequences. They chose the name because they said that every time politicians ran up debt in their country to high levels and caused a crisis, they said: It will not happen to us. This time it is different. We are different from those other countries that went belly up. Then it happens just like that, savagely, immediately, like the financial crisis that hit us in 2007–2008. What they concluded in further study was something else. Not only when you get your debt too high do you run the risk of a financial crisis, but your debt slows your economic growth and the countries that have debts that equal 90 percent of the economy—I see my good friend, Senator REID. He has the toughest job in Washington and I am not making it any easier for him. It will be good for him to hear this. I think he knows it.

But they have concluded when your total American debt reaches 90 percent of our economy, our GDP, and goes above that, it pulls down your economic growth by 1 percent. CBO now is scoring our growth to come in at .9 percent below what it otherwise would be because of our debt.

The first quarter we had 2 percent economic growth. If we had 3 percent economic growth that would be a 50-percent increase in growth. If we had 1

percent greater increase in growth that would amount to, according to the White House economic team some time ago, an increase of 1 million jobs in America.

What I am saying is we erroneously state too often, I think, that the question is about our children and grandchildren. I truly believe the sluggish growth and the very weak job numbers we have been having are the result of carrying too much debt. We have to start reducing that debt even if it is painful for us to do so. I hope our colleagues will produce a budget that will actually change the numbers. I am not confident that will happen.

Failing that I do hope, Mr. Leader, and I say this to my leader, too, that if a bill is brought forth in the Senate we have at least 7 days to consider it before we are asked to vote on it. I believe it will take that long to properly evaluate it.

I see the majority leader here. It is always a pleasure to work with him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would say before my friend leaves the floor, his leader, my friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky and I are representing the Senate along with Senator KYL and Senator DURBIN at the White House. We have been there many days now. We understand, all of us there, Democrats and Republicans, the significant adverse effect this huge debt has on our country. Everyone there is trying to arrive at a point where we do something about that. We are not there yet. It is difficult to do. We understand it is going to take, we believe, a mix of spending cuts and some way to generate some more revenue. We are working our best to get this done.

My friend is right, the debt is a drag on the economy. There is no question about that. Once we are able to raise the debt limit, I think we are going to see some energy in this economy we have not seen in some time. But we are not there yet. I wish I could report to my friend from Alabama and the rest of the Senate and the country that we have completed our negotiations, but we have not. We are going to go back again tomorrow. The President said 3:45, and I said a.m. or p.m.? It will be 3:45 p.m. tomorrow that we will be back, trying to move forward.

My friend from Alabama has an important responsibility as the person who is the ranking member now of that most important Budget Committee. I am sure he has learned a lot, having taken this assignment, that he did not know before. That is the way it is with everyone in the Senate. I have learned a great deal working through the CR, different iterations of that, and now on this work we are doing trying to arrive at a debt reduction package along with raising the debt ceiling. I have learned a lot. I have a lot more to learn.

I appreciate the intensity of my friend in that in which he believes, whether it is this or as the person running the Judiciary Committee for the

Republicans. He is always very intense. He and I don't always agree but we agree more than people think. But one thing no one can ever take away from the junior Senator from Alabama is the seriousness of his being in the Senate.

LAS VEGAS NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 20th anniversary of the Las Vegas Natural History Museum. For two decades the Las Vegas Natural History Museum has provided children and families from all across southern Nevada with the opportunity to learn about science and history in an educational setting outside of the classroom. It is my great pleasure to honor this fine institution, its employees, and the museum's board members before the U.S. Senate today.

The museum started in 1989 when a group of dedicated citizens petitioned the Las Vegas City Council to find a permanent home for a collection of wildlife and prehistoric exhibits. In July 1991, the museum opened its doors to the people of Las Vegas with a collection of loaned wildlife and prehistoric exhibits. Today, the museum has acquired a world-class collection of artifacts for their multimillion dollar collection. Even the Smithsonian Institution has taken notice of our museum. In 2002, the Las Vegas Natural History Museum became an affiliate with the Smithsonian Institution, granting them access to the Smithsonian's vast collection of exhibits.

While many museums across the country have struggled with the economic downturn, the Las Vegas Natural History Museum continues to thrive and grow. Last year, the Las Vegas Natural History Museum provided educational tours to 30,000 students in Clark County. All of their programs are designed by grade level to meet State educational requirements. The museum also provides opportunities for at-risk schools to visit the museum free of charge. Their Open Doors Program provided scholarships that allowed nearly 20,000 visitors from at-risk or economically disadvantaged schools to experience the museum.

I am proud to join with my fellow Nevadans in recognizing the Las Vegas Natural History Museum on reaching this important milestone. For 20 years, this institution has provided the children of southern Nevada with an interactive learning experience, and I have no doubt that the museum will continue to be an important part of our community for years to come.

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I have added my name as a co-sponsor of S. 598, the Respect for Marriage Act. This legislation would repeal the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, which I voted for in 1996.

I now believe it was a mistake for the Federal Government to legislate in this area in a way that overrides the effect of State laws. Prior to the enactment of DOMA, the Federal Government had deferred to the States to determine what constitutes marriage. I believe we should return to that position.

I also believe it is wrong, and probably unconstitutional, for the Federal Government to treat married couples differently solely on the basis of their sexual orientation.

Enactment of the Respect for Marriage Act will help ensure that the full protections of our Constitution apply to all of our citizens.

COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in acknowledging the 15 Columbia River Basin tribes' involvement in the Columbia River Treaty negotiation and review process. As some of you may know, the Columbia River Treaty is an agreement between Canada and the United States on the development and operation of the major hydroelectric dams in the Columbia River Basin. It addresses power and flood control benefits in both countries. The treaty has been in effect since 1964. Under the provisions of the existing treaty, if either country wishes to modify or cancel the treaty, it must notify the other country by the year 2014.

With 2014 approaching, the United States and Canadian treaty "entities" have already begun talks regarding a possible extension and modification of the treaty. The Columbia River Treaty review team has designated representatives from 15 Columbia River tribes, also known as the Sovereign Review Team, SRT. The Columbia Basin tribes have vital cultural and natural resources at stake since their homelands are located in the area affected by the treaty and, as sovereign units of government and members of the Sovereign Review Team, SRT—they have a right to play an important role in those negotiations. It is important to recognize the unique fishing rights for salmon that will have to be taken into account during any negotiations of this treaty with our neighbors to the north. The outcome of these negotiations could have a profound impact on the Northwestern United States.

I really appreciate one of the designated tribal representatives from Oregon, the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, for their continuous involvement. I also appreciate the other members of the Sovereign Review Team. The tribes and folks from the Pacific Northwest all share a common desire for proactive approaches in salmon restoration and recovery, and it is important to come together with shared strengths, joint efforts and coordinated education strategies.

Unfortunately, the Columbia River Treaty was enacted during a time in our history when consideration was not

given to the treaty's effects on the natural and cultural resources of tribes/first nations whose homelands are located within the Columbia River Basin. Lack of previous dialogue and inclusion of tribal perspectives has disrupted regional and tribal interests by leading to the degradation of rivers, the salmon population, traditional food sources, natural resources, and tribal customs and identities.

The Columbia River Treaty Review provides an opportunity for the United States to include Columbia Basin tribes in the treaty review process. I want to emphasize the importance of tribal consultation and incorporation of traditional knowledge in this process—to ensure protection and conservation of the numerous natural resources that tribal people's way of life are dependent on.

The treaty review provides an opportunity to discuss and learn ways to strengthen both the government-to-government relationship that exists between the United States and the individual Indian nations as well as the U.S.'s position relative to Canada. This can lead the U.S. to advance its relationship with 15 additional sovereigns. I have enjoyed working with tribes on a number of important issues; I value our continued friendship and look forward to working together in the future. I am proud to support the 15 Columbia River Basin tribes in their efforts to stand alongside the United States in negotiations of the Columbia River Treaty and stand ready to assist in any way I can.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2219. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated: