

the goal, and that is to put our fiscal house in order. But we are not united in the Senate about how to do it. So let's have that debate this week. Let's have that debate that says we should be spending more or we should be spending less; that we should be taxing more or taxing less, because we have real disagreements on that.

I am in the spend less, tax less group, but there are views that are differing. Let's put it out there and start the debate. Because if we have a budget resolution, then everything can be solved from there. If we have a budget resolution that we can agree is the right amount of spending for the debt crisis we are in, then we will know the way forward to dealing with the debt crisis. That is a real possibility, and that is what we ought to be talking about.

I will not support cloture on a motion to proceed to a Libya agreement that says the President can continue the involvement. I think we need to deal with the crisis that Congress has a say in doing. Certainly Congress had a say in producing it, and we are the ones responsible to the American people for solving the problem that has been created.

I urge my colleagues not to vote for cloture on the motion to proceed to the Libya resolution and, instead, turn to the budget, put a budget resolution out, and, for the first time in almost 2 years, we can begin to talk together to solve this problem by passing a budget resolution that will lower spending and hopefully keep taxes low so our fragile economy can continue on the path toward improvement, that would have businesses feel confident to hire people, rather than putting obstacles in place, and get this unemployment rate of over 9 percent off the books. That would be the answer for this week, in my opinion.

I hope the majority leader will turn to the budget and let's solve the crisis at hand. I think that is why we are in session this week.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate was scheduled today at 5 p.m. to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the bipartisan Libya resolution, which is sponsored by Senators KERRY, McCAIN, LEVIN, KYL, DURBIN, FEINSTEIN, GRAHAM, and others. I spoke with the Republican leader just a short time ago, and we have agreed that, notwithstanding the broad support for the Libya resolution, the most important issue for us to focus on this week is the budget. So we will work to set up the vote on the sense-of-Senate resolution that I have offered

on shared sacrifice and perhaps a Republican alternative as well. Meetings are in process now and will continue on the debt limit and on larger budget matters throughout the Capitol and I am confident everyone knows the White House is involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion, with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res. 20, be vitiated.

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

Mr. REID. I withdraw my motion to proceed to Calendar No. 88, S.J. Res. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

SHARED SACRIFICE IN RESOLVING THE BUDGET DEFICIT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 93, S. 1323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to proceed to Calendar No. 93, S. 1323, a bill to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there will be a vote at 5 p.m. today on a motion to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to notify Senators of their need of attendance in the Senate at this important time in our country's history.

I would note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AUDIT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to extend some remarks I made on the Senate floor on June 6. The report I was reporting on on June 6 evaluated audits produced by the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General in fiscal year 2010. I called that report a report card because that is exactly what it was. Each of the 113 unclassified reports published in fiscal year 2010 was reviewed and evaluated and graded in five categories. My report was produced by the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General in fiscal year 2010. After each report was graded individually, all the scores for each report in each category were added up and averaged to create a composite score for all 113 reports.

Although 15 top-quality audits were highlighted in the report, the overall score awarded to the 113 was basically D-minus. That is low, I know. Maybe the score should have been a little higher. Clearly, none reflected any of the reforms Inspector General Heddell, DOD, put in place in December of 2010, as all were published well in advance of that date.

My oversight staff read these reports as educated consumers. We expected these reports to provide leverage in the monumental day-to-day Department of Defense oversight task. We want them to provide assurance that the Defense Department is spending taxpayers' money wisely. Some reports did that but most did not.

This report, prepared by this Senator from Iowa, is sure of one thing: The audits which are the subject of my report card are not somehow exempt from oversight and public scrutiny. In other words, these audits should just not sit on the shelf and collect dust; they need, as well, to be put under the public microscope, especially when they cost almost \$1 million apiece to produce. Mr. President, \$1 million for an audit report is a heck of a lot of money. So that is exactly what we did in the report card—put these reports in the public spotlight, and I will keep them there until I see sustained improvement at the inspector general of the Department of Defense.

As the report states and as I explained in my speech on June 6, this grading system was subjective and imperfect. However, as subjective and inexact as it may be, I believe it provided a reasonable and rough measure of audit quality.

Following my speech, Defense Department Inspector General Heddell pounced on my report. He expressed strong opposition to the low score. He complained that it did not adequately reflect \$4.2 billion in what he called "achieved monetary benefits," identified in fiscal year 2010 reports.

To address IG Heddell's concerns, my staff asked the audit department to prepare an information paper that linked the \$4.2 billion in savings to the audit where those savings were reported. That information was provided to me on June 20. I call it a crosswalk. It takes me to the exact page in each report where the savings were discussed. This document listed \$4.4 billion in identified potential monetary benefits and collections of \$4.2 billion.

After reviewing the crosswalk, I have concluded that Inspector General Heddell had a legitimate gripe about my report card. He is right. It should have included a section that addressed potential savings. So I will address those issues right now, focusing on four reports that contain almost all of the \$4.2 billion in savings listed in the collections column.

In grading these reports, we did not give sufficient credit for potential savings and inefficiencies. They were a casualty of the grading system for one simple reason: If the exact dollar amounts of the alleged fraud and waste were not verified using primary source accounting records—and using primary source accounting records is very important—then they did not pop up on my oversight radar screen.

My staff is attempting to work with the audit office to develop a mutually

agreed upon set of standards for grading audits. The purpose of these discussions would be to create a grading process that would accurately capture the true quality of all reports, including policy reviews that uncover real savings and efficiency.

From the beginning, I have been very critical of the audit office for producing far too many policy reviews and far too few hardcore contract and payment audits. For the most part, the policy audits have no measurable monetary impact whatsoever. However, I have learned recently that at least a few are important for other reasons. I am told that some of these reports are a real value in the work of our Armed Services Committee here in the Senate. Contract and payment audits are also very important and I would say most important. They go right to the heart of the IG's core mission: to root out and deter fraud, waste, and theft. If done right, they, too, can produce big payoffs. Those audits earned top scores in my report card. I am not saying the audit office should do nothing but contract and payment audits. What I am saying is this: The current mix of audits creates a huge imbalance in favor of policy reviews as opposed to monetary reviews. So a better balance needs to be established by the Inspector General's Office.

That said, I have an admission to make to my colleagues. I finally found a policy audit that I like. This report is entitled "Recapitalization and Acquisition of Light Tactical Wheel Vehicles." That audit report is No. 2010-039, dated January 29, 2010. It identified potential savings of \$3.84 billion. That is 90 percent of the savings uncovered in all the fiscal year 2010 audits.

In my report card, I gave this audit a low grade. This audit failed to connect the dots on the money trail and verify dollar amounts using primary source contracts and payment records, plus it took 16 months to complete. When you add the 4 to 6 months of planning that often precedes an audit start date, you are probably looking at 2 years to complete the audit, and that is far too long. But this report had other important qualities that were overlooked. It uncovered gross violation of applicable procurement regulations, including the use of sole-source contracting arrangements. It also determined that the proposed vehicle might duplicate the capabilities of existing vehicles.

In the midst of this audit, for reasons that remain unclear, the project manager decided to stop the program "and put the \$3.84 billion in funding to better use in fiscal years 2010-2013." This language suggests that all of the money was reallocated within Army accounts for other purposes. Clearly, the audit may have helped to stop \$3.84 billion in potential waste. That is excellent. But this does not constitute savings in the classical sense, as all the money was shifted to other Army projects. Waste could have happened in those other projects as well.

It reminds me, while we are here in session in what normally would be a recess and I am reporting that the inspector general found \$3.84 billion in potential waste, now that they are trying to find trillions to cut down on the budget deficit, it might be a time to look at the Defense Department and stop the reprogramming of money. If it is going to be saved, it ought to be saved, and that means it will cut down on the deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator has used 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I would like to continue, if there is no objection.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Using a modified grading system to reflect the good quality of this audit, it would have earned a higher score were it not for an excessively long completion time. In this particular case, however, the impact of the audit was apparently felt while the audit was still in progress, so the timeliness rule may not apply here and probably should be set aside.

There are three other audits containing savings and inefficiencies that I would like to discuss.

The next one is entitled "Implementation of the Predator/Sky Warrior Acquisition Decision Memorandum," No. 2010-082, dated September 10, 2010. The purpose of this audit was to determine whether the Air Force and Army had complied with the Department of Defense directives and law to combine the Predator and Sky Warrior drone programs. The Defense Department estimated that \$400 million could be saved by merging the two programs.

While the audit was in progress, the Department of Defense pulled the rug out from under the auditor. A new directive was issued stating that the two programs did not have to be combined. To counter this move, the auditors recommended administrative action against those who failed to comply with the original directive. The Department of Defense nonconcurred and tossed the auditors a bone. The Department of Defense wiggled out of harm's way by offering to do a meaningless lessons-learned exercise. In the end, the auditors caved in, agreeing that the Department of Defense plan was responsive and backed off.

Despite what appeared to be an unsuccessful outcome, the Office of Inspector General still claimed that this audit produced \$60 million in savings. The audit itself indicates that the \$60 million was, in fact, "reprogrammed to meet higher priority operations." That means it was reallocated to other Department of Defense accounts and thus not saved.

Since this audit was all about an opportunity to save \$400 million and the Department of Defense balked, maybe these so-called savings might be better characterized as lost savings. In my report card, this audit earned low scores mainly because it failed to verify ac-

tual costs of two drone contracts using primary source accounting records, and it failed to assess the validity of the Department of Defense estimated savings of \$400 million. I am not convinced this audit deserves a higher score, especially since it took 22½ months to complete, and the recommendations, though initially tough, were watered down in the end.

The last one I wish to report on is entitled "Deferred Maintenance and Carryover on the Army Abrams Tank," No. 2010-43, dated March 2, 2010. This report concluded that contrary to the Army's claim, depot maintenance on M-1 tanks was not deferred in fiscal year 2008. All planned overhauls were, in fact, completed, but a large sum of money was left over. The Army requested and received a formal, written waiver to carry over \$346 million in unneeded and unused fiscal year 2008 M-1 maintenance funds for use in 2009 and beyond. The reason given was inadequate capacity at the Lima, OH, tank plant. Without the waiver, this money would have been canceled and lost.

The report concluded that the Army documents contained "inaccurate, misleading" information that may have caused a violation of the Antideficiency Act. It recommended that the waiver be rescinded and \$275 million in fiscal year 2008 money be canceled and reprogrammed or reduced.

The Army appeared to agree with the recommendations to disclose the \$275 million carryover to Congress but did not concur with other recommendations.

This report does not point to any real savings. This report probably deserves higher scores except for the timeliness and strength of the recommendations. It was untimely, taking 22 months to complete.

In addition, there were unresolved issues about the waiver document. Did the official who signed the waiver know that the document may have allegedly contained false and misleading information? And was he questioned about its truthfulness? If so, the report should have recommended that he be held accountable.

The last of four reports uncovered \$2.2 million in purported savings, but this one appears to be more about helping the Army spend—not save—money.

It is entitled "Controls Over Unliquidated Obligations for Department of the Army Contracts," number 2010-073, dated July 19, 2010.

This report deserves high scores for hitting most of the dots on the money trail, including verification of exact dollar amounts using primary source accounting records. Such nitty gritty accounting work is highly commendable.

Unfortunately, the objective of this audit appears to be questionable. The report finds that sloppy Army accounting work "could increase the risk that funds are unavailable for other needs

because funds available for de-obligation are not identified in a timely manner." Now what does that really mean?

It means the money in question is no longer needed and is at risk of being "lost" because it is about to expire.

Having un-needed money lying around in the Pentagon is almost always a recipe for more waste. In the Pentagon, there is no such thing as un-needed money. Every dollar has a mission.

This report is all about managing money to make sure every cent is spent before it expires. Avoiding the loss of appropriations is the primary responsibility of the Army Comptroller or Chief Financial Officer—not the IG.

In this scenario, the IG's primary focus should be to ensure that "lost" appropriations are not used illegally—or that un-needed monies are not wasted by being shifted to another questionable project. Money that is not needed should be reported to Congress and returned to the Treasury.

Although this audit deserves high scores in several categories, its long completion time—16 months—and questionable focus lowers its overall score.

To summarize, there are two main problems with these four reports on savings and collections. The fourth one I am not going to go into now to save time, but I will include that for the RECORD. None was timely, No. 1. No. 2, reported savings are unverified and elusive.

First, these four reports took an average of 19 months to complete. Two took a total of 45 months, or almost 4 years, to finish. That does not include the 4 to 6 months it takes, I am told, to get an audit rolling. As I have said on other occasions, the power of top quality audit work is greatly weakened by stale information.

Secondly, these four reports supposedly produced \$4.2 billion in collected savings. But all of that money appears to have been shifted to other Department of Defense accounts and spent. To the best of my knowledge, not one cent was saved or redeposited in the taxpayers' bank account. Only in government could all the money be spent and still claim savings.

What we are talking about here is lost savings that grew out of waste that was thankfully discovered and avoided. Waste that is avoided surely has monetary benefits.

In closing, I wish to share a simple observation with my colleagues. For some reason, auditors in the Office of Inspector General show a great reluctance to use the word "waste"—w-a-s-t-e—in their reports. That word rarely, if ever, appears in their audits. At the same time, auditors seem overly eager to tout savings and efficiency. Why would that be? Could it be that their superiors in the Pentagon take a dim view of the word "waste"?

Savings may be nothing more than the flip side of waste. Auditors detect and verify potential waste and then convert it to potential savings by pro-

posing remedies to eliminate the waste. Maybe the auditors need to start calling it what it is—call it waste—and then talk about savings.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

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

PILOTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, we came back. We weren't anticipating coming back from this recess that we were going to be on. I can't help but think a lot of that was a result of the statements President Obama made, criticizing the Senate for leaving at a time when the debt was so bad when, in fact, I think that is a bum rap. We have a serious problem I think we need to address and that is spending. All of these things President Obama is doing right now to make everyone think we are trying to address it—appointing committees and groups to get together; having the Vice President head up this group and the other group; and Republicans and Democrats meeting—all the President has to do is quit spending.

I have been here for a few years and I remember during the Clinton administration in 1995, I came down to this podium on the floor complaining that President Clinton had come out with a new budget and that budget was \$1.5 trillion. I said, this is unbelievable. It is not sustainable. We can't do it. That was \$1.5 trillion to run this country for a period of 1 year. Now this President has come up with three budgets. Each one of the budgets is a multitrillion-dollar deficit budget. The last one was \$1.65 trillion. This is more than the total amount of money it took to run the entire country. It is all in the President's budget. It comes out initially \$800 billion for stimulus that didn't stimulate. This was something that—I don't know why—either nobody cares or the American people aren't listening. It is very simple. We have a problem because the President spends money as no one else has in history. Here he has right now actually raised the debt—from every President, George Washington to George W. Bush—yet he comes out and says, What are we going to do about spending? The answer is to quit spending.

I hope the American people remember this. This is not the reason, frankly, why I am down here today. In spite of what we have been led to believe in various publications, other things are going on.

There is one piece of legislation I will be introducing tomorrow. I have been working on it for about 6 months, and I have talked to people. We have caucuses in the Senate about every kind of concern. We have an Army caucus, and we have an Air Force caucus. We have caucuses on caucuses. One of the cau-

causes we have is a general aviation caucus. I am particularly sensitive to this in that I have been flying airplanes for over 50 years, and it is one where we are dealing with single issue people.

Anyway, tomorrow, Wednesday, I am going to introduce legislation that is going to be very important to people who are the single issue people who fly airplanes. I know a lot of us don't even care. I have heard people say they are all fat cats. I defy anyone to go up to Osh Kosh once a year, the last weekend of every July, and see the hundreds of thousands of people there who are not wealthy people, they are single issue people. Many of them have made experimental airplanes in their garages. This is something we have enjoyed for many years, and it is something I have enjoyed. I think because of my involvement, I have probably received more complaints and more requests from people out there in the real world—pilots—over things that have happened when the Federal Aviation Administration has cause to try to either revoke their license or give them the fear of revocation.

Over the years, there have been several instances where I have passed legislation to fix the system by which the FAA proceeds in these enforcement actions. I can remember back in the year 2000. Probably yet today the greatest single pilot, most gifted pilot in America is a guy named Bob Hoover. Bob Hoover is up in years now. He is actually older than I am. As am I, he is still flying airplanes. They did what is called an emergency revocation on Bob Hoover. I never did find out what allegedly he did wrong. But it was actually in the field where this great pilot would take a twin engine Shrike up to 10,000 feet, come down and roll right up where the crowd is. He does all of that with a glass of water up there on his dash. He is one of these unbelievable human beings.

Anyway, he came to me and said, What am I going to do? They have taken away my livelihood. All of these airline pilots who make a living flying airplanes could have a revocation. I passed a law. It took 2 years to do it—and it shouldn't have—so if something happens with a pilot and he gets his license revoked, there is a process he can go through that offers appeals and makes it a fair process. So I have been dealing with this for a long period of time. I have to say this: With any bureaucracy that has the power to take action against an individual, it is our job in Congress to ensure there are appropriate safeguards in place to prevent agency overreach. This bill provides that. The bill does simply four things. Those out there who are pilots will understand exactly what I am talking about. First, it requires in an FAA enforcement action against a pilot, in a case where there is enforcement action, the FAA has to grant to the pilot all the relevant evidence, such as the air traffic communications

tapes, flight data, investigative reports, flight service station communications, and other relevant air traffic data 30 days before any action can proceed, an enforcement action against the pilot. That is a matter of fairness. If a person is going to be accused of something, he has to know what he is being accused of. This is currently not done. It often leads to a pilot being grossly uninformed of his alleged violation and recourse.

The same section of the bill requires the FAA to advise a pilot who is the subject of an investigation relating to approval, denial, suspension, modification, or revocation of an airman certificate of the nature of the investigation, that an oral or written response to a letter of investigation is not required, that no action can be taken by the FAA against a pilot for declining to respond, that any response can be used as evidence against the pilot, and that the FAA's investigative report is available.

That sounds like a lot of talk. All we are saying is the pilot is entitled to have all the information other people have. I will give a good example. One of the things we know—and I have heard this all of my 55 years of flying—is that when you talk to a controller—he can be a controller at a control tower or anything else—that they have to keep that recording and the pilot can have access to the recording. I have always thought this was true until something happened to me and I found out that isn't true. So this means that until we change it, that is not going to happen.

Secondly, it clarifies "statutory deference"—that is a legal term—as it relates to the National Transportation Safety Board on actions by the FAA. This is what happens. The FAA would do something, and this could theoretically be appealed to the NTSB. The problem with that is, the NTSB—the National Transportation Safety Board—has routinely rubberstamped anything that comes from the FAA. It is called statutory deference. So that decision has been able to take place in the appeals process.

To give an example, in fiscal year 2010, there were 362 aviation certificate appeals filed with the NTSB's Office of Administrative Law Judges. The Board's judges held 61 hearings on these appeals and reversed the FAA order only 5 times. Also during this time period there were 40 petitions seeking review of FAA emergency determinations. Of these, 6 were procedurally defective and were dismissed and on that basis, and 10 were voluntarily withdrawn. The remaining 24 petitions were considered on their merits with only 1—1—being granted out of 23 being denied. So we know this is a serious problem.

What this does is not only clean up statutory deference, but it does a second thing. It allows an airman at his own discretion to be able to appeal to the Federal District Court.

The third thing the bill does is require that the FAA undertake a notice

to airmen. This is kind of complicated. But a notice to airmen is called a NOTAM. A NOTAM is something they are supposed to involve the people in—the pilots flying—so if they are going to go to a certain airport, they will have all the information as to what is wrong with that airport—a system might be down; a number of things can take place. But, nonetheless, it simplifies that system. Any pilot knows what a NOTAM is, but for those who don't, they are notices provided by the FAA to give information to pilots about air space, runways, flight conditions, and all that. The procedure hasn't worked, because they have actually said there are NOTAMs and they didn't even file the NOTAMs and there is no way for the pilot to be able to tell if there is a NOTAM out there, even though he is required to determine that there is. The current system says it is the pilot's responsibility to be aware of a NOTAM even if the FAA has not posted it.

Fourth and finally, the FAA's medical notification process has long been known for a multitude of problems. Of all the requests for assistance the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association receives each year—28 percent of all of the legal assistance—28 percent are related to the FAA's medical certification process. The bill requires a review of the FAA's medical certification process and forms, to provide greater clarity in the questions and reduce the instances of misinterpretation that have, in the past, led to allegations of intentional falsification against pilots. Nonprofit general aviation groups, aviation medical examiners, and other qualified medical experts will make up an advisory panel to advise the Administrator, again giving the right people a voice in the overall determination. So this is just an advisory board. The same way with revamping the NOTAM process. These are advisory boards that are to work with the FAA in coming up with a system.

There are two provisions in the bill that will require an FAA review of current practices and two other provisions that make the system specifically fairer for pilots.

After years of intervening to help fellow pilots, I was never fully appreciative of the feeling of desperation until it happened to me. This happened last October. I was flying a group of nonpilots in my twin engine—one of my planes, a twin engine, it holds six people—we were flying into Cameron County Airport. A lot of people don't realize how big Texas is. It is way down on the tip of Texas. It is about the same distance south as Key Biscayne, FL, or some place down there, but it is way down there. I used to be a builder and developer there. I have landed there over 200 times. I was flying a group down there. The Corpus Approach handed me off to Valley Approach who took me all the way down to runway 13. I will actually read what they said. Approach control said: You

are cleared for visual approach to runway 13. Then I responded, and he said: Yes, 115 echo alpha roger, before you go there is traffic that appears to be in the pattern landing there at 900 feet. That is fine.

So this is what they do. That is wonderful.

I started landing, and you get to a point in a twin-engine plane full of people where you have slowed down enough where you cannot make a go-around. I was almost touching down when I saw they were working on the runway. It was too late to go around.

The three problems I had and have heard about countless times from pilots, which we correct with this legislation: When I tried to get the voice recording, it took me 4 months, and I am a Senator. I thought: What about these people out there and the frustration they are going through? We will correct that. I was required to respond to allegations within 10 days or they would proceed in an enforcement action against me. By the time I received the 10-day notice, there were only 4 days left to respond to the accusations, enforcement actions, and I did not even know the reason for the enforcement actions. And, No. 3, we found out the NOTAMs were never posted by the FAA until 11 days after this took place. In other words, I did nothing wrong. But at any time I could have suffered a revocation of my license.

I think it is important to mention that most of the people who work at the FAA—be it the controllers, inspectors, investigators—are helpful.

This year is my 32nd consecutive year to attend the Osh Kosh fly-in. The first thing I always do is go up there and talk to all the controllers. They are up there as volunteers, and I thank them for what they are doing.

Less than 2 weeks ago, I was flying from Oklahoma to Wyoming. I called on an instrument flight. I had to get an IFR clearance at 5 o'clock in the morning. The guy was so courteous, I asked him his name. It is Bill Liebeno. He could not have been more helpful to me. Talk about giving me all the NOTAMs, he said: The localizer is out, the DME is out, Runway 14-32 is closed, taxiway B is closed, the approach lights are out. He could not have been more factual.

I have a lot more to talk about. I know there are others who want to speak before this very significant vote that is coming up at 5 o'clock, which I think is a live quorum call. I would only say this: I am going to introduce this bill on Wednesday. If there is anyone here—we already have Senators BEGICH and JOHANNIS, who are the co-chairs of the Senate Aviation Caucus. Of course, this is bipartisan. They are on as cosponsors. We have several others as cosponsors.

I would say to any staff—I know no Members are listening—who happen to be listening right now, if your Member wants to at least be sensitive to the needs of general aviation, this may be

his or her only chance this year. I suggest those individuals who care about the problems I outlined become cosponsors of this legislation before I introduce it tomorrow afternoon.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I, as well as many Americans, am concerned about the future of our country. I am concerned we may not be able to continue to pay our bills. I am concerned one day in the near future we could look like Greece. I do not want to see America rioting in the streets because we cannot pay our bills. That day is coming. It is coming in the near future if we do not wake up to the problem.

I am not alone. Members of the President's own administration have said that the No. 1 threat to our national security is our national debt. It is out of control. August 2 is fast approaching. August 2 is when the debt ceiling is reached.

What is the debt ceiling? It is like reaching your credit card limit. If you have a \$5,000 a month credit card limit, and you have reached it, do you call the company and say: Give me more credit or do you try to live within your means? Do you try to only spend what money you have? We as a country have been spending money we do not have. But it has now gotten out of control. We owe China \$1.1 trillion. We owe Japan nearly \$1 trillion. A spending addiction is our problem. It is out of control.

We are spending \$10 billion a day. Of that \$10 billion a day, we are borrowing \$4 billion. We are spending \$100,000 every second. Of that \$100,000 a second, we are borrowing \$45,000 a second.

We are paying for our debt at historically low interest rates, about 2.5 percent. But many of us have lived through a time when interest rates were much higher. The historic average is over 5 percent. If interest rates go back to the historic average, we will be swamped in debt. Interest will become, over the next 10 years, \$5 trillion.

This is what looms. Our future is not a good one unless we get things under control. So last week a group of us said no more. We do not want to discuss anything else until we start discussing solutions for the debt, solutions for the looming debt crisis. We said no more. So today we will win and draw attention back to the debt ceiling. We are not going to talk about anything until we resolve this issue. But we have to have a real discussion. It has to include Republicans and Democrats and Independents and everyone. But do you know what is going on. There is a resolution before the Senate now. The Democrats say: Raise taxes and that will fix the problem.

The problem is not revenue. The problem is spending. We used to spend

about 1 in 5 dollars up here. Now we are spending 1 in 4 dollars. So 1 in 4 dollars of the economy is coming to Washington. Twenty-five percent of the GDP is spent in Washington. That is money that is not left in the marketplace, not left in the hands of those who earned it, and not left in the hands of people who can create jobs. It is being wasted up here.

We are not spending the money wisely. We spend more than we take in, so the interest to finance this profligate spending is bankrupting us. The vast majority of our problem is interest, and it will grow. It is growing exponentially. You can look at this chart I have in the Chamber and you will see that interest is going to consume us. As you can see from the chart, as the debt rises, it rises exponentially in the next few years, unless we do something about it.

Unfortunately, I do not think the Democrats are serious. They have produced a resolution that says they can raise taxes, which is a nonstarter. It is a horrible prescription for an economy in the middle of a recession, and it is not going anywhere.

We have proposed a resolution that could fix the problem. Our resolution says that government can simply not act any differently than individuals, that they should have to balance their budget. We have introduced a resolution that says we, as Republicans, will vote to raise the debt ceiling if we do three things: significant cuts in Federal spending, at least back to the percentage we were before we got into this administration; statutory caps, saying we are limited as to how much money we can spend each year; and the third thing is we want a balanced budget amendment. If we have these, we will raise the debt ceiling. But short of that, we cannot possibly vote to raise the debt ceiling unless government changes its ways.

Government is not spending your money wisely. People cannot account for—even the Pentagon cannot balance its books. They refuse to be audited because they say they are too big to be audited. We have to do something about a government that is out of control. But we want a serious dialog with the other side. Instead what we are getting is frivolousness.

What I would say to the Democrats today is: You want to vote on raising taxes? You think that is an answer? They have a resolution. I do not want to filibuster their resolution. I will vote on it tonight. If you want a vote on raising taxes—if the Democratic Party wants to be the party of raising taxes, I am happy to be in the party that says that is not the answer.

I call for a vote immediately, today. If Democrats want to raise taxes, let's do it. I am happy to vote on that today because it is not the answer. If the other side wants to have a full-throated debate on this issue, let's do it. Let's debate over the next 2 days, and then we have a solution. Let us

vote on raising the debt ceiling. We will do it in the next 2 days. We do not have to wait. Raise the debt ceiling, contingent upon a balanced budget amendment. The American people demand it, and I think we should ask for nothing less.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from South Carolina after I make a few remarks.

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

LIBYA

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, it is pretty obvious that the Senate feels that its priorities—and I think they are well placed, particularly in light of the fact that the Fourth of July recess was canceled because of the issue of the debt limit and the deficit and our lack of action and need for action on the issue—I understand that and have suggested and agreed that this resolution on Libya be delayed. However, I would point out that the Senate does need to have a debate about United States policy and military action in Libya.

Whether my colleagues are supportive of what we are doing in Libya or not I think is an issue that needs to be debated on the floor of the Senate. I believe the Senate does play a constitutional role and maybe even a more unique one than the other body. So I think it is time we did have a debate, discussion of this issue, and an opinion rendered in keeping with the War Powers Act.

Unfortunately, the administration has made it far more difficult than it otherwise might have been if we had carried out our responsibilities and the President carried out his responsibilities some months ago. The fact is this conflict would have been over if we had taken a leadership role and declared a no-fly zone when the rebel forces were on their way to Benghazi.

The fact is, if the United States had used the full weight of its air assets in this conflict, Qadhafi would be gone now. And I would tell my colleagues, have no doubt, Qadhafi will go. He will go. The question is when. And what role did the United States of America play in supporting these people who are fighting for freedom? What role did the United States of America play in trying to free up Qadhafi's ill-gotten gains and have them given to the Transitional National Council? What role did the United States play in leading from behind in Libya?

The United States of America leads, not NATO. We lead NATO. And when someone says NATO is leading on this conflict, I would remind my colleagues, of the 28 members of NATO, only 8 members are actually in the fight, and one of our major allies, Germany, has taken a hike.

So if we had used the AC-130 gunships, the A-10 Warthog close air support capability, Qadhafi would be

gone now. But the fact is, he will go, and it is up to us, in my view, to express our support of people who are seeking the same rights and freedoms that are guaranteed to us.

I would remind my colleagues who said we never should have been involved in any way, it is a fact that Qadhafi and his forces were at the gates of Benghazi, a city of 700,000 people, and Qadhafi has said he would go house to house and kill—and kill—whoever they thought had resisted them.

We say we should never have allowed Srebrenica, where 8,000 people were massacred. We say we should never have allowed Rwanda to happen. We say we should never have allowed the Holocaust to happen. The United States did the right thing by stopping Qadhafi's forces at the gates of Benghazi and preventing the massacre of I do not know how many thousands of innocent civilians.

There is no doubt what Qadhafi has promised if he is able to remain in power—a man who has the blood of Americans on his hands because of the bombing of Pan Am 103, because of terrorist acts he supported in Africa—he will do so again and has pledged to do so.

When my colleagues ask what American national security interests are at stake, look at the man's past actions and look at what he has promised to do if he is able to stay in power; and that is, to pose a direct threat to the United States of America's vital national security interests.

We are involved in Libya. My colleague from South Carolina will testify we are providing refueling. We are providing intelligence. We are providing all kinds of assistance. We are including using Predators, which are killing the bad guys. So to somehow allege that the United States is not engaged in hostilities which would trigger the War Powers Act is simply sophistry. The Senate has been silent on this issue for too long, in my view.

But I also want to caution my colleagues about preventing United States action as well as authorizing.

The last time the Congress of the United States of America engaged in cutting off funding was at the end of the Vietnam war. Whether historians or people happen to acknowledge it, a lot of bad things happened after we cut off funding in Vietnam. Amongst them was millions of Vietnamese put in re-education camps and thousands slaughtered. So I would caution my colleagues about actions of Congress which prohibit certain actions on the part of the administration. But most of all, America should lead.

We should use our air assets, not our ground assets, to get rid of this brutal dictator and his regime. Every day that goes by innocent civilians in Libya are wounded and killed.

So I would ask my colleague from South Carolina if he has a few words, but also to address the issue of how much U.S. involvement actually is

there, which would then—by most objective observers—trigger the Congress's requirement to act in keeping with the War Powers Act and our constitutional obligations.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I thank the Senator. I will give my thoughts as briefly as I can. My first thought is that we live in incredibly dangerous times—exciting and dangerous. What is the Arab spring about? What are people asking for in Libya? They are asking to replace Qadhafi and form a new government where they will have a say. I do not think that is too much to ask.

All I can say is that America's freedom is best secured when she, America, is assisting others to obtain theirs. And the one thing history tells us, free people settle their differences without resorting to the evils of war. So to those in this body and throughout the country—I know we are broke. We are here today to supposedly talk about the budget. Well, we are not doing anything but talking. We are \$14.3 trillion in debt. There are all kinds of ideas between Republicans and Democrats about how to get the country's fiscal house in order. It is July 5. We are here looking at each other doing nothing. But there is another part of the world, as the Senate and the House basically talk about America being in debt, where people are dying, as I speak, trying to change their government for the better.

What should we do? I will tell you what we should do. We should help where we can. Senator McCAIN has experienced war unlike very few people in this body. He knows when we go to war bad things happen to good people. The idea that he or myself or anybody else relishes trying to go to war or being in war is offensive, quite frankly. He knows better than I, and I have a pretty good understanding of what happens when we go to war.

But here is what happens when we do not go to war sometimes: Bad people are able to do incredible things that we wind up having to confront later, and it costs everybody more to have waited.

So what are we doing in Libya? We are following rather than leading. Now, to Senator McCAIN's question. NATO's bombing activities are being done without American air power. We spend more money than all NATO nations combined on defense. I know a lot of Americans do not like that. I do not like it either, but it is the way it is. We are the arsenal of democracy.

When America does not fly, wars go on longer, more people get raped, more people get killed. Let me tell you, if Qadhafi survives this is the end of NATO.

If you do not want America to go alone in this dangerous world, count me in. But who are we going to partner with? If the U.N. is seen by the American people as an unreliable group to deal with dictators—and it is—what if NATO is no longer an organization that people throughout the world respect on

the side of good, and the evil side of the ledger does not care if NATO gets involved because they do not have the will to do anything about it?

So we should be involved with our NATO partners. Our NATO partners depend on Libya more than we do. They came to Afghanistan not because they were attacked but because we were attacked. They are our friends. They are our allies. They have been with us trying to make sure Afghanistan never goes back into the darkness, a place that attacked us or them again.

So when they need us, I will tell President Obama: Now is not the time to sit on the sidelines. I know we are a war-weary Nation, but there is no upside to Qadhafi staying in power. That is a national security nightmare for this country.

Here is a recent headline: Qadhafi threatens to attack Europe over airstrikes. Colonel Qadhafi has threatened to carry out attacks against homes, offices, families in Europe unless NATO stops its campaign of air strikes against his regime in Libya. He actually means it. Hitler meant it. He means it.

So we should be talking about the debt; we are not. We should be taking a stand against Qadhafi in an effective way. As Senator McCAIN said, we are leading from behind. I just cannot tell you how upset I am with policies coming from this administration that are sending the signal to our allies that we are not as reliable as we should be, and to our enemies that we do not have the same amount of will to protect our freedom as they do to take it away from us.

Mr. McCAIN. I would ask my friend, is it not true that we are providing tanker support, logistics support, Predator strikes, intelligence, and all kinds of assets to those eight nations that are involved in the fight? When we are using Predators and killing people, that pretty well fits the definition of "hostilities." Yet, for reasons which are still not clear to me, the administration fails to acknowledge that.

Could I also say one thing that is very concerning as well is this recognition of the Transitional National Council. I know my colleague—because we were just in Turkey—noticed that another country, Turkey, one of the most important nations in the Middle East, just recognized the Transitional National Council, froze the assets that Qadhafi has. Yet this administration refuses to do so. There is some \$30 billion, I am told, of Qadhafi assets that we could freeze and make available to the Transitional National Council. It may require some legislative action, but it requires administration leadership. They could then pay people, could provide arms and weapons to their own people, as well as subsidies for the government.

Again, an example of leading from behind—the French, the Italians, the Turks, and other nations have all now recognized the Transitional National

Council. Yet the United States has failed to do so.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I could try to answer the hostility question. When we are using Predator drones to bring down military targets, that, to me, is an acceptable situation in Libya. I do not want ground troops in Libya. The people in Libya do not want a ground invasion by NATO forces. They want our help. And what do we have to offer better than anybody in the world? Intelligence gathering. These platforms that are gathering information about targets are unique to America.

The target packages that are being put together are being done mostly by Americans, and we are turning these target packages over to NATO countries. Some of the aircraft that are flying—and God bless our allies for taking this risk—are 30 years old. No one has the ability like the American Air Force and naval forces to carry on aerial campaigns.

But some people in this body have a right to have their say like we do. We should be debating this, but the administration's position that a Predator drone attack is not a hostile act is dangerous because in Yemen, the administration, with my full support, is taking the fight to Yemen today. They are using Predator drone attacks against al-Qaida groups in Yemen. We just had special forces involved in killing al-Qaida operatives in Somalia. We have to be on the offensive. We need to be hitting these people over there before they can reorganize and hit us here.

So I support the administration's ability and constitutional right to take the fight to the enemy. But for them to tell the body these are not hostile acts is the ultimate confusion. It is confusing to the enemy; it is confusing to our allies; it is confusing to the American people. I reject this definition being offered by this administration that using Predator drones to attack targets is not a hostile act.

I believe the War Powers Act is unconstitutional. There are two things we can do in this body as a Member of Congress: We can declare war and we can cut off funding when we do not like things the way they are going. We very seldom declare war in this Nation from a congressional point of view for a reason. But we have constantly engaged forces that wish to attack us and our allies without declarations of war. If you do not like what we are doing in Libya, cut off funding. Do not try to micromanage the war through congressional fiat.

So \$30 billion is available to the Libyan people. It is money frozen, stolen by Qadhafi. The Turkish Government, the French, the British in some sense have recognized this Transitional National Council. If we would do that, they would have access to the \$30 billion.

Senator MCCAIN met with the leadership of this council. I have too. They would gladly pay us back for any assistance we could provide if they could

get their hands on the money. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. MCCAIN. I have been assured personally by the leadership of the Transitional National Council—by the way, one who has a doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh, and their Finance Minister was an economics professor at the University of Washington. So let's dispel any illusions about we do not know who they are. They are good and decent people who have risen up against an oppressive and repressive dictator and murderer. They want to reimburse the United States for our expenses, the way the Kuwaitis and the Saudis did after Operation Desert Storm.

But the point is that, again, anybody who believes that it is not in America's national security interest to see Qadhafi gone has paid no attention to his words and his actions. History will record how the United States stood on people who were struggling both peacefully and where it necessitated the use of force of arms, is where the United States of America was.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I may, we have our good colleague, a Naval intelligence officer, Senator KIRK from Illinois, and we will certainly yield to him now. But one last thought.

America needs to do two things quickly: We need to get our fiscal house in order. We need to balance our budget and decide among ourselves how important is this national security. To me, it is the No. 1 thing we should do in Congress. If we do not get that right, there is nothing else that is going to matter. There will never be economic prosperity in America if the world is in the hands of evil people who will make it very difficult to travel and trade and do business.

The other thing we need to do, after we balance our budget, is to have a clear vision of who we are and what we believe. I believe we are destined to lead the free world. I do not consider it a burden. I consider it the birthright of all Americans, not only to maintain our freedom but to help others secure theirs.

A word of warning: The day that America rejects that leadership role is a day we will eventually lose our freedom and more damage will be done to this country if we disengage than if we do engage.

So with that, I would like to recognize Senator KIRK from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to agree with the Senator on the Libya resolution. But I understand from the majority leader that we are not going to take up the Libya resolution now. I would just urge them—before we descend into any potential partisan warfare on any other issue, there is a bill that is ready for the Senate's consideration right now that was overwhelmingly, unanimously approved by Democrats and Republicans on the Appropriations Committee, and it is ready for Senate consideration this week.

My hope is that we will now, or maybe tomorrow, take up the Military

Construction and VA appropriations bill, which Senator JOHNSON and I have coauthored, and which Senator INOUE and the Senator COCHRAN have approved. It is \$1.2 billion in discretionary spending below the President's request. It is \$620 million below the enacted level. It is even \$2.6 million in budget authority below the House mark. This is ready to go.

So absent debate on some other resolution which has little to no future in the House of Representatives, my hope is that we will follow the House that has already approved the VA-MILCON appropriations bill, and we will take up overwhelmingly bipartisan legislation that benefits our men and women in uniform and those veterans, and that we will not waste this week on legislation that has little to no future. Instead, we will achieve something this week by having taken up the MILCON-VA bill, which was so overwhelmingly approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee just last week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend's advice. We are working to make sure the week is spent relating to the No. 1 issue facing the country today; that is, how to make sure we get a handle on deficit spending.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 3]

Casey	Kirk	Schumer
Cornyn	McCain	Stabenow
Graham	Nelson (NE)	Tester
Isakson	Paul	Webb
Johanns	Reid	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the majority leader. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators desiring to vote or change their vote?

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCCONNELL. the following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—83

Akaka	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Ayotte	Hagan	Paul
Baucus	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Hatch	Pryor
Bennet	Hoeben	Reed
Bingaman	Hutchison	Reid
Blumenthal	Inouye	Risch
Blunt	Isakson	Roberts
Boozman	Johanns	Rockefeller
Boxer	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Brown (MA)	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kerry	Schumer
Cantwell	Kirk	Sessions
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Kohl	Shelby
Casey	Landrieu	Snowe
Chambliss	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Coats	Leahy	Tester
Cochran	Levin	Thune
Collins	Lugar	Toomey
Conrad	Manchin	Toomey
Coons	McCaïn	Udall (CO)
Corker	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Webb
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Moran	Wicker
Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)	Wyden

NAYS—8

Barrasso	Enzi	McConnell
Coburn	Graham	Vitter
Cornyn	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Heller	Lieberman
Burr	Kyl	Murkowski
DeMint	Lee	Murray

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to 39 service members from California or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom since December 7, 2010. This brings to 276 the number of service members either from California or based in California who have been killed while serving our country in Afghanistan. This represents 17 percent of all U.S. deaths in Afghanistan.

CPL Kenneth E. Necochea Jr., 21, of San Diego, CA, died December 12 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when insurgents attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Corporal Necochea was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY.

CPL Derek T. Simonetta, 21, of Redwood City, CA, died December 12 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when insurgents at-

tacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Corporal Simonetta was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY.

SSgt Justin E. Schmalstieg, 28, of Pittsburgh, PA, died December 15 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Schmalstieg was assigned to the 1st Explosive Ordnance Disposal Company, 7th Engineer Support Battalion, 1st Marine Logistics Group, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

LCpl Jose L. Maldonado, 21, of Mathis, TX, died December 17 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Lance Corporal Maldonado was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Cpl Eric M. Torbert Jr., 25, of Lancaster, PA, died December 18 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Corporal Torbert was assigned to the 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

PFC Conrado D. Javier Diaz Jr., 19, of Marina, CA, died December 20 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his vehicle with an improvised explosive device. Private First Class Javier Diaz was assigned to the 3rd Squadron, 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment, Vilseck, Germany.

LCpl Kenneth A. Corzine, 23, of Bethalto, IL, died December 24 of wounds received December 5 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Lance Corporal Corzine was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Cpl Tevan L. Nguyen, 21, of Hutto, TX, died December 28 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Corporal Nguyen was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

MAJ Evan J. Mooldyk, 47, of Ranch Muriesto, CA, died January 12 in Khowst Province, Afghanistan, in a noncombat-related incident. Major Mooldyk was assigned to the 19th Sustainment Command, 377th Theater Sustainment Command, Belle Chasse, LA.

PO2 Class Dominique Cruz, 26, of Panama City, FL, was found during search and rescue operations January 19 in the Gulf of Oman after being reported missing January 18. Petty Officer 2nd Class Cruz was assigned as an operations specialist to the USS Halsey homeported in San Diego, CA.

Sgt Jason G. Amores, 29, of Lehigh Acres, FL, died January 20 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Sergeant

Amores was assigned to 3rd Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

SPC Rudolph R. Hizon, 22, of Los Angeles, CA, died February 28 in Logar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when insurgents attacked his unit using an improvised explosive device. Specialist Hizon was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 30th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Polk, LA.

Sgt Jason M. Weaver, 22, of Anaheim, CA, died March 3 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when insurgents attacked his unit using an improvised explosive device. Sergeant Weaver was assigned to the 504th Military Police Battalion, 42nd Military Police Brigade, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA.

Cpl Jordan R. Stanton, 20, of Rancho Santa Margarita, CA, died March 4 while conducting combat operations in Helmand Province, Afghanistan. Corporal Stanton was assigned to the 2nd Reconnaissance Battalion, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, NC.

SSG Mark C. Wells, 31, of San Jose, CA, died March 5 in Helmand Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when insurgents attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Staff Sergeant Wells was assigned to the 45th Sustainment Brigade, 8th Theater Sustainment Command, Schofield Barracks, HI.

SSG Eric S. Trueblood, 27, of Alameda, CA, died March 10 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device. Staff Sergeant Trueblood was assigned to the 391st Combat Sustainment Support Battalion, 16th Sustainment Brigade, Spinelli Barracks, Mannheim, Germany.

PFC Arturo E. Rodriguez, 19, of Bellflower, CA, died March 12 in Paktika Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when insurgents attacked his unit using small arms fire. Private First Class Rodriguez was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 506th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY.

SPC Rudy A. Acosta, 19, of Canyon Country, CA, died March 19 in Kandahar Province, Afghanistan, of wounds suffered when he was allegedly shot with small arms fire by an individual from a military security group. Specialist Acosta was assigned to the 4th Squadron, 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment, Vilseck, Germany.

SPC Jameson L. Lindskog, 23, of Pleasanton, CA, died March 29 of wounds suffered when enemy forces attacked his unit with small arms fire in Konar Province, Afghanistan. Specialist Lindskog was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY.