The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 530 to amendment No. 529.

In the amendment, strike ''3'', insert ''2''.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 531

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit the bill with instructions, which is also at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] moves to commit the bill (S. 1323) to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 531.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 10, after ''deficit'' strike all that follows and insert the following:

''(1) should require that those earning $1,000,000 or more per year make a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort; and

(2) should not end Medicare as we know it.''

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 532

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 532 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

After ''Medicare'', strike all that follows and insert ''and Medicaid as we know it.''.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 533 TO AMENDMENT NO. 532

Mr. REID. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 533 to amendment No. 532.

Strike ''we'' and insert ''all Americans''

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the cloture motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Daniel K. Inouye, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Bernard Sanders, Frank R. Lautenberg, Sherrod Brown, Jack Reed, Dianne Feinstein, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Carl Levin, Charles E. Schumer.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 91, H.R. 2055.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 91, H.R. 2055, an act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the clerk will report the cloture motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 91, H.R. 2055, an act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Daniel K. Inouye, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara Boxer, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tim Johnson, Frank R. Lautenberg, Sherrod Brown, Jack Reed, Dianne Feinstein, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark L. Pryor, Carl Levin, Charles E. Schumer.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived with respect to both cloture motions.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw my motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. 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. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

REMEMBERING DAVID GETCHES

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of Colorado's great educators and community leaders, David Getches, who passed away on Tuesday, July 5, 2011, at the too-young age of 68.

This is more than a poignant moment for me. I had planned to come to the floor to discuss David Getches' career and character because he was stepping down after 8 very productive years as the dean of the University of Colorado Law School.

We all have had this terrible experience in our lives when somebody whom we love and respect suddenly finds they have a cancer that is aggressive—beyond aggressive. Literally a month ago, David was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer. In the 4 weeks since that time, that cancer stole him from us. But he was always upbeat. He was always someone who we looked to for enthusiasm and inspiration. I will be inspired in my remarks today by what he did. I will attempt not to dwell on his loss.

As I said, Dean Getches served as dean of the Colorado Law School for the last 8 years. With him at the helm, CU Law became one of the most forward-looking institutions of legal training in the country. I want to share a few examples of his vision and leadership. I could not cover all of them if I had a full hour. I want to share some of them with the Senate and with his friends and admirers in Colorado.

He steered this school through the construction of the new LEED Certified Wolf Law Building, which put CU and its law school at the cutting edge of environmental sustainability and energy efficiency—two ideas that were connected to the values that Getches was committed to fostering throughout his career. Getches previously served as executive director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources and as an adviser to the Interior Secretary in the Clinton administration. He had an extensive background in water, environmental, and public lands law. Through his work, Getches impressed upon all Coloradans the importance of good stewardship of our State's precious natural resources.

Mr. President, I am not a lawyer, but I do know Dean Getches' efforts to

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 running 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