



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2013

No. 8

Senate

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 2013)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, we shout praises to You, for Your love never fails. You rescue us from trouble with Your loving and mighty providence. We commend our Nation to Your compassionate care, trusting You to guide it with Your merciful hands.

Bless the work of our Senators. Help them to respect and esteem each other as they struggle together for resolution of complex issues.

Lord, we thank You for the many people working on Capitol Hill who support our lawmakers, serving You faithfully, without public recognition. May we never take for granted their labors for liberty.

We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 23, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HEIDI HEITKAMP, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HEITKAMP thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING NEW MEMBERS

Mr. REID. Madam President, yesterday I had the opportunity to meet with my Democratic Senate caucus for the first time this year. It was the first opportunity for all of us to sit down together, to break bread, and to discuss challenges and opportunities we all face. As the majority leader, I was gratified to see so many new faces and to have such an inclusive caucus. It was music to my ears to hear the announcement that the Presiding Officer today would be HEIDI HEITKAMP.

We have nine new Democratic Senators. Four of these new Senators are women, and so about one-third of our Democratic caucus is now women. We have, for example, the first Asian woman. We have expanded our majority. I am particularly satisfied that with each passing election cycle our caucus better reflects the Nation it serves. But despite the diversity of the caucus—and in particular its freshmen—there is one quality shared by each Democratic Senator: deep and abiding patriotism.

As Governor Adlai Stevenson said:

Patriotism is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime.

That is true. Patriotism is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime. If we look at the records, the careers of these new Senators, that is the way it is.

Each person coming here reminds me of my first few weeks in the House of Representatives when Tip O'Neill—we had a large incoming class, so he called us in these groups of maybe 15 or so, and he told us something I have always remembered. He said: Each of you are successful politicians or you wouldn't be here. And that is true. I say that to each of my new Senators. They are successful politicians, and there is nothing wrong with the word "politician." I am proud I am a politician. I am proud I serve in government, and we should each be proud.

So I am pleased now, and I was pleased yesterday, to be surrounded by so many dedicated public servants, new Members and old alike, who have devoted their lives to making their individual States and our shared Nation a better place in which to grow up, grow a family, and grow old.

Each new Democratic Member is accomplished, I repeat, in his or her own right. Our new caucus members include a couple of former Governors, a Harvard law professor, an engineer, just to name a few. While they have each accomplished so much already, their greatest achievements are still ahead of them. I know they will look back with satisfaction on the work we do together in the Senate.

Our caucus, this Congress, and our country face immense challenges. As we approach these tests and trials, this diverse group of new Democratic Senators will be united by a single objective: to fight for fairness and balance on behalf of the middle class.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S189

SENATE RULES REFORM

We are going to continue to work on Senate rules reforms. I will continue to work with the Republican leader on a package of reforms I hope we can agree on. As I have said before, if we don't agree, then we are going to do something as a Democratic caucus alone. I remain cautiously optimistic we will be able to move forward on a bipartisan basis. I hope we can do that. I will have more to say about that if, in fact, we can do that.

We are not going to get everything we want, and the Republicans aren't going to get everything they want. But maybe we can find a sweet spot in the middle and come up with something that will make the Senate more efficient. However, Democrats reserve the right of all Senators to propose changes to the Senate rules. We will explicitly not acquiesce in the carrying over of all the rules from last Congress. There must be some agreement reached or we will have to use every means to make the Congress—especially the Senate—more efficient.

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. COATS. Madam President, earlier this week, through the eyes of the Nation watched the inauguration ceremony here in Washington. A week before that, back in Indiana, I was present for the celebration of the inauguration of Indiana's 50th Governor, former Congressman Mike Pence, who is taking over after 8 years of leadership under our former Governor, Mitch Daniels. So back-to-back weekends had two special events.

Inauguration ceremonies are a time for reflection on what has happened in the past and a time for new vision on how we ought to go forward with the future. It is also a time for new oppor-

tunity. An opportunity for the kind of change necessary to address the problems and challenges we face.

As I participated in the inauguration events for Governor Pence in Indianapolis just two weekends ago, I couldn't help but think of the remarkable record of achievement and the bold reforms that our former Governor, Mitch Daniels, delivered to the Hoosier State and the lessons they may offer to Washington.

In 2005, Indiana faced a several-hundred-million-dollar deficit. This pales by comparison to the deficit we face here; but, nevertheless, for a State of our size it is a significant amount. Although it is constitutionally mandated in Indiana, we had not balanced our budget for 7 years. Governor Daniels and his team had a vision and the political courage to make much needed changes, and the people of Indiana supported and responded. While other States increased spending and raised taxes, Indiana reduced spending, cut taxes, and paid down our debts.

Governor Daniels, with the help of the legislature and with the support of the people of Indiana, slowed down the rate of spending. The State's expenditures have grown at less than one-quarter the rate of the previous decade. We also reduced the size of State government.

Indiana has the fewest State employees per capita in the country. We paid down the previous debt by 43 percent, and we currently sit with a budget surplus and a rebate program which will give money collected in taxes back to the taxpayer because of our state's efficiency and effectiveness in terms of running our government. Indiana, as a result of this, has received its first AAA credit rating. This means when we do need to borrow or sell bonds to do certain infrastructure or meet other needs, we can receive low interest rates because of our superb AAA rating. All this has transformed Indiana's balance sheet and made our State one of the most attractive places to live, raise a family, and do business in the Midwest, if not in the Nation.

The story of Indiana and how it got hold of its fiscal issues has been written up in national journals and newspapers and documentaries and others. It is a remarkable story. It is not unique because we see these things happening in other States around the country led not only by Republican Governors but Democrat Governors. These are the kinds of decisions that have to be made and are being made to restore state and local governments. And it has created a much brighter future for the citizens of those States.

Governor Daniels has often said, "You'd be amazed by how much government you'll never miss." The results of his administration back that up.

You can go around Indiana, as I have, and talk to people from big cities to small, rural to urban and everything in between and ask them how we have

moved from deficit to surplus in our state. You can ask if they still believe our state performs the necessary functions of government and you can ask Hoosiers what has been cut that you think should have stayed.

Frankly, no one could come up with an answer that says: We have had disastrous consequences from these decisions. The vast majority say that things are working pretty well. In fact, I can get my license renewed through a total revamp of our licensing system in just a few minutes over the Internet or just a few minutes at the DMV. Governor Daniels' measure for that was in and out in less than 7 minutes.

For those of us who have spent hours and hours committing half a day or more to getting our license renewed, this is a remarkable achievement. The use of technology, privatization, and the use of more efficient government demands that our civil servants do more with less and this has proven to be effective.

While the fiscal situation we faced in Indiana is not totally analogous to what we face here, the principles are the same, and there still are many similarities. As Washington seeks answers at the start of this new session of Congress on how we move forward and address our extremely serious debt situation and get our fiscal house back in order so that we too can retain a AAA rating and so we too can provide the opportunity for growth and opportunity not just for the middle class but for all Americans in the future, maybe there are some lessons to be learned from Indiana. The spend less, borrow less, and tax less Hoosier model has resulted in balanced budgets, job creation, and a AAA credit rating. In contrast, the spend more, borrow more, and tax more approach in Washington during these last several years has resulted in fewer jobs, higher debt, and a threatened downgrade from credit agencies.

So as we reflect back on the last 4 years of this current administration, it is clear to me we must take a different course in the second term of this administration.

Whether lawmakers want to admit it, the crux of our problem is this: Washington has promised Americans far too much and committed well beyond our means. Federal spending and borrowing cannot continue at this current pace without dire consequences.

Whether one is reading or listening to a liberal, conservative or a non-partisan economist or an analyst, there is a consensus that sustaining our current rate or continuing our rate of borrowing and spending simply is not feasible and the consequences will be dire if we do not address it.

As we seek to address these issues, my suggestion for Washington is to take a look at the Hoosier model. It is tested, it is proven, and it is working.

We need to go big and bold. We need to have the political courage to look beyond the short-term political consequences, as we perceive them, to the

long-term benefit from sound policies—which, interestingly enough, translate into good politics. Strengthening the economy and getting our country on a track to brighter and more prosperous times should be our priority.

We have proven in Indiana that good policy, no matter how politically difficult it might seem at the time to achieve, does translate into good politics. But much more important than the politics, good policy can translate into strengthening our economy, improving the lives of Americans, and providing opportunity for future generations.

It is time we learn that lesson in Washington that our State of Indiana and many States across the country, as well as other communities, are learning. It is time we exhibit the political courage to stand and do what I think just about everyone in this body understands; that is, to get a hold of runaway spending and borrowing that is putting us in a very deep fiscal hole and will have significant, dire consequences not only on future generations but even our current generation.

The time is now. As I said from this spot yesterday, 2013 is the decisive year. In 2014, we will be back into an election year, and that tired old belief that we cannot make these kinds of changes with the election looming will surface again. If we don't act now, more people will say that we need to wait until after the next election. It will push us into 2015. Many who have looked at our situation fiscally and analyzed it from a nonpartisan, non-ideological basis have said 2015 is too late.

This is the time when we need to summon our courage, summon our political will, and do what is right for the American people. We cannot continue to bump along at less than 2 percent growth. We cannot continue to keep more than 8 percent or nearly 8 percent of our people unemployed; and, obviously, that number is much higher when we count those who are no longer looking for work who have given up. We cannot continue to keep America on the edge of uncertainty in terms of what our fiscal future will look like.

Let us summon that courage to go forward. Let us use examples from those States, the support of those Governors and the support they have received from people across those States. Let us summon the courage to do what we need to do.

I want to continue talking about how we need to address this with a "go big, go bold" type of approach. Everyone says and concludes that if we can put that package together to address our long-term ills over a period of time and bring us back to balance and stability, we will see a revival of the economy of this country and we will see great hope for the American people going forward.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask the Acting President pro tempore if we are in morning business, and I assume we are.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Madam President.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBERTS pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 8 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, President Obama may have been vague on details in his inaugural speech on Monday, but I will give him this, he couldn't have been clearer about the tone and the direction he has in mind for the second term. Gone is the postpartisan rhetoric that propelled him onto the national stage and into the White House. In its place is an unabashedly leftwing appeal for more bureaucratic control and centralized power here in Washington.

On Monday, we saw a President and a party that appeared to have shifted into reverse and jammed on the gas. For Democrats in the Obama age, the era of big government being over is officially over. And anybody who disagrees with their approach isn't just wrong, they are not just standing in the way of progress, they are malevolent, they are the bad guys, they are the ones who want to take food away from children, they want the old and the infirm to suffer, they want to choose between caring for the people who built this country, as the President put it on Monday, and investing in those who will build our future.

I don't know if the President buys all this stuff; I don't know if he believes his own caricature—I certainly hope not—but one thing I do know is that questioning the intentions of one's political opponents makes it awfully hard

to get anything done in a representative democracy. As the President himself said, without so much as a hint of irony, we cannot mistake absolutism for principle or substitute spectacle for politics or treat name calling as reasoned debate.

The President won the election. I congratulate him on his victory. It is his prerogative to lay out an agenda and to make an argument—against all evidence—for the efficacy of big government, more Washington spending, and centralization. It is even his prerogative to argue—mistakenly, in my view—that America's greatness somehow rests not on its communities and voluntary associations, its churches and charities, on civil society, but instead on the dictates of Washington. But to suggest that those of us and our constituents who believe otherwise don't want the best interest of our parents or our children or our country's future is, at best, needlessly provocative; at worst, it suggests a troubling inability to view those who don't happen to share your opinions as beneath you.

To suggest, as one of the President's spokesmen did earlier this week, that both the American political system and those who belong to the party of Lincoln aren't worthy of this White House or its agenda isn't the way to get things done. It makes it impossible to tend to problems we simply have to face up to and that we will only solve together. Frankly, it calls into question the President's own belief in the wisdom and the efficacy of the constitutional system of checks and balances that the Founders so wisely put in place.

The postinaugural period is usually a chance to pivot to governing after a long campaign. It is an opportunity for Presidents to reach out to the minority and to forge compromises. But that is not what we are seeing this time around. Even before Monday we all noted the harsh change in tone, the reboot of the campaign machine, and how, instead of offering an olive branch to those who disagree with him, the President had already decided to transform his campaign operation into a weapon to bulldoze anyone who doesn't share his vision. Well, I would suggest that one thing the American people don't want is a permanent campaign. That is the last thing the American people are looking for—a permanent campaign. They want us to work together on solutions to our problems. And deficits and debt are right at the top of the list.

I wish to suggest this morning the President rethink the adversarial tone he has adopted in recent weeks. Our problems are simply too urgent and too big for the President to give up on working with us. I appeal to him once again to work with us on the things we can achieve together, and let us start with the deficit and the debt. Because the only way we will be able to tackle these problems is by doing it together.

If he refuses, if he insists on spending the next 4 years pushing a polarizing hard-left agenda instead, I assure him he will meet a determined opposition not only from Republicans in Washington but from the very people he seems to believe are squarely on his side in the push to remake government in his image.

The irony in the President's attacks, of course, is that the kind of reforms Republicans are calling for are the only conceivable route to saving the programs the President claims he wants to protect. Failing to reform the entitlement programs of the last century now—right now—is the best way to guarantee they no longer exist in their current form. I mean, one could practically hear the ring of the cash register with every new promise the President made. At a time when we can all see the failure of such policies by simply turning on the news, he seems blissfully—blissfully—unaware of the fact that from Athens to Madrid the sad, slow death of the left's big government dream is on display for all to see. If we want a less prosperous, less dynamic, less mobile society, that is the way to go—just "Europeanize" America.

The President's vision of an all-powerful government that rights every wrong and heals every wound may warm the liberal heart, but it is completely divorced from experience and from reality. So today I wish to do my part to bring the President and his allies in Congress a little closer down to Earth. I know it may be hard for them to accept, but the reality is this: We have a spending problem—not a taxing problem, a spending problem.

Let's take a look at the chart to my right. The green represents historic and projected tax revenue. And we can see it goes right straight across here out to 2040. The tax increases of 3 weeks ago were delivered by operation of law. In other words, the law expired and all of the Bush tax cuts were over. The Congress, 2 hours after everybody's taxes went up—in other words, after all the Bush tax cuts expired—restored tax relief for 99 percent of the American people, and they did it on a permanent basis to guarantee we wouldn't have another cliff, as we inevitably have. When a law sunsets, we have a cliff.

So the President was able to get some new revenue by operation of law, and that represents this dark blue line right across here. You can see that is pretty steady out to 2040.

The President, of course, said that wasn't nearly enough. He said: We need more taxes, and we will be back asking for more taxes later. So as nearly as we can tell, based on what he has said, the taxes he would like to add to the ones he got by operation of law 2½ weeks ago is this light blue line right across here.

If the President were given all the tax increases he says at the moment he wants, that would provide this amount of revenue going out to 2040. As you

can see, that doesn't do anything to solve the problem because the red represents spending in the past and the spending escalation that will occur if we don't do anything to solve the spending problem.

Look at this line dramatically going up to 2040. So as you can see, there is not enough revenue we can raise without completely shutting down the economy to solve the problem. In fact, it produces a rather static and totally insignificant amount of revenue in order to deal with the massive spending problem.

So this constant demand for more and more tax increases on, I guess, whom people assume is the more successful guy down the street may be a great campaign tactic, but it doesn't do anything to solve the problem. Even if the President were able to get every bit of taxes he wants, we still have an enormous gap in spending if we don't deal with the real problem, which is spending. We have a spending addiction. I didn't make this up. This is a fact. This is reality.

So the tax issue is over. Congress has restored permanent tax relief for 99 percent of the American people. Even if the President were to get—and he will not—any more tax revenue, it is perfectly obvious that doesn't do anything to solve the problem.

So the challenge for us—and looking at the chart we can see—is revenue today is just about where it has been for the past 30 years or so. The President spent nearly his entire first term arguing that we needed to tax the so-called rich to solve our fiscal woes. He harangued Congress about it. He argued for it in rallies and debates. He threatened to push us over the cliff if he didn't get his way.

In the end, by operation of law he got part of what he asked for. And the reason he got it, as I said earlier, is because the tax relief we passed in 2001 and 2003 carried an expiration date. President Obama got some of the tax increases he wanted because the law expired. Then Congress, led by Republicans, voted to make Bush-era tax rates permanent for 99 percent of all Americans. Now, permanency is important. It has been kind of lost on the general public, but the importance is we don't have another cliff, another expiration date where all of a sudden everything changes.

Given how much time he devoted to that one topic, one would think his tax hike would have closed the deficit, eliminated the entire national debt, and left us with extra cash to spare. But do you see that tiny little blue line I pointed to right here? That is how much additional revenue he got. This blue area is the revenue he says he wants. He will not get it; but if he did, it is pretty apparent it has nothing whatsoever to do with solving the spending addiction.

So if this revenue doesn't come anywhere close to solving the problem, the real challenge, obviously, is how we are

going to control all of this red. What do we do about this? Well, we are clearly spending way more than we take in. The real uptick, interestingly enough, occurs about the time the President took office. It has been hard enough to find ways to close the President's trillion-dollar deficits. But as I just pointed out, they are nothing next to what is going to hit us when tens of millions of baby boomers reach retirement age—nothing compared to what is heading our way.

I pointed out the massive slope. That is what is headed our way. Nothing short of a bipartisan effort is going to fix this problem, and there is only one way we can do it. We can't tax our way out of this problem. The revenue question is behind us. The law we voted for, as I said, made current tax rates permanent. I am pretty confident not a single Republican in the House or Senate will vote to raise any more taxes. But even if we were to do that, all the taxes the President asked for would only put us here in 2040. And look at what would be spent.

So the reality the President needs to face—and quickly—is that there is no realistic way to raise taxes high enough to even begin to address this problem. That is why Republicans are saying we need to start controlling spending, and we need to do it now. That is why if the President wants to do something good right now, he should put us out of the liberal wish list and put us out of the character attacks and join us in this great task. It is the transcendent issue of our time.

If we don't fix this problem, we don't leave behind for our children and grandchildren the kind of America our parents left behind for us. There is no bigger issue, even though it got scant mention in the State of the Union.

Now, I have no animus toward the President. I just want to see him do something about the problem because the longer we wait, the worse the problem becomes. The more we delay the inevitable, the less time younger Americans will have to plan for the reforms we make today. That is simply not right.

So the President has a choice. He can paint himself as a warrior of the left and charge into battle with failed ideas we have already tried before; he can demean and blame the opposition for his own failure to lead; he can indulge his supporters in a bitter, never-ending campaign that will only divide our country further; or he could take the responsible road. He can help his own base come to terms with the mathematical reality.

Some people over there are living in a fantasy world—a world that doesn't exist. He could reach out to leaders in both parties—and all of the members in both parties—and negotiate in good faith. We would be happy to give him credit. That is fine by me. If boosting his legacy is what it takes and it helps the country, that is all the better.

If my constituents believe they are working to help make their future a

little better and a little brighter, great. But we can't waste any more time denying the reality that is staring each of us in the face. There is only one way to solve this problem, and that is to do something about this spending addiction that is going to sink this country and turn us into Greece.

Senate Republicans are ready to help the President solve this problem. I hope we have an opportunity to do so. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I wonder if I might pose a question to the Republican leader, if he would re-take the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL. I would be happy to respond.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to congratulate the Republican leader for his remarks.

Here is my question. We have arrived at a time when we have a newly elected President who has had a fine inaugural day. He has an agenda that he wants to follow which he announced in his inaugural address. It is not an agenda that most of us on this side agree with, but he has an agenda that he wants to follow in his second term, all of which would ensure—in his eyes—his legacy as a President.

But isn't there one thing that in order to get to that agenda—or any other thing—he and we have to do, and that is to address the debt? Isn't the very best time—isn't the very best time to do something difficult, something nobody wants to talk about, something that is hard—the best time to do that is at a time when we have a divided government, a Democratic President, a Republican House, and 30 or 40 or 50 of us Senators on both sides of the aisle who have been saying for 2 years that we are ready to fix the debt?

Isn't this an opportunity now? Not just because it is a divided government, but because the House of Representatives today may very well create a 2-month or 3-month window during which we can address all of these issues if we had Presidential leadership?

Mr. McCONNELL. I say to my friend from Tennessee, it is counterintuitive. But one could argue that a divided government—which we have had more often than not since World War II—has produced four of the most significant accomplishments for our country in modern times.

In the Reagan administration, President Reagan and Tip O'Neill, the Democratic Speaker of the House, agreed to raise the age for Social Security to save Social Security for another generation. Reagan and Tip O'Neill did the last comprehensive tax reform.

Bill Clinton and a Republican Congress did welfare reform, arguably the most important piece of social legislation in recent times. And Bill Clinton and a Republican Congress actually balanced the budgets in the late 1990s.

My friend from Tennessee is correct. Divided government actually is the

perfect time—some would argue even the only time—we can do tough things, hard-to-explain things that need to be done to save the country. So I hate to miss the opportunity presented by a divided government to tackle the transcendent issue of our times.

The President talked about a lot of things, and that is all interesting, but it had nothing to do with fixing the country. Until we fix this problem, we will not have the kind of country for our children and our grandchildren that our parents left behind for us.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I wonder if I might pose one more question to the Republican leader after making a short statement.

I came to this body as a young lawyer-legislative aide to Senator Howard Baker a long time ago, in 1967. I remember very well Senator Baker's story about how the civil rights bill of 1968 was passed. I have discussed this with the Republican leader before. He knows that era as well or better than I do.

But there was a time when Senator Baker said he was in Everett Dirksen's office—he is the man who had the job that Senator McCONNELL now has. He was the Republican leader then. He said he heard the telephone ring. He heard only one end of the conversation, but Senator Dirksen was saying: No, Mr. President, I cannot come down and have a drink with you tonight. I did that last night, and Luella is very unhappy with me. And that was the conversation.

About 30 minutes later there was a rustle out in the outer office of the Republican leader's office—the very office that Senator McCONNELL now holds. Two beagles, followed by the President of the United States, came in. Lyndon Johnson, the President, said to the Republican leader: Everett, if you won't have a drink with me, I am down here to have one with you. And they disappeared in the back room for 45 minutes.

The point of all that is not their socializing. The point was it was in that very office, the Republican leader's office, that in 1968, the next year, the civil rights bill was written and enacted. Lyndon Johnson got the credit for that in history but Everett Dirksen made it possible, and there were at that time many more Democrats in the Senate than Republicans.

What I want to say to Senator McCONNELL, the Republican leader, the question I want to ask him, is this. He has seen the U.S. Senate and Presidency for the last number of years. He has seen many relationships between the President and leaders of the opposite party. He knows how this place works. My sense of the Republican leader and of the large majority of us is that we wish to see a result. We wish to see a result on this very tough issue of saving Social Security, saving Medicare, saving Medicaid, saving these programs on which seniors depend. I wonder if the Republican leader would

agree with me that despite the fact that we engage every day in political matters, that we have big differences of opinion, that on this issue, without Presidential leadership, we cannot get a result and that there are a lot of us on both sides of the aisle who are ready to work with the President to fix the debt?

Mr. McCONNELL. I say to my friend from Tennessee—in many ways it is a statement of the obvious but a lot of people forget it—there is only 1 person in America out of 307 million Americans who can sign something into law and only 1 person in America who can deliver the members of his party to support an agreement that he makes. The only way to get an outcome on the biggest issue of our time is with Presidential leadership. So it was disappointing to see scant reference in the State of the Union. Of course that is just one speech and I have not given up hoping that this President can make solving the transcendent issue of our time one of his premier accomplishments.

The point I think the Senator from Tennessee and I are making this morning is there are potential partners on this side of the aisle to make this happen. I hope we will not lose this opportunity once again to deal with the biggest issue in the country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for extending his time on the floor. On my own I wish to continue that line of thinking a little bit.

It is traditional that when we have a new President, a newly inaugurated President, that he has a pretty good opportunity to get what he asks; that it is a time of maximum leverage, it is a time to do important things, it is a time to do difficult things, it is a time to do things that otherwise might not get done.

Presidents are defined by their skills—their communication skills, their electoral ability—but they are also defined by their capacity over a period of years to identify the hard issues that are important to our country and cause people, as the President said in his address day before yesterday, to work together to solve those problems. Now the problem is whether you want to raise taxes on the guy down the street with the biggest house. That is not so hard to do. The problem is to spend money that you do not have—because you can do it; that is not so hard to do. If the problem is to address a disaster to help people who are in desperate shape, there might be some debate about whether it is really a disaster or not but it is not hard to do because in the end it is going to happen. What Presidents are remembered for is dealing with important, difficult crises.

President Clinton is remembered for a number of things but one of the things he did was challenge the conventional thinking in his own party to

deal with welfare reform. It would not have happened if he had not done it. It would not have happened if he had not done it because a Republican could not have made the argument. A President's job, according to George Reedy, the former press secretary to Lyndon Johnson, is three things: One is to see an urgent need, two is to develop a strategy to meet the need, and the third is to persuade at least half the people he is right.

President Nixon in the early 1960s went to China. That seems like ancient history but that was straight against the core of the Republican Party at that time. That was something that was inconceivable for a Republican President to do, given the history of mainland China and Taiwan, as they were both called.

There have been many times in our history when Presidents have had to do the hard work. President George H.W. Bush made a budget agreement which may have caused him to lose the election in 1992 because it angered a number of Republicans. But it also helped balance the budget and gave us a period of time in the 1990s when that budget agreement plus a good economy gave us an actual surplus of funding.

I sense that there is at the White House a feeling, two things I wish to disabuse the White House of. The first is that the budget problem is not a real problem. I cannot believe people at the White House think that. Everybody knows it is. Senator McCONNELL gave a very good explanation of what was going on there. But let me say it this way: In 2025, according to the Congressional Budget Office, every dollar of taxes we collect will go to pay for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt, and there is nothing left for national defense, National Laboratories, Pell grants for education, highways, or the investments that we need to make in research to grow this country. It all goes for Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and the interest on debt, every single penny we collect. And that is only 12 years away. That is not me talking. That is the Congressional Budget Office saying that. The Medicare trustees have said that in 2024 the Medicare Program will not have enough money to pay all of its bills. Whose bills? Bills of seniors, bills of Tennesseans, many of whom are literally counting the days until they are old enough to be eligible for Medicare so they can pay their medical bills. It would be a tragedy if that day arrived and there were not enough money to pay the bills. But the Medicare trustees, who by law are supposed to tell us these things, say that day will come in 2024. It is just 11 years away and that is the day for people already on Medicare and people who are going to be on Medicare.

Medicaid, which is a program for lower income Americans, is an important program. As Governor, I dealt with it in my State. But when I was

Governor, it was 8 percent of the State budget. Today it is 26 percent of the State budget. It is soaking up almost every dollar that would go to higher education. As a result, students around the country are wondering: Why are my tuition fees going up? It is because of Washington's Medicaid Program requiring States to make decisions that soak up money that otherwise would be used to fund education.

In our State of Tennessee, 30 years ago the State paid 70 percent of the cost of going to the University of Tennessee. Today it pays 30. And Medicaid is the chief culprit.

Everyone knows this. The President's own debt commission has told him this and suggested a way to deal with it. Forty or fifty of us on both sides of the aisle have been working together, meeting together, having dinner together, writing bills together, trying to come up with plans to do it. Senator CORKER, my colleague from Tennessee, has developed a bill on which I am his prime cosponsor which says we have found a way to strengthen Medicare and other entitlements by reducing the growth in spending. We understand this.

We passed a Budget Control Act a couple of years ago. People said they didn't like it. It was not so bad because it took 38 percent of the budget, which is all of our discretionary spending—including national defense, national parks, national labs—and said it will go up at about the rate of inflation. This is before we get to the so-called sequester. But what about the rest of the budget? That is the automatic stuff we do not even vote on: Medicare, entitlements, all this? It is going up at about three to four times the rate of inflation. It is going to bankrupt these programs. Seniors will not be able to have their medical bills paid and the country will be bankrupt. That is no overstatement. The former Comptroller of the Currency says that. President Clinton says this is an urgent problem. The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says the national debt is the single biggest threat to our national security. Why are we not dealing with it? I think we are not dealing with it, A, because it is hard to do; B, because on both sides of the aisle we have not been effective in dealing with it before.

I remember when we had an all-Republican cast of characters here in town—President Bush, a Republican majority—we tried to reduce the growth of Medicare and we could not get the votes to do that.

This is not easy to do, but Robert Merry, who wrote a book about President Polk, had lunch with some of us yesterday, made this statement: "In America's history every crisis has been solved by Presidential leadership or not at all."

Whether it was Lincoln in the Civil War or Reagan and Tip O'Neill or Nixon to China or Clinton on welfare reform—we can all identify the crises.

But it takes Presidential leadership to do it. It takes that to do it.

I was a Governor, which is much smaller potatoes. If I sat around waiting for the State legislature, with all respect, to come up with a road program we would still be driving on dirt roads. They were waiting for the Governor to do it. That is how our system works.

I wonder if the President thinks that the debt is not a problem? I cannot imagine anybody at the White House thinks that. This is a problem. If the President does not address it during his two terms he will be remembered by history as failing to do that. His legacy may be a failure to address financial matters that put this country on a road to bankruptcy. Or, if he were to do it, if he were to provide the leadership, he would be—as the Australian Foreign Minister has said, "America is one budget agreement away from reasserting its global preeminence." Why wouldn't President Obama want to be known as the President who caused America to reassert its global preeminence by dealing with a budget agreement during the first 3 months of his term and then he can get on with his agenda, about which we can argue? That leaves me with only one thought: That the President thinks we don't want to do it. We do want to do it and it is a misunderstanding if he thinks that.

I know the Republican leader would not mind me saying he is a wily, clever tactician who knows the Senate as well as anyone here. But if you look carefully, when we got down to the last few days of the year and needed an agreement on taxes, the Republican leader was in the middle of the agreement. When we needed an agreement to try to avoid default on the debt, the Republican leader was the one who was in the middle of doing that.

I think if the White House thinks that the Republican leader or we on the Republican side do not want to fix the debt, they are badly misunderstanding where we are and who we are. I do not know how we can say it more clearly. We have written bills that do it. We have held dinners to talk about it. We have made public statements with Democrats, 30 or 40 of us at a time, saying we support Simpson-Bowles, we support Domenici-Rivlin, or we support this or we support that. What is missing? Two words: Presidential leadership. This is not a partisan comment. It just does not work unless the President lays out his plan.

Some say the President does not want to lay out his plan. He has to lay out his plan. He is the President. We are just legislators. Senator CORKER and I have put out our plan. Who pays attention to that? Madam President, \$1 trillion in reductions and a \$1 trillion increase in the debt ceiling—it is out there. That is not going to work. However, if President Obama, with his skills, calls together Simpson and Bowles or his advisers and says: Here is

my plan to save Medicare, here is my plan to save Medicaid, here is my plan to fix the debt, and I want bipartisan support to do that, he will get it. At first, because it is a difficult issue, everybody will say: Oh, no, we can't do it that way. We need to sit down, talk, and come up with a result. I think the Republican leader has shown he is prepared and willing to do that. He has said it and done it on other issues. I don't know what else the rest of us can do to show that.

What I am trying to respectfully say today, as much as anything, to the President of the United States is congratulations on your inauguration. I was there. I was proud to participate in it and have the opportunity to speak for a minute and a half about why we celebrate for the 57th time the inauguration of an American President. We celebrate it because our country is distinguished from most other countries in the world by the peaceful transition or reaffirmation of the largest amount of power in the world. We have our political contests, and then we have the restraint to respect the results.

After winning the election, it is important, first, to get the fiscal house in order. The time to do it is while we have a divided government. The time to do it is while the President is at the peak of his popularity. The time to do it is while the House of Representatives—the Republican House—has created a window of 2 or 3 months to deal with all the fiscal issues. The time to do it is after 2 years of discussion with Republicans and Democrats in a bipartisan way about the need to fix the debt and the importance of it for the country.

My hope is that as the President and his advisers look at the Senate, they see a willingness to solve the problem of fixing the debt in a bipartisan way. I get the feeling they don't believe that about us. I don't know what else we can do to cause them to believe that. There is not the same kind of comfortable, back-and-forth relationship there should be. I have heard some people say: Well, the Johnson-Dirksen days are ancient history. That was a long time ago. However, human nature doesn't change. Human nature doesn't change in 50 years, 100 years, or 500 years.

There is plenty of good will across the aisle and on this side of the aisle, at the beginning of this term, to work with a newly inaugurated President and say: Mr. President, we are ready to fix the debt. Provide us the leadership. No great crisis is ever solved without Presidential leadership in the United States. You are the President; you are the only one who can lay out the plan. We will then consider it, amend it, argue about it, change it, and pass it. After that, we can get onto the President's agenda, about which we will have a difference of opinion, but he will go down in history as the man who was willing to do something hard within his own party, which was to fix the debt

and save the programs seniors depend upon to pay their medical bills.

I hope I can say that in the spirit of someone who participated in the inauguration and admires the President's considerable abilities. I hope he and his advisers stop, take a look, and say: Maybe we were wrong. Maybe this is the time to do it. Maybe we are the only ones who can do it, so let's make a proposal and get started.

I thank the President. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I was pleased to hear a few days ago that Senator SCHUMER said we would have a budget in the Senate. It has been now, I think, about 1,370 days, give or take, since we have had a budget in the Senate, even though plain statutory law requires the Congress to have a budget. Now Senator MURRAY has followed up today, I believe, with a quote saying: ". . . the Senate will once again return to regular order and move a budget resolution through the Budget Committee and to the Senate floor."

So the Budget Committee has not been meeting. It has not been doing its duty. As the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, I have been aghast at the process and have talked about it for now for over 1,000 days. So this will be a good step.

My colleagues would like to suggest somehow that they decided to do this out of the goodness of their hearts because it is the right thing to do. But I think the American people have had a belly full of this.

The U.S. House of Representatives has repeatedly passed budgets, but the Senate has refused to even bring one up in committee or on the floor for over 2 years now. They have said they are raising the debt limit for about 3 months, but they have declared that the Senate does not get paid until we have a budget. Right now there is no punishment for not passing a budget. I was a Federal prosecutor for over 15 years and know how to read a code. It has no penalty for failing to pass a budget. It says the Senate should bring up a budget. It should complete the budget process in committee by April 1 and then the full Senate should take it up and it should be completed by April 15. The Senate is given priority: 50 hours of debate, virtually unlimited amendments—an opportunity to debate the financial condition of America.

That is why it has not happened. Senator REID, the Democratic leader for

the last several years, has said it would be foolish to have a budget. What he meant was that it would be foolish politically. Because when you bring up a budget, this is a tough thing. The House did that.

PAUL RYAN offered a historic budget that would change the debt course of America and put us on a sound path. They had to make some tough choices. So they were, of course, attacked in the election—Oh, these are horrible people; they want to throw old people off the cliff and that kind of thing and it was irresponsible—while during this entire process, the Senate was in direct violation of Federal law that required us to bring up a budget. We did not bring it up because it would be foolish, foolish politically, because we have to take tough votes. We have to stand and be counted. Numbers have to be analyzed: How much are you truly going to raise taxes? Oh, well, is that going to change the debt course?

Is this latest \$600 billion tax increase going to change the debt course of America? No; it is not. Our deficit last year was about \$1,080 billion. How much would this tax increase, this \$600 billion, have changed that? That is \$60 billion a year. Instead of \$1,080 billion or so in deficit, our deficit would have been \$1,020 billion. Is that going to fix our problem? No, it will not.

These are difficult problems. These are very difficult problems, and it is not going to be easy. But it was easy to attack the House while not producing a budget. It is a pretty flabbergasting thing to me. So I am glad we are now going to have this process. It will not be easy for Republicans. It will not be easy for Democrats. But what are we paid to do? What responsibility do we have as the Congress—that has the power of the purse—if not discussing the great issues of our time?

We are on an unsustainable debt path. Last year there was another trillion-dollar deficit, and they are projecting we will have a trillion-dollar deficit this year. That is 5 consecutive years of trillion-dollar deficits. I know President Bush was criticized, and correctly sometimes, for spending too much. The highest deficit he ever had in 8 years was \$470 billion. The year before he left it was \$160 billion. President Obama has averaged well over \$1,000 billion a year in an annual deficit ever since.

This is not sustainable, as every expert has told us time and time again. So I am worried about it. Maybe we can move out of these secret meetings where the Senate just sits around and we wait for the people to appear, write us a bill at midnight on December 31—actually 1 a.m. on January 1—that is supposed to handle it and nobody has even read it.

That is what we have been doing for the last 4 years. It has worked out good politically because it has kept an honest discussion of the dangerous path we are on from being part of the public debate. We have to have it part of the

public debate. I am not saying this budget, if it moves through the Senate, is going to solve our problems and that it will be adopted. I am not saying that. But I do believe the American people will understand better the challenges we face and Senators will understand better the challenges we face, how deep they are, how systemic they are.

In 2011, after Republicans won a victory in the midterm elections, there was hope we would have a new budget from the President, that he would reach out to the House that had gotten a Republican majority for a change—they took back the majority, and there were more Republicans in the Senate—and that the President was going to produce a budget that would put us on the right path and maybe a historic path that would help make Social Security and Medicare sustainable, preserve those programs so people can go to bed at night and feel confident these programs not going to go bankrupt and there are not going to be dramatic cuts. We can do that. It would take some belt-tightening, but we could do that. Yet the administration refused: You are just partisan, SESSIONS.

I am saying, without fear of contradiction by anybody who knows what has happened, that this administration basically has not wanted to talk about those deep spending issues that amount to more than half the money we spend.

That was a challenge. Maybe that logjam has broken and this budget process will give us an opportunity to move forward.

I do not like to be critical of nominees or anyone. I try to be as courteous and respectful as we can to people whom we deal with on a regular basis in the Congress. But I have to share with my colleagues a deep feeling that we have a serious credibility problem with credibility on debt and financing. We have to end that credibility problem. We have to be honest and deal with real numbers.

In January of 2011, Mr. Jack Lew, the then-Director of the Office of Management and Budget, with a substantial staff—one of their primary duties is to produce a budget every year—submitted the President's Budget to Congress. The President always submits a budget—it has been late, but they have always sent them over. The Senate has not moved budgets like it is required to, but every President has always sent over a budget. There was great hope that the budget would be the kind of breakthrough—with a Republican House and a Democratic President and a Democratic Senate—that somehow this would be an opportunity for historic agreement to put America on a sound path and get us off these trillion-dollar deficits, put us on a path to a balanced budget and do the kind of things that are necessary for the welfare of our country.

Mr. Lew produced the budget, and he went on television immediately and talked about it. On Wednesday of that

week, he was going to be before the Budget Committee, but this is what he said in his CNN Sunday morning interview about his budget. I would ask you to listen to these words, colleagues and friends, anybody who is watching, and see what they mean to you. He said:

Our budget will get us, over the next several years, to the point where we can look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore; we're spending money that we have each year—

Money that we have each year— and then we can work on bringing down our national debt.

That was on CNN.

So he appeared before the Budget Committee and I asked him if that was an accurate statement; did he stand by that. He said: Yes, sir, and he never wavered from that.

I will just say that as part of the budget process we get a stack of documents—this much—from Mr. Lew's office. The Office of Management and Budget submits them—supporting documents—as part of their process. They are easily ascertainable. The numbers are not in dispute.

The lowest single deficit over 10 years that Mr. Lew projected was more than \$600 billion. In other words, there was never a balanced budget, never paying down the debt, never a single year we were not borrowing at least \$600 billion.

None of what he said is accurate. It is breathtaking. I called it the greatest financial misrepresentation in history. It would have added \$13 trillion to the debt of the United States over 10 years, by his own estimate, not stuff I made up. Yet he said we are not going to be adding to the debt anymore.

So I thought, if a businessman reported to potential stock purchasers, our company is on the right track, we are not adding to our debt anymore—we are going to look the American people in the eye and say we're not adding to the debt anymore, we are spending only money we have—you are borrowing—the least amount of money you have borrowed in a single year is \$600 billion, larger than President Bush ever had in 8 years as President.

When I asked him about it, he insisted that it was true. So we have got a problem here, and that is why I am not going to support Mr. Lew for the Secretary of the Treasury. I am not going to vote for him. I believe he knew exactly what he was saying. He produced a budget that was panned by virtually every editorial board in America. They hammered it as failing to meet the challenge of our time, and he knew it was that way. He is not a person who doesn't understand these issues. He knew what it was all about. But they decided they would go out and spin it this way. They would say it did what the American people wanted.

I hate to be this harsh, but there is only one conclusion. They decided to produce a budget that did not change the debt course of America and left us on an unsustainable path. Even their

own numbers show that, but they would tell the American people this, say it was fixed, and maybe lull them into a false sense of confidence.

Then they attacked PAUL RYAN of the Republican House for producing a realistic budget. It wasn't a dramatic budget, it didn't even balance in 10 years, but it changed us and put us on a sound path. They would attack him as not caring about people, and for 2 years that is what has happened.

Once we bring a budget to the floor of this Senate, Republicans and Democrats are going to find out this is a very difficult situation we are in. The challenge is going to be very difficult, and we are going to have a hard time dealing with it.

Mr. Lew didn't just make that comment to CNN, in case you think I am exaggerating here. He also said this in an NPR, National Public Radio, interview on February 15, 2011, the day, I believe, of a Budget Committee hearing:

If we're able to reduce the deficit to the point where we can pay for our spending and invest in the future, that is an enormous accomplishment. This budget has specific proposals that would do that.

He looked the American people in the eye, or, I guess, talked to their ears on NPR, and said his "budget has specific proposals" that would put us in a position to pay for our spending and invest in the future and reduce our deficit.

He went on to say on February 15, 2011, at the Budget Committee hearing—and I think this was my question, Was this an accurate statement that you made, Mr. OMB Director?

He said:

It's an accurate statement that our current spending will not be increasing the debt. We've stopped spending money that we don't have.

I mean, I almost can't read those words without the hair standing up on the back of my neck. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget appeared before the U.S. Senate Budget Committee, and he said, "it's an accurate statement," this baloney, "it's an accurate statement that our current spending will not be increasing the debt . . . We've stopped spending money that we don't have."

Nothing could be further from the truth—the lowest single deficit was \$600 billion.

What about on a different CNN interview on February 14, 2011:

It [the budget] takes real actions now so that between now and 5 years from now we can get our deficit under control so that we can stabilize things so that we're not adding to the debt anymore.

He promised, and looked the American people in the eye and said, in 5 years, we are not going to be adding to the debt anymore. He knew exactly what he was saying. He knew exactly what he wanted the American people to hear. There is no ambiguity about it, and it was utterly false.

February 13, 2011, on ABC, he said:

This budget has a lot of pain. [but] it does the job, it cuts the deficit in half by the end

of the President's first term . . . It's going to take us a lot of hard work just to take us to the point where we're not adding to the debt.

There is not one year that they are not adding to the debt.

In the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth years of the budget that Jack Lew presented, when you look at his real numbers, the deficit was going up each year. So it was not a fix to our debt problem.

Then he says this on the White House blog, February 13, 2011:

Like every family, we have to tighten our belts and live within our means while we're investing in the things that we need to have a strong and secure future . . . We know that you have to stabilize where we're going before you can move on and solve the rest of the problem. This budget does that.

So it is going to stabilize us and move us forward.

Well, as I say, that was not well received. The New York Times wrote this on February 5, 2011. That was his op-ed. I won't go into the editorials, but a whole list of those were critical of Mr. Lew.

I would just say this, we are in a difficult financial position. We need honesty, we need a budget that is truthful, we need the regular order so the Budget Committee does its work, and then it comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate—this will be first time in over a thousand days—it guarantees 50 hours of debate, it can't be filibustered, it can be passed with a simple majority, we will know what is in it, and people can offer amendments. That is what should have been happening for a long time that has not been happening. That is what the law requires, and that should be completed by April 15 of this year.

As we go forward, I am confident that we will be better served by public discussion of our debt, not secret meetings. I have been critical of them. I had hoped that some of them would ripen into some good solutions, but all we have had is temporary "kick the can down the road" maneuvers, and nothing substantial has been done to change the debt course of America.

By the way, when Mr. Erskine Bowles, whom President Obama appointed to head his fiscal commission, saw this budget in 2011, he said it goes nowhere near where they will have to go to resolve our fiscal nightmare. Everybody knew this budget wouldn't do the job, and that is why it was never brought through the process, and that is why it wasn't brought to the floor for a full budget analysis in committee and in debate on the floor.

So as we go forward, I will be meeting with our new chairman, Senator MURRAY. She is a great, tough advocate for her values, but she is a good person to work with. I have told her we will try to work with her, but we are going to talk about the great issues of our time, the difficulties we face, and see if we can't make this system work better and try to put this country on a sound financial footing.

We can do it. We can get this country on a sound path. It is not impossible, but anybody who thinks it will be easy is wrong. This is going to take some hard work. As we do that in a bipartisan, open way in the committee, on the floor of the Senate, the American people will be able to digest the difficulty of some of our challenges, and so will our Members in Congress. In the end, that, I think, leaves us in the best position to reach the kind of agreement, compromise, solution, that can put us on the right path, because everybody is going to have to swallow a little bit.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

THE BUDGET AND THE DEFICIT

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I couldn't help but listen to the words of my friend from Alabama regarding the debt and deficit, and then to be reminded that we did balance the budget not too long ago. In fact, in 1993, we passed a tax bill here in the Senate and in the House—it was signed into law by President Clinton—which set us on a course to reduce the deficit. In fact, by the years 1999 and 2000, we balanced the budget. We had a surplus. Can you imagine that? We had a surplus for 3 years in a row. The Congressional Budget Office and OMB said that if we had continued on that pathway, we would have fully paid off the national debt by 2010.

When I hear my friends on the Republican side talk about reducing the deficit and the debt, we did that. When the Democrats were in charge of the Senate and the House and we had the Presidency, I would also point out that not one Republican on that side of the aisle voted for that bill in 1993. I can remember standing here and debating with my friend from Texas at that time on this bill, and there were all kinds of dire warnings that if this bill passed, we were going to have depressions and recessions; the business community would stop, and it would be the worst thing that ever happened to this country if we passed the Clinton tax proposal. Well, we passed it, but without one Republican vote.

And what happened? We had the largest spurt of economic growth this country had seen almost since the 1950s and 1960s. This was to the point to where, as I said, by the end of the 1990s we had a balanced budget and we had a surplus.

Then President Bush comes into office, and we had surpluses, enough to retire the entire national debt by the year 2010. So what did President Bush say? Well, now we are going to give tax cuts. They pushed through this big tax cut bill for which this Senator did not vote.

That tax cut bill gave a lot away to corporations and to the wealthy of this country, so that they didn't have to pay their fair share. Also, there were

two wars we didn't pay for, plus a recession, and now we are in this huge deficit.

We know how to get ourselves out of this fix. We did it in 1993. It was by having the people in this country pay their fair share of taxes, to make sure that corporations, to make sure that those who enjoy the benefits of living in this free and productive society, pay their fair share. This is for all of us to raise the revenues necessary to meet our obligations in education, health, infrastructure building, the security of our Nation, and also to raise enough revenues so we can reduce the deficit.

But it can only be done with fairness and with fair sharing by all, and that is what President Obama has spoken about. He spoke about that in his inaugural address. That is what we have been talking about here for a long time; that is, shared sacrifice on behalf of all, and to make sure that all pay their fair share of taxes in this country so we can once again do what we did in 1993. We can do it again if only my friends on the Republican side will join with us in making sure we raise the necessary revenues to get us out of this hole.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Missouri.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 2 p.m. today, and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

REMEMBERING STAN MUSIAL

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, first of all, this is the first time I have spoken on the floor when you were in the chair. Welcome to the Senate and welcome to the presiding chair.

I want to talk for a few minutes today about a baseball great, a Missouri great, Stan Musial, who passed away on Saturday at the age of 92. Stan Musial was born in November 1920 in Denora, PA. His title was Stan "The Man." He was the youngest of six children. When he wasn't called Stan "The Man," he was just a guy who worked at a company as a young man, whose dad was a Polish immigrant, whose mother was of Czechoslovakian ancestry, and whose dreams were probably not to become a professional baseball player but who was, indeed, a great athlete from the very start.

In his remarks, when he presented Stan Musial the Medal of Freedom in 2011, President Obama said the following:

Stan matched his hustle with humility. He retired with 17 records—even as he missed a season in his prime to serve his country in

the Navy. He was the first player to make—get this—\$100,000. Even more shocking, he asked for a pay cut when he didn't perform up to his own expectations.

I don't think that August Busch gave him the pay cut—again, a quote—but I have read the story where Stan Musial was holding out for a pay package somewhere in the mid-90s and August Busch, Jr., who not long before that had bought the Cardinals, called him into the office and said: I'm never going to pay you 90—whatever thousand dollars he was asking for. He said: I'm going to pay you \$100,000, and you are going to be the first baseball player to make \$100,000.

Stan Musial played for the Cardinals from 1941 to 1963, the only Major League team he played for. He entered the majors in 1941 as the fifth youngest player. He ended his career in 1963 as the third oldest player. He had a record of 24 times being named to the Major League Baseball All-Star team. He won seven National League batting titles, three National League Most Valuable Player awards, and he led the Cardinals to three World Series championships in the 1940s.

Stan Musial—No. 6—had a batting average of at least .300 in every 1 of his 17 seasons—a .300 hitter for every 1 of his 17 seasons. His lifetime batting average was .331. He batted .330 in the year before he decided to retire. He had 3,630 career hits, hitting 1,815 hits in St. Louis at Sportsman Park and Busch Stadium, and he hit another 1,815 on the road. He played as well at home as he did away from home. He missed the entire 1945 season while he was serving in the Navy.

It was a fan at Ebbet's Field—with the Dodgers playing at Ebbet's Field—who groaned as he came to the plate one time in a game—he was always particularly good against the Dodgers. The fan said: Here comes the man. And from that point on, his nickname was Stan "The Man."

I had a chance to sit by Tommy Lasorda at a luncheon a few years ago after I had read a biography of Stan Musial. Tommy was sort of the long-time Dodgers manager who was a player when Stan Musial was playing, and he said he thought Stan Musial was the best ballplayer he ever saw play, and he was death on the Dodgers. The Dodgers fans liked him, but it was a real rivalry.

Stan was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame the first year he was eligible, in 1969, and he would be one of the great ambassadors to baseball for the rest of his life. When he retired in 1963, Commissioner Ford Frick said:

Here stands baseball's perfect warrior. Here stands baseball's perfect knight.

Stan Musial became an American icon throughout ballparks and over the radio in the 1940s and 1950s. KMOX, in the 1960s, had a booming signal that went almost all the way to the west coast and covered a lot of the South, and the St. Louis Cardinals were the furthest south of any baseball team

and the furthest west of any baseball team. Because of that, Stan Musial played on a club that, in many ways, became America's team at that time.

I can remember growing up in southwest Missouri on a dairy farm, and particularly late at night when we were hauling hay—and I can remember this when I was 10 or 12 years old—and whoever was in the truck must have been almost deaf because the driver would have the radio turned as loud as you could turn the radio up, and the St. Louis Cardinals game would be coming out of both windows as we were out there working in the fields or, if we weren't working in the field, we would be sitting on the porch somewhere listening to the Cardinals play, and there was no greater Cardinal than Stan Musial.

Bob Gibson, another great Cardinal and Stan's teammate and fellow Hall of Famer, said:

Stan Musial is the nicest man I ever met in baseball.

And Bob Gibson went on to say he didn't particularly associate nice with baseball, but he associated nice with Stan Musial.

Bob Costas had this to say about Stan Musial:

Stan Musial didn't hit in 56 straight games. He didn't hit .400 for a season. He didn't get 4,000 hits. He didn't get 500 home runs. He didn't hit a home run in his last at bat, just a single. He didn't marry Marilyn Monroe; he married his high school sweetheart. His excellence was a quiet excellence.

ESPN titled Musial the most underrated athlete ever. Only Hank Aaron—thinking about the things Stan Musial didn't do—had more runs than Stan Musial and extra base hits. Only Tris Speaker and Pete Rose had more hits. And only Babe Ruth and Barry Bonds created more runs. But Stan Musial was at the highest levels in all of those areas.

Writing in the St. Louis Post Dispatch this week, Bernie Miklasz wrote:

Let's celebrate Musial's extraordinary life and be thankful for his enduring presence through the decades. Let's keep it simple in honor of this remarkably uncomplicated man. There has never been a more perfect union, a better relationship between an athlete and a town, than Stan Musial and St. Louis. From the time Stan took his first at-bat as a Cardinal, until his death Saturday at his home in Ladue, he was part of the community's soul for 71 years, 4 months, and 2 days.

Many stories about Stan Musial have been told, but I want to mention three that Bernie mentioned in that same article. He talked about when Musial was first inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame—as I said earlier, as soon as you could possibly be inducted. It was an overcast day in Cooperstown. The crowd was quiet, subdued, and a little bit put off by the day. Moments before Musial's official ceremony, the clouds got out of the way and the sunshine emerged, and Dizzy Dean's widow said: "Stan brought the sun. He always does."

In the 1960s, a second story emerged of Musial and other Major League stars

visiting U.S. troops in Vietnam, and they went to the military hospitals to console the wounded soldiers. One seriously injured soldier looked up at Musial from his hospital bed and said: "You're the best." And Musial's response was: "No, you are."

Brooklyn Dodgers pitcher Joe Black, an African American, told a story about being racially taunted by players in the St. Louis dugout during a game. Musial, who was batting at the time, and facing Joe Black, stepped out and angrily kicked the dirt to display his disapproval of his own teammates. He waited after the game to tell Black:

I'm sorry that happened. But don't you worry about it. You're a great pitcher. You will win a lot of games.

Black said Musial's support helped him gain the confidence he needed to become a top pitcher.

The fourth and last story Bernie told was of legendary center fielder Willie Mays, who frequently talked about Musial befriending African-American players, relating that at an All-Star game black players were being ignored by the other players. Mays said:

We were in the back of the clubhouse playing poker and none of the white guys had come back or said, "Hi" or "How's it going?" or "How you guys doing?" or "Welcome to the All Star Game." Nothing. We're playing poker and all of a sudden I look up and here comes Stan towards us. He grabs a chair, sits down and starts playing cards with us. And Stan didn't know how to play poker! But that was his way of welcoming us, of making us feel a part of it. I never forgot that. We never forgot that.

Musial didn't make a lot of fiery speeches. He didn't "lead" a movement or try to promote himself as an angelic humanitarian. He just did good things.

There is one last story, a love story, between Stan and his wife Lil. This may be the best Musial statistic of all. They were married for 71 years, 4 months, and 2 days until Lil's death on May 3, with Stan following her in January.

I listened to KMOX from the hay truck I talked about earlier, like lots of other Cardinals and Musial fans, but I remember the first time I saw Stan Musial play at Sportsman Park. I remember the first time, 30 years later, I actually met him, when I was the Secretary of State in Missouri. Getting to meet Stan Musial was about as good as it got even then. I remember hearing him play "Take Me Out to the Ball Game" on his harmonica.

Baseball was lucky to have him, Missouri was lucky to have him, and the Cardinals and St. Louis were lucky to have him, and I am pleased to be here today to say how much we appreciate Stan Musial.

I am also pleased to be joined by my colleague from Missouri, Senator MCCASKILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague. He and I disagree on many things, but we agree on many things also, and one of

those things usually begins and ends with the State we love, Missouri, and certainly some of our most famous and beloved people who come from Missouri. Obviously, there is no one who deserves more love and respect than Stan Musial.

There are so many memories about Stan Musial that I want to try to encapsulate today, but the interesting thing about the memories I have about Stan Musial is that I don't have these memories because I am a Senator. They do not belong uniquely to me because I am an elected official. I have these memories that I share with hundreds of thousands of people who were lucky enough to encounter Stan Musial during his time on Earth.

You know, when you meet somebody, and you can tell they are kind of looking over you to try to find the person who is more important behind you or maybe they are impatient because they do not think you are a big enough deal to be taking their time? If you look at our sports icons today who travel with posesses and have entourages and certain rules about who can come near them and who can't and when, that was not Stan Musial. Not one day of his career or one day after his career did he consider himself untouchable. He saw it as his duty and obligation to be there for all fans. Whether it was somebody who worked at the ballpark sweeping after the game was over or whether it was a very talented ballplayer from another team, everyone was equal in Stan Musial's eyes. What a wonderful American value.

I could stand here today, Madam President, and talk about his amazing record as a baseball player, his unique swing, and the beauty of his accomplishments in America's favorite pastime, but what we need to focus on as we mourn the loss of this living legend is his character because it was his character that brought universal love, respect, and devotion to the man, our man, Stan "The Man."

I know Senator BLUNT talked about this story, but I want to elaborate a little bit.

It is 1952. Joe Black has just been called up to the majors after spending 1 year in the minors with the Brooklyn organization. He is facing Stan Musial. Now, keep in mind that this is an accomplished baseball player who had won two championships in the Negro Baseball Leagues, and it had only been a few years since Jackie Robinson had, in fact, broken the color barrier for Major League Baseball. He is facing Stan Musial, who already was the most feared hitter in baseball. He is standing there as a Black man on the mound in this baseball game, and out of the Cardinal dugout come jeers and taunts. In fact, one of the things said was, hey, Stan, you are not going to have any trouble hitting that ball against that dark background.

When the game was over, Stan Musial decided not to stay in the Cardinal dugout. Joe Black told the story

that as he sat in the dugout, he felt a hand on his shoulder. He looked up, and there was Stan Musial from the opposing dugout saying to Joe Black: You are going to be a great pitcher.

Now, that encapsulates the character of Stan Musial.

Chuck Connors, "The Rifleman," used to tell this story. He was a struggling hitter for the Chicago Cubs.

I may need to explain to you, Madam President, but I certainly don't need to explain to anybody in Cardinal Nation that the Chicago Cubs are an opponent. Now, we don't like the Chicago Cubs in Cardinal Nation.

Chuck Connors asked a teammate what he should do about his swing. He was struggling with being able to hit in the majors, and they all told him the same thing: The only guy who can help you is Stan Musial. So even though he was reluctant to approach a hitter on the opposing team, he went to Musial and asked for help, and, of course, Stan responded as all of us would expect he would; he spent 30 minutes in the cage with an opposing player trying to help him with his swing. Connors recounted that he really wasn't ever that good of a hitter, but he said he never forgot Stan Musial's kindness.

And when he finished watching me cut away at the ball, Stan slapped me on the back and told me to keep swinging.

After the 1946 season, the promoters from the Mexican League decided it was time for them to up the ante on baseball. At the time, Stan Musial was making the enormous sum of \$13,500 playing for the St. Louis Cardinals. The Mexican League came to Stan Musial and said: We are going to offer you—a king's ransom at the time—\$125,000 for 5 years. That was a lot of money for Stan Musial and his family, but he turned down the Mexican League. When asked about it later, he said:

Back in my day, we didn't think about money as much. We just enjoyed playing the game. We loved baseball. I didn't think about anybody else but the Cardinals.

Harry Caray knew Stan Musial for over 50 years. He would often tell the story of Stan Musial wandering out of the ballpark after a steaming doubleheader—and trust me, we can have steaming doubleheaders in Missouri—looking as if he had been through 15 rounds in a prize fight and every single thing in his body language signifying that he was exhausted and just wanted to go home and lie down. Instead, when he got to his car, he found fans waiting for him. "Watch this," Harry Caray told a friend. And sure enough, Musial's whole body straightened—like Popeye had just eaten a can of spinach—and he started shouting, "Whaddya Say! Whaddya Say!" And he signed every single autograph of all the fans surrounding his car. Harry Caray loved telling that story not because it was unusual—that is who Stan Musial was—but for the opposite reason: because it was ordinary. Even in his time, when baseball players weren't

paid as much and so were more part of the community, Stan Musial stood apart by standing with the people in the community.

It wasn't just Cardinal Nation that worshipped Stan Musial. His opponents, the opposing teams—can you imagine this happening today? Believe it or not, the New York Mets had a Stan Musial Day at their park. And in Chicago, the home of the Cubs, he once finished first in a favorite player survey, edging out the legendary Ernie Banks, who was also a very nice guy who was beloved by the fans of baseball in the Midwest.

I could go on and on with stories that reflect this man's character. Yes, he has amazing statistics. Yes, him hitting a baseball was a thing of beauty to all baseball fans in America. But, really, what this man was about was that phrase we love to throw around in politics way too often; that is, American values. This was a man who didn't have to talk about his values because he lived them—his love for his family and how close they are.

I am very fortunate to be friends with the Musial family and have visited with them in the days since his death. They received messages from every star in the constellation of American baseball, but one stood out. Joe Torre, upon hearing of Stan's death just a few days ago, sent a message to the Musial family, and it simply said this:

Stan Musial was a Hall of Famer in the game of life. We will miss you, Stan Musial.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Virginia.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, as we get started on this next Congress—and I wish to congratulate the Presiding Officer for joining this Chamber. As someone who has had the opportunity to preside during my first 2 years in the Senate, I commend the Presiding Officer for those actions and look forward to working with you on a variety of projects.

What I want to do today is continue a tradition that I actually inherited from one of our former colleagues, Senator Ted Kaufman of Delaware. Senator Kaufman, who had been a long-time employee of the Senate, came to this floor on a fairly regular basis during his time here to basically celebrate and acknowledge—in most cases—the tireless, unsung work of so many of our Federal employees. As we debate budgets, debt, and deficit, we oftentimes

recognize we have to make extraordinary and difficult choices in cuts. In many instances, behind all of those cuts are Federal employees who do remarkable work in keeping us safe, providing services, and helping our country grow.

Ted Kaufman used to come down here on a regular basis and celebrate some of those unsung heroes. I was proud to continue his tradition during the last Congress and look forward to carrying it on through another session.

I start this next Congress actually celebrating two great Federal employees, I might add, who both happen to be Virginians who serve as excellent role models. They represent the thousands of professionals who work quietly every day across our intelligence community to keep our Nation safe.

Very often these professionals work in anonymity and many risk their lives in troubled spots far away from the limelight, and that is how it should be. Recently we have seen certain incidents abroad, and sometimes they pay with the highest sign of sacrifice in terms of their lives.

For their service, their late nights and early mornings away from their families, the risks they take, and the sacrifices they make every day—and because they do not hear this nearly enough—allow me to say thank you to those members of the intelligence community.

JEANNE VERTEFEUILLE

Today I wish to briefly tell the remarkable stories of two extraordinary women who built their careers at the Central Intelligence Agency. Jeanne Vertefeuille, who is pictured here, passed away on December 29 at the age of 80 after a brief illness.

In announcing her death to the CIA family, Acting Director Michael Morell appropriately described Ms. Vertefeuille as an icon within the agency. If her story were not true, it would read like a spy novel.

Jeanne joined the CIA when she graduated from college in 1954. It was the year I was born and a year DICK DURBIN was also young. This was a time when the American intelligence community could be best described as an old boys' club. She was hired at the CIA as a GS-4 typist. This is a woman coming out of college in 1954 hired as a typist.

Over her career, which stretched over nearly a half century, Jeanne Vertefeuille blazed a trail for women in the national clandestine service. She methodically worked her way up to leadership positions. There were overseas postings in Ethiopia, Finland, and The Hague. She became an expert in Soviet intelligence and spycraft. She retired as a member of the Senior Intelligence Service in 1992.

Even after her retirement, she continued her work for the agency as a contractor, making still more valuable contributions and working without a day's break in service until she became ill last summer. As her obituary reads:

She remained a quiet agency soldier . . . purposefully nondescript and selflessly dedicated.

She lived alone and walked to work.

But if she was a great figure at the agency, Ms. Vertefeuille was also a tenacious and effective one, and in October of 1986 was asked to lead a task force to investigate the disappearance of Russians whom the CIA had hired to spy against their own country.

Together, with colleagues at the CIA she invested years in the methodical and painstaking hunt for a mole. It was through her efforts, and the good work of many others, that we ultimately unmasked the notorious traitor Aldrich Ames in 1984. Remember, this is a woman who joined the CIA in 1954 as a typist.

Aldrich Ames turned out to be one of the most dangerous traitors in the Nation's history. Thanks in large measure to Ms. Vertefeuille, he was convicted of espionage and is now serving a life term without parole.

SANDY GRIMES

Jeanne Vertefeuille's story does not end there. The Washington Post recently described how one of her colleagues, Sandy Grimes—another Virginian who worked with her on the Ames task force—stepped up over the past year to care for Jeanne as she was battling cancer.

Sandy Grimes, a career CIA employee whose parents worked on the Manhattan Project, ultimately served as Jeanne's primary caregiver. She sat with her each day during the final 3 months of her remarkable life. She monitored Jeanne's care and tried to make sure she remained comfortable. She often brought personal messages of support and appreciation from their former colleagues. Ms. Grimes said:

I felt an obligation to be there with her. I can't imagine not doing it. I was the one Jeanne would accept. I owed it to her as a friend.

By all accounts Jeanne Vertefeuille was an intensely private woman, and she doubtless would recoil at the attention she is now receiving. One cannot help but be inspired by this true-life story of service, patriotism, and friendship demonstrated by these two great employees, Sandy Grimes and the late Jeanne Vertefeuille. Their service reflects well on the thousands of other intelligence professionals whose names can never be revealed. Both of them deserve our recognition and thanks.

During the last Congress I joined 14 Senators in a Joint Resolution to mark the U.S. Intelligence Professionals Day. At some point during this Congress, I hope we can gather more supporters so we can have a day designated on a more formalized basis to recognize the enormous contributions made by intelligence professionals. Again, this is an effort to bring respectful attention to these quiet professionals who literally—as a member of the intelligence committee, I can testify to this—keep our Nation safe every day without any thought of recognition.

Again, I look forward to working with my colleagues so we can introduce this resolution in the next Congress.

As I conclude my remarks, I see my friend the distinguished majority whip. We have spent a lot of time over the last 2½ years grappling with the challenges around the debt and deficit and trying to make some of the very hard choices we are going to need to make as a Nation.

While it appears that we may be avoiding some of the immediate consequences of the so-called debt ceiling debate, which I am glad to see, never should the full faith and credit of the United States be used as a political hostage. Again, I want to compliment my friend the Senator from Illinois who has been as stalwart as anyone in this Chamber at stepping up and who has been willing to speak truth to even those who are the most supportive about some of the challenges and choices we have to make.

We are going to have to proceed at a level of spending that is less than what we have had in the past. As we think about cutting back budgets, I think it is important to remember that behind many of these budgets, there are not just numbers but there are incredible professionals who give their life's service to making this a stronger Nation. So with this tribute to Jeanne and Sandy, I commend these two great Federal employees.

I will be back on a regular basis to celebrate Federal employees throughout this Congress because too often in today's day and life, government service is disparaged. But for Jeanne Vertefeuille and Sandy Grimes we might not have as safe a Nation as we do today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will accept my colleague from Virginia's kind words with at least an indirect apology for the defamation which he included in his speech suggesting that I was somehow an Ancient Mariner here in the Senate. I wear my trousers rolled but not quite as rolled as my friend suggested.

I thank the Senator for his leadership on this deficit and debt issue. We have a lot to do and we have to do it thoughtfully. I am glad my colleague highlighted the two employees.

I read the obituary of the one the Senator from Virginia highlighted. It was an extraordinary story of a woman who persevered in an agency which didn't have much use for women beyond the secretarial staff. I am glad the Senator continues this tradition of acknowledging these important Federal employees.

I thank my friend from Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO STAN MUSIAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it has been said in St. Louis, MO, baseball is not a sport, it is a religion. If that is

true, Stan Musial was a St. Louis civic patron saint.

Stan Musial was an icon in St. Louis. He was the best ballplayer to wear a Cardinal's uniform and one of the best to play the game of baseball.

Stan Musial was my childhood hero when I was a boy and he remains a hero in my life to this day. When a person reaches my age, and maybe my station in life, they are supposed to be beyond the stage of swooning adolescence. But when it comes to Stan Musial, I am a 10-year-old kid all over again in East St. Louis, IL, buying more bubble gum than I can possibly afford in the hope that I would open one of those packages and find, covered in pink powder, a card that had Stan Musial's picture. It was the treasure of my youth, and it still would be today if my mom had not thrown those cards away.

Stan Musial's death has hit the Cardinals Nation like a death in the family. One Cardinal fan spoke for many of us when she said losing Stan Musial "is like losing a grandparent. It's hard not to tear up."

I grew up in East St. Louis across the river, and my most prized possession when I was a kid was my very first Stan Musial Rawlings baseball glove. As a kid I rubbed that glove with something called Gloveoleum until I was the only one who could still see Stan Musial's name burned in the leather. One of the highlights in my life came 2 years ago when I got to meet Stan Musial in person for the very first time in my life. It was at the White House, February 11, 2011. Stan Musial was there to receive from President Obama the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He is one of only eight other baseball players in the history of America to receive that prestigious honor. Listen to the company he joined: Joe DiMaggio, Jackie Robinson, Ted Williams, Roberto Clemente, Hank Aaron, Frank Robinson, and the famous Buck O'Neill.

At the White House I stood patiently waiting for the moment to ask Stan Musial to sign that old baseball glove, which I still have and have had since I was a kid. He agreed to do so. What a thrill. I was 10 years old all over again.

Outside Busch Stadium in St. Louis is a statue of Stan "The Man" in his playing prime. He is coiled up in his batting style. Every coach said don't bat like Stan "The Man," even though he has great numbers. If you do that, you will never hit the ball. We all tried; the coaches were right. Etched in the base of that statue are words that Major League Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick said when Stan retired in 1963: "Here stands baseball's perfect warrior. Here stands baseball's perfect knight."

On the field and off Stan Musial was always a gentleman, always a champion. He exemplified the values of sportsmanship, discipline, hard work, grace, consistency, and a love of family. Baseball broadcaster Vince Scully, a Hall of Famer himself, once said:

"How good was Stan Musial? He was good enough to take your breath away."

Stan Musial played his entire 22-year career for the St. Louis Cardinals. He did take off one season in 1945 to serve our country in the U.S. Navy during World War II. His 3,026 games with the same club are second only to the 3,308 games over 23 years by Carl Yastrzemski.

When Stan Musial retired from baseball after the 1963 season, he held 29 National League records and 17 Major League records. Here are just some of his career numbers: a batting average of .331, an on-base percentage of .417, 3,630 hits, 725 doubles, 177 triples, 475 homers—and the first homer I can ever remember seeing on television was the All-Star game in St. Louis, and darned if Stan Musial didn't get up in the 12th inning, parking a home run into the outfield stands, winning it for the National League. I couldn't have been more thrilled, my first exposure to baseball on television. He had 1,951 RBIs and 1,949 runs. He is the only baseball player to finish his career in the top 25 in all of these categories.

Where did he get that nickname? It was coined not by a Cardinals fan but by a Brooklyn Dodgers fan in May 1946, after Musial's four hits helped lead the Cardinals to a 13-to-4 drubbing of the Brooklyn Dodgers. Every time Stan Musial came to the plate, the fans in Ebbets Field said, "Here comes the man." And the name stuck.

The legendary baseball writer Red Barber once described the 1947 season as "the year all hell broke loose in baseball." It was the year Jackie Robinson integrated Major League Baseball. Jackie Robinson would later recall when asked about his baseball career that it was Stan Musial and Hank Greenberg, two players who went out of their way to be friendly and encouraging in that historic and difficult year.

Maybe Stan Musial's greatest baseball day came on May 2, 1954. It was a double header in St. Louis against the New York Giants. He hit three homers in the first game and two in the second.

In 1957, Stan Musial became the first Major League Baseball player to earn the amazing salary of \$100,000 a year. Two years later, when his batting average dipped to .255, it was Musial who went to the Cardinals' owners and asked them to cut his salary back to \$80,000. He wasn't playing up to what he thought he had the potential to play up to.

Late in his final season, he stayed up all night waiting for the birth of his first grandchild, and the next day he became the first grandfather to ever homer in the Major Leagues. Umpires—and this says something about what a gentleman he always was—umpires never once ejected Stan Musial from a baseball game in more than 3,000 games.

On January 21, 1969, Stan Musial was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame on

the first ballot. He was named on 92 percent of the ballots—something on which to reflect after what we just went through a few weeks ago when no one made the cut for the Baseball Hall of Fame. Stan Musial was the first player to receive 300 votes on a Hall of Fame ballot.

When he retired, the St. Louis Cardinals retired his number, No. 6. Cardinals manager Mike Matheny has said that when the entire Cardinals team takes the field this year, they will be wearing a No. 6 patch on their uniforms. But then he said:

It will be a call for us to do our very best to live up to that high standard of excellence.

Then he added:

You don't come across names like warrior, prince and knight by just having Hall of Fame statistics. It comes from making an impact in people's lives. I was in that group. Mr. Musial, I say thank you. He's a perfect example of what it means to wear this jersey.

I want to give credit to my colleague, Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL. She worked with me—in fact, she led the way in terms of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, along with Senator Bond, for Stan Musial. And she came up with a great idea. I don't know if it is going to go anywhere, but I am going to try to help her make it a reality. She has suggested we can honor this American hero, this regional hero and the values he stood for by naming the new bridge being built across the Mississippi River at St. Louis in honor of Stan Musial. I grew up on the Illinois side, and we kind of looked over at Missouri a little differently than most, and they looked at us a little differently too. But if there was one thing that ever united us it was baseball loyalty and Stan Musial. It is a perfect name for a bridge that spans between Illinois and Missouri in that region of the country.

I am proud to join Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL, and we will be introducing a bill to name the bridge the Stan Musial Memorial Bridge. Other legislation is being considered in the Illinois and Missouri General Assemblies at this time. I wish them the best in honoring this great man. It was my great honor to join him on that historic date when he was given the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

(The remarks of Senator DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 113 and S. 114 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Louisiana.

GOOD GOVERNMENT REFORM

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, more and more Americans from all walks of life, of both political parties, feel there is not just a pond or a sea but an ocean of difference between the real world where they live and Washington, DC. They view—I think correctly—Washington, DC, as a different planet where

normal rules do not seem to apply. That is why on the first day I could introduce new legislation in this new Congress, I chose to introduce a package of reform measures—measures aimed at bridging that gap, bringing those two worlds together, returning us—returning Washington to the real world and reconnecting with the American people.

The American people are also concerned—rightly—about the bitter partisanship, the overly ideological tone of almost all of the debate we have here in Washington now, here in Congress.

I believe these sorts of reform measures—the four bills I have introduced in particular—can also help bridge that divide because they are not ideological, they are not partisan, they are good-government reform, things that can and should and, hopefully, will bring us together and bring us together and reconnect us with the American people. Again, it is another reason I chose to introduce this package of four reform measures, four good-government bills on the first day I could introduce legislation this Congress.

The first is a very simple and basic but fundamental idea: term limits for Members of Congress. I am honored to be joined by six other Senators right out of the gate, right out of the box in terms of cosponsoring this important legislation: Senators PAUL, AYOTTE, COBURN, LEE, RUBIO, CRUZ, and JOHNSON. I thank them for their cosponsorship and their support. This measure would limit Members of Congress in the House to three consecutive terms, a total of 6 years, and the Senate to two consecutive terms, a total of 12 years. It is a consensus measure supported by citizens groups very active and supportive of the concept of term limits. The idea, again, is simple: to reconnect Congress with the American people, to do away with the notion of legislating as a career, and to get back to the Founders' vision of citizen legislators.

When I was in the State legislature, I authored and passed term limits for the State legislature. That required a State constitutional amendment—a big deal—a two-thirds vote in each body, and then a vote of the people. But because of the people's voices rising and being heard, we achieved that. With that reform, which was voted overwhelmingly into the State constitution by the people of Louisiana, we have a regular influx now of new, fresh blood, real experience from the real world that reconnects in a very healthy way the State legislature and all of us, the citizens, whom it is supposed to represent. That was needed for the State legislature, and if it was—and it was—it is needed a thousand times more for Congress because that divide, that sea, that ocean, that difference between different planets in the eyes of so many Americans is even greater between Congress and the real world, Congress and the American people.

The second bill I have introduced is a bill to do away with automatic pay increases for Members of Congress. That is present law, that we get regular increases of pay with no proposal, no bill put in the hopper, no debate, no need for an inconvenient vote. I think that is just outright wrong. I think it helps build that distrust on the part of the American people. I am joined by a bipartisan cosponsor, Senator McCASKILL of Missouri. I thank her for her leadership and her support of this measure. Again, the measure is very simple: Just repeal, do away with any automatic pay increases for Members of Congress. If there is to be a pay increase, there should be a bill proposing it and open debate and a public vote.

The third measure is also fully bipartisan. I am introducing it with Senator BILL NELSON of Florida. It is reform of the Corps of Engineers—something very important for our two States but also for, indeed, the whole country. In Louisiana, in Florida, and elsewhere, unfortunately, the Corps of Engineers has become a poster child for a dysfunctional Federal Government, a Federal bureaucracy, a Federal system that is just bogged down, does not work. It takes 10 and 20 years to study something, never ever getting to construction. We need to streamline and reform that process, and the Vitter-Nelson bill does just that by greatly streamlining the process by which Corps projects can come to fruition, putting State and local leaders more in charge of that effort, at first on a pilot basis. Hopefully, we will expand that in the future for important Corps of Engineers projects. Again, that is particularly important for our States of Louisiana and Florida, but it is important for so many States and for the country as a whole.

Fourth and finally, I am introducing a measure that I have had before to reform Federal campaign finance law to prohibit PACs and campaign funds from employing Members' spouses or family members.

That is just a way, quite frankly, in some circumstances for Members of Congress, politicians, to pad their family income. I think that is wrong, and that leads directly to the real suspicion and low regard in which so many Americans hold this institution.

Again, this bill is simple, straightforward, but important. It would prohibit spouses and immediate family members of Members of Congress from receiving payments from that Member's campaign accounts or leadership PACs. That is a loophole and an area of abuse we must close. We must prohibit that abuse in the future.

These four bills won't solve every problem out there. They won't be the be-all and end-all of important reform and good-government efforts, but they would be an important start. They would help us truly reconnect with the American people and narrow this divide, which is so vast right now, between the real world, real Americans,

and this institution. They would be important, nonpartisan, nonideological reform efforts that we can gather around, Republicans and Democrats alike, to do something positive, to do something productive, and to reconnect with the American people.

I urge my colleagues from both parties to support these measures, to come on as cosponsors. Many of you already have, and I thank you for that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period of morning business be extended until 5 p.m. today and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

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

TRIBUTE TO JOHN "JACK" EDWARD BRESCH

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life, legacy and service of a dear friend—John Edward Bresch. Jack led a life filled with compassion. He worked tirelessly for everyone to have access to affordable, quality health care, especially needy children and families. His heart was as big as heaven.

But Jack's life was also a life of great humor. Anybody who knew him also knew his warm and infectious laugh. It was a sure sign that Jack was somewhere nearby because you could almost hear his laughter before you saw his face. And everybody was glad to see Jack coming their way. He truly never met a stranger.

Sadly, we won't be able to hear that distinct laughter again. Jack passed away on September 1, 2012, surrounded by his family after a brief and courageous battle with pancreatic cancer. From the moment of his fateful diagnosis until the day he left us, we saw in him grace and courage, dignity and humility, joy and, yes, laughter—and so much love and gratitude lived out on a daily basis that, even in our sorrow, his memory will never be lost.

Tomorrow, Jack will be laid to rest in our Nation's most hallowed ground—Arlington National Cemetery—with full military honors as a decorated Naval Lieutenant who served as a Chaplain during the Vietnam war.

In his life, Jack Bresch was many things but above all, a family man, devoted to his wife, JoAnn; his children, Mary Elizabeth, James Richard, and

Jeffrey John; and 10 grandchildren on whom he doted. He also leaves behind countless friends and colleagues whose lives are enriched with memories of this gregarious, energetic, larger-than-life man. But when a loved one is gone, it is often the little things you remember most. Some of us will remember how much Jack loved neckties. Some of us will remember sharing Jack's favorite drink—a Manhattan, made with Maker's Mark, up, no bitters, with a twist of orange. Some of us will remember how often Jack quoted the 19th century German politician Otto von Bismark—"Politics is the art of the possible." And some of us will remember how proud Jack was to be at the White House when President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act for which he worked so tirelessly. A friend saw Jack on TV and sent him a text to let him know, and Jack texted back, "Just a pleasure to be here."

It was a pleasure for Jack to be anywhere. Simply put, Jack enjoyed being with people, and people enjoyed being with Jack. He was a great person to talk to—probably because he began his adult life as a Roman Catholic priest. Jack was a priest in the Diocese of Pittsburgh, his native city, from 1966 to 1974. In 1968, at the height of the Vietnam war, he entered the U.S. Navy and served as a Navy and Marine Corps Chaplain in posts around the world. During his time in the service, he supervised drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs and worked as a liaison with the American Red Cross. After the war, Jack left the priesthood. But in some ways, he never stopped being a chaplain, in the sense that he never wavered from his steadfast belief in social justice. He carried that belief forward in career that made the world a better place—working for Congress, the Federal Government, the Illinois Hospital Association, the Catholic Health Association, and the American Dental Education Association. Many members of Congress got to know Jack through his work as the lead lobbyist for the Catholic Health Association. They also learned quickly just how hard it was to say "no" to Jack.

While at the Catholic Health Association, Jack worked closely with then First Lady Hillary Clinton and the White House to develop a plan for reforming the Nation's health care system. While at the American Dental Education Association, he was instrumental in improving access to dental care for needy children. For more than a decade, he worked diligently to ensure that policymakers understood the value of oral health to overall health—the reason why he was invited to the White House for the signing of the Affordable Care Act. Jack lived long enough to see the Supreme Court uphold key portions of the Affordable Care Act. He knew the law wasn't perfect, but he was happy to see it move forward. Remember, he believed that "politics is the art of the possible."

To JoAnn and Jack's entire family, my wife Gayle and I extend our deepest

sympathy because we are part of that family. Jack and I shared four of his 10 grandchildren, but he lent all the rest of them to me, too. It is hard to think of this world without Jack being a part of it, making us laugh—and hearing him laugh—and making us care—the way he cared.

There is a wonderful anonymous quote which may well describe how we should think of Jack's passing, especially since he served so courageously in the Navy. It offers great comfort to those who grieve. And it goes something like this:

I am standing upon the seashore. A ship at my side spreads her white sails to the morning breeze and starts for the blue ocean. She is an object of beauty and strength, and I stand and watch her until, at length, she hangs like a speck of white cloud just where the sea and sky come down to mingle with each other. Then someone at my side says, "There! She's gone."

Gone where? Gone from my sight—that is all. She is just as large in mast and hull and spar as she was when she left my side, and just as able to bear her load of living freight to the place of destination. Her diminished size is in me, not in her, and just at the moment when someone at my side says, "There, she's gone,"—there are other eyes watching her coming, and other voices ready to take up the glad shout, "There she comes!"

Jack Bresch was a man whose optimism could overwhelm any doubter and whose joy for life was wonderfully contagious and completely irresistible. The ancient poets tell us that "one must wait until the evening to see how splendid the day has been." Our day with Jack Bresch was splendid indeed.

As we prepare to honor Jack with the military honors due a decorated Navy Chaplain, I would like to end my tribute to Jack's life with a traditional nautical blessing and wish my dear friend "fair winds and following seas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO PATTI PAGE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, Patti Page died on New Year's Day this year. She was 85 years old. The Senate has not been in session for most of the time since then. I wanted to come to the floor to pay a Tennessean's tribute to Patti Page. Patti Page is best known for our State song, the "Tennessee Waltz." A few years ago, in 2007, when I met her for the first time, she told me the story of the "Tennessee Waltz." I knew some of it, but she completed the rest of it.

In 1946, a couple of Tennesseans, Pee Wee King and Redd Stewart, were driving from Memphis to Nashville. That was before the interstate highways. It took a pretty good amount of time to drive that distance. I don't know whether or not they were drinking a beer on the way from Memphis to Nashville but they were relaxed, and one of them said to the other, Why is it Kentucky and Missouri have a waltz and Tennessee doesn't have a waltz? So

on the way from Memphis to Nashville they took out a penny matchbox, which is one of these big boxes with wooden matches in it, dumped out the matches on the floorboards of the car, and on the back of the penny matchbox, between Memphis and Nashville, in 1946, Pee Wee King and Redd Stewart wrote the "Tennessee Waltz." They sang it around a few places. Pee Wee King sang it at the Grand Ole Opry. Nobody paid much attention to it. Cowboy Copas sang it. They sang it on Red Foley's show in Missouri. Nothing much happened to the "Tennessee Waltz" until 1950, and this is the story Patti Page told me. Mercury Records in New York had a new song they were sure was going to be a big hit. It was called "Boogie Woogie Santa Claus." I don't know whether it was a follow up to "Rudolph the Red-Nosed Reindeer," but the executives in New York were sure it was going to be a big hit so they wanted the hottest young female singer in America to record "Boogie Woogie Santa Claus" so they hired Patti Page. She flew to New York, recorded it for Mercury Records, and then in those days you always had to put a record on the back of the main record. You had to pick a song. It would be the "B" side. Just as a throw-away they put on the back of it the song by Pee Wee King and Redd Stewart, the "Tennessee Waltz."

We know the rest of the story. The "Tennessee Waltz" sold about a million copies. Nobody ever heard of the "Boogie Woogie Santa Claus" except those who bought the "Tennessee Waltz." Mike Curb, who runs Curb Records in Nashville, told me it was the best selling record ever by a female artist. Patti Page eventually sold 100 million records. She was the top selling female artist in record sales in history.

Growing up I heard her songs, "Mockingbird Hill," "I Went To Your Wedding," "Old Cape Cod." In 1952 she had a song called "Doggie in the Window." It sounds like a silly little song, but it sold a lot of records and a great many Americans remember it. When I was Governor of Tennessee I would travel to Japan, recruiting industry. In the evenings I would go to a restaurant bar with friends, and to my astonishment all of my Japanese friends, many of whom did not know much English, could sing every word of the "Tennessee Waltz." When I inquired about it, it was because it was introduced during the time of the American occupation of Japan in 1950 or so, and according to them, the Asian music doesn't have the same kind of standard that American music has. We get a phrase or a theme in our minds and we never forget it, such as the "Tennessee Waltz." So the "Tennessee Waltz" became a song that most Japanese men of that age knew, remembered, and could sing from memory.

I met Patti Page for the first time 6 years ago. It was 2007. She was about 79 or 80 years of age at the time. She told me the story of the recording of the

“Tennessee Waltz” for Mercury Records. It turned out it was her last recording session. Mike Kerr, the owner of Kerr Records, had invited her to come to Nashville and record an album, “Best of Patti Page.” He had invited me to come play the piano while she sang the “Tennessee Waltz,” which I did. It was a real thrill and she was very patient to put up with an amateur piano player for her very special song. She told me then it wasn’t the first time she had performed with a Tennessee Governor. In 1950 she had performed with Tennessee Governor Gordon Browning at a Memphis theater. This was when she was all the rage, the “Tennessee Waltz” was all the rage, and the Governor wanted to sing it with her.

I asked how it went. She said, “Well, to tell you the truth, the Governor wasn’t a very good singer.”

I don’t know what she said to others about my piano playing, but I think that was probably about as harsh a verdict as Patti Page ever rendered of any other person.

According to the New York Times obituary, Patti Page once said:

But I don’t think I’ve stepped on anyone along the way. If I have, I didn’t mean to.

Well, Patti Page is gone now, but her music is not. Whenever we Tennesseans hear our State song, the “Tennessee Waltz,” played, or whenever we sing it, we will remember the voice of Patti Page.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks that the obituary about Patti Page from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times—Obituary]

PATTI PAGE, HONEY-VOICED '50S POP SENSATION, DIES AT 85

(By Anita Gates)

Patti Page, the apple-cheeked, honey-voiced alto whose sentimental, soothing, sometimes silly hits like “Tennessee Waltz,” “Old Cape Cod” and “How Much Is That Doggie in the Window?” made her one of the most successful pop singers of the 1950s, died on Tuesday in Encinitas, Calif. She was 85.

Her death was confirmed by Seacrest Village Retirement Communities, where she lived.

Ms. Page had briefly been a singer with Benny Goodman when she emerged at the end of the big band era, just after World War II, into a cultural atmosphere in which pop music was not expected to be challenging. Critics assailed her style as plastic, placid, bland and antiseptic, but those opinions were not shared by millions of record buyers. As Jon Pareles wrote in The New York Times in 1997, “For her fans, beauty and comfort were one and the same.”

“Doggie in the Window,” a perky 1952 novelty number written by Bob Merrill and Ingrid Reuterskiöld, featured repeated barking sounds and could claim no more sophisticated a lyric than “I must take a trip to California.” It is often cited as an example of what was wrong with pop music in the early '50s, a perceived weakness that opened the door for rock ‘n’ roll. But if that is true, and if the silky voice of “the singing rage, Miss

Patti Page,” as she was introduced during her heyday, was mechanical or sterile, she had significant achievements nonetheless.

“Tennessee Waltz,” from 1950, sold 10 million copies and is largely considered the first true crossover hit; it spent months on the pop, country and rhythm-and-blues charts.

Ms. Page was believed to be the first singer to overdub herself, long before technology made that method common. Mitch Miller, a producer for Mercury Records, had her do it first on “Confess,” in 1948, when there were no backup singers because of a strike.

The height of her career predated the Grammy Awards, which were created in 1959, but she finally won her first and only Grammy in 1999 for “Live at Carnegie Hall,” a recording of a 1997 concert celebrating her 50th anniversary as a performer. Her career was also the basis of recent, short-lived Off Broadway musical, “Flipside: The Patti Page Story.”

In the early days of television Ms. Page was the host of several short-lived network series, including “Scott Music Hall” (1952), a 15-minute NBC show that followed the evening news two nights a week, and “The Big Record,” which ran one season, 1957–58, on CBS. “The Patti Page Show” was an NBC summer fill-in series in 1956.

Ms. Page defended her demure, unpretentious style as appropriate for its time. “It was right after the war,” she told The Advocate of Baton Rouge, La., in 2002, “and people were waiting to just settle down and take a deep breath and relax.”

She was born Clara Ann Fowler on Nov. 8, 1927, in Claremore, Okla., a small town near Tulsa that was also the birthplace of Will Rogers. She was one of 11 children of a railroad laborer.

Having shown talent as an artist, Clara took a job in the art department of the Tulsa radio station KTUL, but an executive there had heard her sing and soon asked her to take over a short country-music show called “Meet Patti Page” (Time magazine called it “a hillbilly affair”), sponsored by Page Milk. She adopted the fictional character’s name and kept it.

The newly named Ms. Page broke away from her radio career to tour with Jimmy Joy’s band and was shortly signed by Mercury Records. She had her first hit record, “With My Eyes Wide Open, I’m Dreaming,” in 1950. Other notable recordings were “Cross Over the Bridge,” “Mockin’ Bird Hill,” “Allegheny Moon” and her last hit, “Hush . . . Hush, Sweet Charlotte,” which she recorded as the theme for the Bette Davis movie of the same name. That song was nominated for an Oscar, and Ms. Page sang it on the 1965 Academy Awards telecast.

Ms. Page briefly pursued a movie career in her early '30s, playing an evangelical singer alongside Burt Lancaster and Jean Simmons in “Elmer Gantry” (1960), David Janssen’s love interest in the comic-strip-inspired “Dondi” (1961) and a suburban wife in the comedy “Boys’ Night Out” (1962), with Kim Novak and James Garner. She had one of her earliest acting roles in 1957 on an episode of “The United States Steel Hour.”

In later decades her star faded, but she continued to sing professionally throughout her 70s. Early in the 21st century she was performing in about 40 to 50 concerts a year. In 2002 and 2003 she released an album of children’s songs, a new “best of” collection and a Christmas album.

Ms. Page married Charles O’Curran, a Hollywood choreographer, in 1956. They divorced in 1972. In 1990 she married Jerry Filicetto, a retired aerospace engineer, with whom she founded a New Hampshire company marketing maple syrup products. He died in 2009. Survivors include her son, Danny O’Curran; her daughter, Kathleen Ginn; and a number of grandchildren.

Ms. Page’s nice-girl image endured. In 1988, when she was 60, she told The Times: “I’m sure there are a lot of things I should have done differently. But I don’t think I’ve stepped on anyone along the way. If I have, I didn’t mean to.”

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

(The remarks of Mr. COONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 85 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. COONS. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STARTUP ACT 2.0

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I have only been a Member of the Senate for 2 years, but in that short period of time at least seven other countries have taken actions that we have not taken to better support and attract entrepreneurs to their countries’ economies. The map beside me shows those countries: the United Kingdom, Russia, Singapore, Australia, Brazil, Chile, and Canada. Those countries have changed their rules, regulations, passed laws, changed their policies to make their country more friendly to startup businesses and to entrepreneurship.

I wish to focus on and visit with my colleagues about what is happening in one of those countries—our neighbor to the north, Canada—and explain why it is in the interests of our own country to act quickly to retain highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants.

In 2002, Canada announced plans to create a new visa to attract foreign entrepreneurs to their country. Canada is developing a plan to admit foreign entrepreneurs who have received capital from venture funds to start businesses in Canada and to admit them to Canada within weeks. A spokesman for the Canadian immigration agency was quoted in September as saying: “Canada seeks young, ambitious innovative immigrants who will contribute to Canada’s job growth and further drive our economy.”

But Canada is not just changing its laws to attract entrepreneurs; it is advertising and trying to lure talent there. The ad we are now showing—this is a full-page ad that appeared in a publication called Fast Company. It is an American magazine dedicated to startups, to technology and innovation. The advertisement for Ontario highlights R&D incentives and innovative and dynamic business environment

and the top talent needed to grow new businesses.

We in Congress and in the administration need to take note of this. Other countries, including our friends to the north, are aggressively courting entrepreneurs and talented individuals and they are luring them from here; they are trying to get them from the United States. Canadian Citizenship and Immigration Minister Jason Kenney said: "We need to proactively target a new type of immigrant entrepreneur who has the potential to build innovative companies that can compete on a global scale and create jobs for Canadians."

While we work in the United States to continue educating our children with the skills for a 21st century economy and training the next generation of great American entrepreneurs, we also need to be welcoming to those who want to create a business in the United States and employ Americans now. With respect to Canada, America is the country of entrepreneurs, a place where those with good ideas who are willing to work hard can come and make something for themselves.

There is a global battle for entrepreneurial talent and the United States is falling behind. A story I heard while visiting California, the Silicon Valley, last year, illustrates this point pretty well. A large company that just a few years ago was a small startup told me they had plans to hire 68 highly skilled immigrants but could not get a visa for them to work in the United States. Rather than letting this talent go, the company hired them but hired them at their location in Canada. It is certainly troubling that 68 jobs went outside the United States. They were lost in our country because the United States does not have a visa program that works. What troubles me even more is that some of those 68 people hired in Canada will go on to start a business that may result in significant job creation in Canada. Those jobs that could have been in the United States are now in another country and those individuals who may start a company are no longer in the United States but are now in Canada. When we lose entrepreneurs and highly skilled immigrants, we lose the jobs they create.

The good news is there are steps we can take to attract and retain foreign entrepreneurs and highly skilled immigrants. In a bipartisan effort, Senator WARNER, Senator COONS, Senator RUBIO, and I introduced Startup Act 2.0 last year. Senators BLUNT and Scott Brown of Massachusetts joined as cosponsors, and an identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives with an even number of Republican and Democratic supporters. Again, this year, I am working with those colleagues to reintroduce a bill very similar to that in very short order.

Startup Act 2.0 makes changes to the Federal regulatory process to lessen government burdens on job creators, modifies the Tax Code to encourage in-

vestment in new businesses and capital formation, seeks to accelerate the commercialization of university research that can lead to new ventures and, most importantly, provides new opportunities for highly educated and entrepreneurial immigrants to stay in the United States where their talent and new ideas can fuel economic growth and, most importantly, create jobs for Americans.

Startup Act 2.0 creates an entrepreneurial visa for foreign-born entrepreneurs currently in the United States—legally in the United States. Those with good ideas, with capital, and the willingness to hire Americans would be able to stay in the United States and grow their businesses. In many instances, foreign-born entrepreneurs, here legally, have an idea and want to begin a company that will employ Americans but are told their visa does not allow them to remain in the United States.

Take the story of Asaf Darash. Asaf was born in Israel and came to the United States in 2007 after being awarded a Fulbright scholarship to study at the University of California. After completing his doctoral thesis, he founded a software company called Regpack. Asaf raised \$1.5 million in financing for the company and hired more than a dozen Americans. His company has the potential to grow quickly and to further create additional jobs. But Asaf, the founder of this dynamic company, is no longer in the United States. My staff contacted him this morning and he said that because of the difficulty in obtaining a visa and the amount of time and effort it was taking, he decided it was easier to move to Israel and take the core of the company, including its jobs, with him. As Regpack grows, new jobs are going to be created in Israel—jobs that could have been in the United States if we had a visa dedicated to foreign entrepreneurs such as Asaf.

Sadly, his story is far from uncommon. Immigrants legally living in the United States who have a good idea and want to start a business have few options available to them. With very few ways to stay, these entrepreneurs, just like Asaf, are forced to move and take their businesses with them and take the jobs they have created and will create to other countries.

I wish to make certain America is the best place for entrepreneurs who want to build America and hire Americans. Passing Startup Act 2.0 will help make this happen.

Entrepreneurial immigrants have long contributed to the strength of our country by starting companies and creating jobs. Of the current Fortune 500 companies, more than 40 percent were founded by first- or second-generation Americans. Today, 1 in every 10 Americans employed at a privately owned U.S. company works at an immigrant-owned firm.

In our mobile world, entrepreneurs have a choice as to where they start a

business. For decades, there was no better place than the land of opportunity—the United States of America. But things are changing. Other countries are aggressively seeking the best and brightest, those with entrepreneurial talent, as a way to grow their economy.

I believe most—in fact, I would say at least 80 percent—of my colleagues in Congress agree with the visa provisions in Startup Act 2.0. They understand that retaining highly skilled entrepreneurial immigrants will lead to economic growth and new jobs for Americans. Unfortunately, there is an approach in Congress that has been here for the last several years that says if we can't do everything, we will not do anything. I urge my colleagues let's pass what we can agree on now and keep working to find common ground on issues that still divide us.

Canada and other countries are creating new opportunities for entrepreneurs, for startup companies, but the United States is still the home of the American dream. We need to pass Startup 2.0 so individuals can pursue their ambitions in America.

Millions of our citizens remain out of work. Our economy is barely growing. One would think, common sense would suggest we would work hard together to deal with the issues we have agreement on that would help jump-start the economy.

Let's do that. Let's jump-start the American economy through entrepreneurship and allow those with talents and skills we need to pursue the American dream in the United States of America and thereby strengthen our economy.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DYSFUNCTIONAL LEGISLATING

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we all know in the Senate and in the House of Representatives about the low grades Congress receives in public opinion polling. Everybody knows what the public reports: Congress is partisan. Congress is divided. Congress is dysfunctional.

One recent survey that got a lot of media attention reported that Congress is less popular than a root canal. Across the country, people are fed up with Congress. Indeed, Members of Congress are fed up with Congress.

Americans want a Congress that can take on the tough challenges of today. But another recent poll by USA Today and Gallup showed that 77 percent of Americans feel "the way politics works in Washington these days is causing serious harm to the United States."

Americans think Congress has a problem. Indeed, Americans think Congress is a problem. Well, if we want to fix a problem, we ought to be specific about it. A doctor wouldn't try to fix a patient without a precise understanding of the patient's problem. An engineer wouldn't try to fix a system without a precise understanding of the system's problem. A mechanic wouldn't try to fix your car without a precise understanding of your car's problem. So if we are going to fix what is wrong with Congress, we better have a precise understanding of what Congress' problem is.

Let's start with the Senate. We do have our share of dysfunction in the Senate, I will confess. Undoubtedly, the filibuster is being abused. Certainly, nominees awaiting confirmation are unjustifiably delayed. Indeed, they are held hostage. So everything is not all roses in the Senate.

But we did pass a highway bill, a bipartisan highway bill, that passed the Senate with 74 votes. We did pass a farm bill, a bipartisan farm bill. Although I did not support that particular measure, it was a bipartisan measure that passed the Senate with 64 votes.

We passed the Hurricane Sandy emergency relief bill, also in bipartisan fashion, with 62 votes. We had open debate, we had discussions, we had amendments, and we passed legislation.

Particularly, we passed, by a powerful bipartisan vote of 89 to 8, a bill that avoided tax increases for 99 percent of Americans and extended emergency unemployment benefits for another year and protected us from the fiscal cliff. When it comes to legislating, the Senate actually has a pretty strong bipartisan record.

How did those Senate bills do on the House side? Well, the House couldn't pass its own highway bill. Congress has been doing highway bills since the Eisenhower years. This isn't rocket science. The House couldn't do one. The best the House of Representatives could do was to pass a short-term extension that allowed some of their Members to get to conference on the Senate bill, but they took no bill into conference because they couldn't pass one. Even then, they delayed the conference negotiations, putting thousands of jobs in jeopardy before they finally came around and passed an amended version of the Senate bipartisan highway bill. So their record on the highway bill is nothing to be proud of.

The House also couldn't pass a farm bill. Farm bills are pretty ordinary legislative business too. We do them all the time, but the House has passed no farm bill. We passed a strong bipartisan Senate farm bill. They can't even agree to call up the bipartisan Senate farm bill and pass it. With 80 percent of the agricultural land of the country in drought, there is no farm bill. It is trapped in the sinkhole of the House.

The House almost couldn't pass a disaster bill. If you go back to Hurricane Katrina, when Katrina hit back in 2005, the House of Representatives then had emergency aid on its way to the 850,000 damaged or destroyed homes of the gulf coast in 11 days. In 11 days aid was on its way. This time, with this House of Representatives, the House balked at the bipartisan Senate disaster bill and, finally, it took them 78 days after the landfall of Hurricane Sandy to send help to the half million homes and businesses damaged or destroyed by that storm.

The condemnation of the House of Republicans was bipartisan. The Republican Governor of New Jersey blamed, and I quote, "the toxic internal politics," the toxic internal politics, of the House Republicans for this fiasco. "This," he said, and I will quote again, "is why the American people hate Congress."

Is there a problem over in the House? You bet there is, to the point where one departing House Republican Member compared the Speaker of the House to the manager of an asylum and the Speaker's House Republican colleagues to the asylum inmates. That is pretty strong criticism from within the Republican Party.

The reason I give this speech is to try to be precise about what the problem is that has driven Congress's approval into the cellar, and what exactly is that problem? Well, I think the House votes on the so-called fiscal cliff bill and on the emergency Hurricane Sandy aid illustrate what the problem is. Those bills passed the House for one reason and one reason only: The Speaker of the House of Representatives waived what is called the Hastert rule.

What is the Hastert rule? The Hastert rule is probably the most significant contributor to dysfunction in Washington right now. It is not even really a rule, it is a policy, a political policy of Republican Speakers. It began under former Republican Speaker Hastert, hence its common name as the Hastert rule. The rule is that the Speaker will bring no bill to the floor of the House of Representatives without a majority of his own party supporting the bill. It doesn't matter about a majority of Congress; Democratic votes don't count. It is only when the Speaker has a majority of Republican votes supporting it that the Speaker will allow legislation to come to the floor.

It has actually gotten a little bit harder under Speaker BOEHNER, who has said, I don't feel comfortable scheduling any controversial legislation unless I know we have the votes on our side first, which sounds like he is saying he has to be able to produce a majority of the House out of just the Republican caucus before bringing a bill. But whether it is the original Hastert rule requiring a majority of the majority before they will even bring a bill to the floor or what appears to be the Boehner rule, that they have

to have the votes on "our side first," it is a rule of obstruction.

There are somewhere between 50 and 60 Members of the House Republican tea party caucus and a whole bunch more House Republicans who are scared of the tea party and scared of what might happen to them if they get a tea party primary challenger. So getting a majority of his party together for anything reasonable is a challenge for Speaker BOEHNER.

House Republicans could not get a majority of their conference to support a highway bill. So the Hastert rule kicked in and there was no House highway bill, none—they couldn't do one at all because they couldn't get it through their conference under the Hastert rule. That is why there was no highway bill.

The House Republicans could not get a majority of their conference to support a farm bill, so under the Hastert rule there is no House farm bill. The Speaker won't bring up the stalled bipartisan Senate farm bill, because under the Hastert rule he can't get a majority of his party to support even the bipartisan Senate farm bill.

We were headed for the exact same result on the fiscal cliff—we were headed for the exact same result on the fiscal cliff. Speaker BOEHNER could not get his party to support protecting America from the fiscal cliff. So, with literally minutes left to spare, and with the House Republican Conference ready, willing, and about to pitch the country off the fiscal cliff, Speaker BOEHNER did what? He ignored the Hastert rule. He ignored the Hastert rule, and he let the fiscal cliff bill come to the floor of the House without having the votes on "our side first," to use the Speaker's language. Two-thirds of House Republicans actually voted to roll America off the fiscal cliff. Here is the vote count. Republican "yes" votes on the fiscal cliff legislation were only 85. Republican "no" votes on the fiscal cliff legislation were 151. He wasn't even close to making the Hastert rule.

That fiscal cliff bill passed the House 257 to 167 because the Democrats came out and voted for it, 172 to 16; 172 Democratic "yes" votes, 16 Democratic "no" votes. Two-thirds of the "yes" votes that put the fiscal cliff bill across and saved America from a 100-percent tax increase and protected our economy from the fiscal cliff—two-thirds of those votes came from Democrats. If the Speaker had enforced the Hastert rule, we would be over the fiscal cliff today.

What happened on Sandy? After nearly 3 months of stalling, while my State, while the Presiding Officer's State of New York, while the States of New York and New Jersey, struck by Sandy, were waiting urgently for the relief that we got to the coast within 11 days, they stalled and they stalled because they could not get a majority of the Republican caucus to support Federal relief for our hurricane-ravaged States. Under the Hastert rule, they

couldn't get that bill to the floor. So Speaker BOEHNER once again decided to forgo the Hastert rule. That is how they got the Sandy emergency aid bill passed. Look again at the votes. Republican "yes" votes for the disaster bill, 49; Republican "no" votes for that bill, 179. That bill was dead on arrival under the Hastert rule. The Republican caucus couldn't support it, wouldn't support it, and we would be without any help now if they had followed the Hastert rule.

On the Democratic side, what was the vote on the Hurricane Sandy bill—192 "yes" votes to 1 "no" vote. The final count was 241 ayes, 180 nays. The bill passed, but about three-quarters of the support came from Democratic votes.

If the Speaker had imposed the Hastert rule, not only would we be off the fiscal cliff, but we would have failed at providing disaster relief for Hurricane Sandy. The only reason these critical pieces of legislation avoided the fate of the highway bill and of the farm bill is that the Speaker didn't follow the Hastert rule. He couldn't follow the Hastert rule because he wouldn't have been able to pass legislation. If his tea party caucus had forced America off the fiscal cliff, he knew there would have been hell to pay, so he waived the Hastert rule.

Now, of course, House Republicans are all in a fuss about having waived the Hastert rule. One tea party lawmaker admitted that the New Year's Day tax vote left a lot of his fellow Republicans with a very bad taste in their mouth. So it is probably back to Hastert rule business as usual on the House side, with death by tea party to any major bipartisan Senate legislation.

The tea party over on the House side wanted to vote for extreme things, such as voting to repeal or defund ObamaCare over 30 times—over 30 times—or voting to turn Medicare into a voucher program. If it is extreme enough, then they will vote for it. But those are actions which are not supported by the American people, and they can't pass the Senate.

For the regular business of government, for the regular business of passing Senate bipartisan legislation, the tea party-Hastert rule combination is deadly.

So back to where I began. If you are concerned about dysfunction in Congress, if you are wondering why we are less popular than a root canal, if you are wondering why 77 percent of Americans look at Congress and think we are actually doing more harm than good, and if you want an explanation of the dysfunction, take a look at the Hastert rule. If you look at this problem the way a doctor would look at a patient, the way an engineer would look at a system, the way a car mechanic would look at an automobile, and you look for what is broken, be specific; it is the application by the Speaker of the Hastert rule that prevents strong, bi-

partisan Senate legislation from going forward. When something moves, it is because the Hastert rule has been waived.

So if you want to see what is wrong, that quest takes you straight to the House of Representatives, and there it leads you straight to the House Republican conference, and there it leads you to that toxic combination of the tea party and the Hastert rule.

When you understand the problem, the cure is obvious: The House should ditch the Hastert rule. Call things up for a vote. Let everybody's vote count. Don't refuse to proceed unless only your own party will let you. It is the obvious and only solution. The fiscal cliff bill and the Sandy bill and the votes on those bills prove it.

With those tea party extremists dominating the House Republican conference and ready to pitch the country over the fiscal cliff and leave hurricane victims high and dry, the Speaker had to ditch the Hastert rule. The only way the House can do bipartisan business on major issues is to ditch the Hastert rule.

As we saw, the Senate has its problems, but we are actually doing OK, just as our legislative record shows. Over and over, we pass real, significant, bipartisan legislation after a real process on the floor of argument and amendment. As the House's legislative record shows, the problem is over there. More precisely, the problem is within the House Republican conference. Still more precisely, again, the problem is that toxic combination of the tea party and the Hastert rule.

If we want Congress to function effectively, if we want to succeed at doing the work of the American people, such as the fiscal cliff bill and the hurricane relief bill, and if we don't want to see more important legislation, such as highway bills and farm bills, fail in the House, unable to pass in the House, blocked in the House, the solution for the problem is clear: We have to ditch the Hastert rule and let the House as a body work its will, just as the American people elected it to do.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 6:30 p.m. today and that all provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

(The remarks of Mr. CHAMBLISS pertaining to the introduction of S. 122 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

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

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

SANDY DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to encourage the Senate to seek quick action on the Sandy relief package that has been long overdue. I know the majority leader is committed to bringing it to the floor as soon as we can get some type of agreement with the other side of the aisle, and I hope that agreement can come quickly because a recovery that is delayed—as this has already been significantly delayed—is a recovery that very likely can fail.

We cannot afford for one of the biggest engines of the national economy, which is the Northeast, to fail in its recovery. This is not only for the sake of the Northeast but for the entire country.

I appreciate the majority leader's steadfast commitment to provide that relief as quickly as possible here in the Senate, but time is a-wasting. It is already Wednesday, and I am concerned we will lose another week before we, in fact, seek passage and then go to the President. From there, it would move on so the resources could begin to flow to communities across the Northeast that have languished since Sandy took its toll.

There is no excuse for delay. We already had the delay in the House. They could have passed the package the Senate passed in a transparent process that had the Appropriations Committee—on both sides—scrubbing the bill. It was brought before the Senate in a fashion in which we like to see the Senate work. I believe there were 25-some-odd amendments that were considered, a full vetting of the legislation, and there was a strong bipartisan vote at the end of that process. It was then sent to the House, and unfortunately it languished and died at the end of the last Congress.

Now the House has acted in a different fashion. So I am happy at this point to accept the House's version—even though I do believe the Senate version is superior in a variety of ways—so it can be sent to the President. Getting relief to the citizens in the Northeast is critically important.

I look at the package the House has, and I say to myself that \$50.7 billion in resources, in addition to the flood insurance package that has already passed, will allow our residents and small businesses that have been waiting so long to recover and begin to rebuild. Finally, it will show them that they have a strong partner in the Federal Government and that someone is there for them, as we have been whenever and wherever disaster has struck

our fellow Americans throughout this Nation.

Obviously, I would have preferred the Senate bill, which was stronger, but we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We need to get assistance to the victims of Sandy as quickly as possible. This is a vehicle that gets us to that goal.

While the House bill significantly reduces assistance in a couple of areas—including fishery disasters and community development funding, which I think in that respect may stump the recovery of an important industry along our coast and could potentially siphon off billions in CDBG funding that is badly needed right now in New York and New Jersey by amplifying what disasters are eligible for it—I am pleased to say we protected the overall amendment of the CDBG funding from the Senate bill, which is about \$16 billion.

While it is not everything we needed since it will now be spread even thinner across even more disasters, we can certainly help as many communities rebuild and recover as we can because time is of the essence. There is a fierce urgency right now. There are many business owners whom I have spoken to who said to me: Senator, I am at a critical juncture. I don't know whether I can reopen. If the government is not going to give me assistance, then I likely won't open because adding more debt, even in terms of a long-term, low-interest loan, is still debt. They say: I took out debt to start this business or: I took out debt to get through the great recession, but I don't really have the option to take out more debt without some direct assistance, such as a grant. A grant would give the help I need to jump-start my business so I can get those individuals I had employed reemployed once again and create an opportunity for our community.

That decision right now for those businesses, which are life-and-death decisions, is pending and hanging by the will of the Senate to act.

I am also pleased that the package the House passed recognizes what I have been saying all along—that funding the Army Corps of Engineers' efforts is critical to rebuilding coastal communities, particularly New Jersey's weakened coastal defenses. We are at the lowest of our immune system as a coastal State, and we already see the biting cold. It is cold throughout the Capitol today, which shows how cold it is outside. Think about those residents who are fellow Americans and don't have a place to call home because they don't have the wherewithal to get their home back in a way in which they can once again be able to live there, raise their families there, and meet their challenges as a family in a warm nurturing environment. That does not exist for many of our fellow Americans because they don't have the wherewithal to decide whether they are going to get the type of assistance to help them rebuild their homes. All of that is pending.

Part of that is the Army Corps of Engineers' ability to reengineer our beaches in a way that ultimately provides not only for the potential of tourism, which is a \$37 billion industry in our State, but even more importantly for the protection of lives, property, and protection against repetitive losses. That is what is going to happen when we get this money to the Army Corps of Engineers so they can rebuild our coastal defenses. This package would give Jersey Shore residents and businesses the comfort of knowing they would be better protected in the future than they have been in the past.

It also includes \$13 billion in critical funding I sought to help to restore our transportation systems. For example, it would allow New Jersey Transit to repair extensive damage from the storm and allow the agency to build facilities on higher ground to prevent future flood damage, which is a common-sense option. When we think about fiscal responsibility, why would we rebuild only to the very same status that was allowed to be flooded in the first place and caused all of the damage the government would pay for? The passage of this potential package from the House would allow the port authority to finish repairing the PATH station and harden electrical equipment to prevent future damages.

If we could get an agreement, the package that would come to the floor would include necessary policy reforms that I have supported that will streamline recovery efforts and improve FEMA's public assistance programs, which is critical to a successful recovery. These reforms would allow us to rebuild what is in place even stronger and better before there is another storm. Again, this is important in terms of the end results. It is important in terms of the fiscal responsibility to ensure we rebuild in such a way that we don't end up with repetitive damage, which would be more costly to the government.

It would allow a third-party dispute resolution process for major projects. Some of the history we have, particularly with Katrina from Senator LANDRIEU's experience, is the reality of not having a dispute resolution process, which ultimately forestalled recoveries and critical projects to that State and in those communities. Also, coverage for childcare costs related to disaster recovery through FEMA individual assistance is a critical element.

Without going through all of the provisions of the House bill, let me just say we need to pass this relief package. People are suffering. They are desperately waiting for certainty so they can start rebuilding their lives, their businesses and communities. They are trying to get back on their feet. They need this aid even if it is late and even if it is ultimately longer than other disasters have had to wait. As I pointed out in the past, I think it was 10 days or so when \$50 billion flowed to Katrina victims. We are nearly 3 months since

the worst disaster on the east coast in terms of a natural disaster that has taken place.

The people of the Northeast, the people of my State of New Jersey and our neighbors in New York desperately need this funding, and it is time to help these fellow Americans. It is time to do it now. It is time to do it this week. It is going to take time for this recovery to take place. The longer we delay, the greater the chance of failure we, in fact, create. I think we want success, not failure. I think we want to understand, as an institution, as I have said many times, that this is the United States of America. That means we respond to the challenges and the disasters that take place in other parts of the country. We do it, hopefully, more expeditiously than this, and at the same time we stand by our fellow Americans so they can reclaim their lives, reclaim their commitments to their communities, reclaim the opportunity to reopen their businesses, to contribute to those communities, to our State, to this Nation, to our society.

So I strongly urge our colleagues who have some reticence to agree to moving forward on a Sandy bill to come to common ground with us, to come to agreement to move this relief package. No American should have to languish months after a disaster to get help. That should not be the standard. The hallmark of our response should be an intelligent but expeditious response to the consequences of a disaster that any American faces. That is our tradition. It is a tradition we should maintain. It is a tradition that, unfortunately, in this particular instance has not been a reality. It is a tradition that I hope we can ultimately embrace once again this week in finally pushing through a Sandy package that can move to the President for signature and bring relief to our communities.

With that, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO KEN SQUIER

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate Ken Squier, of Stowe, VT, for his historic contribution to motor sports and to broadcasting, and for his deep and abiding commitment to the people of Vermont. On November 29, 2012, NASCAR presented Ken with the prestigious Buddy Shuman Award, given to "an individual who has played a key role in the continued growth and success of Cup racing."

Most Americans know Ken Squier as the "Voice of the Daytona 500." In 1979, Squier convinced CBS Sports to broadcast the Daytona 500 in its entirety. This event was a seminal moment for stock car racing in the United States, later described by ESPN as "NASCAR's most revolutionary event," the one that convinced the national networks

that NASCAR had a very wide following around the country.

When he was 14 years old, Ken Squier announced his first race at a small dirt track in northern Vermont—from the back of a logging truck.

In 1960, he opened Thunder Road SpeedBowl, a quarter-mile racetrack in Barre, VT. In summer, the track has hosted stock car races every Thursday night for the last 50 years. These events have become fixtures in the culture of northern Vermont.

As NASCAR developed a national following, Ken Squier became one of its most celebrated personalities. He pioneered the use of in-car cameras during broadcasts, putting viewers right next to the driver during the race. Ken's voice became inseparable from the sport, providing turn-by-turn coverage of all CBS-broadcast races for almost two decades. This included the sport's most prestigious event, the Daytona 500.

Ken Squier is not at all defined solely by his importance to racing. He has deep roots in northern Vermont. In 1969, he became president of Radio Vermont, Inc., a family business that is one of the only independent, family-run radio companies left in the United States. Radio Vermont's stations provide a variety of music, sports, and news; in particular, they focus on local events, the happenings that bind communities together and give them identity. Over the years, Ken has staunchly opposed corporate consolidation of the media because he believes, strongly, that radio stations should serve the community and provide vital conduits for local information. He has practiced what he preaches.

Radio Vermont's immense value to the communities it served was proven during the aftermath of Tropical Storm Irene in August 2011. Irene was the most destructive storm to hit Vermont in decades. Torrential rains and Vermont's mountainous terrain brought flooding on a vast scale, wiping out houses, businesses, and historic downtowns. Roads and bridges were washed away, cutting dozens of towns around Vermont off from the outside world. Ken and his staff, Eric Michaels, Lee Kittell, Tom Beardsley, meteorologist Roger Hill, and others kept the station on the air 24 hours a day in the weeks after the storm to ensure vital emergency information reached Vermonters in towns that had been cut off. With the State of Vermont's emergency communications equipment washed away, Radio Vermont proved that local radio stations are fundamentally important to their communities.

Ken Squier has helped change sports in America, but even more significantly, he has been a true exemplar of a good citizen. Vermont is, and will remain, deeply in his debt.●

REMEMBERING CATHERINE O'NEILL

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in hon-

oring Catherine O'Neill, the great advocate for refugee women and children who died in Los Angeles last month at age 70. Cathy was my friend and neighbor, and I will miss her.

Catherine was born in 1942 in Queens, NY, the daughter of Irish immigrants Patrick and Bridget Vesey. After graduating from St. Joseph's College in Brooklyn and teaching as a Catholic missionary in Texas, she earned master's degrees in social work from Howard University and in international affairs from Columbia.

Cathy had an extraordinary career as a social worker, writer, editorial director, businesswoman, and director of the UN Information Center in Washington, DC. She was also active in political life, twice running for office in California and serving as finance director for Governor Jerry Brown's 1976 presidential campaign, but she is best known for her groundbreaking and heroic efforts to help refugee women and children.

In 1989, after visiting refugee camps around the world as a board member of the humanitarian International Rescue Committee, Cathy became a founder of the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, now Women's Refugee Commission.

As the Commission's board chair, Cathy traveled the world to listen to refugee women and children and learn about their most pressing needs. She attracted prominent women journalists, academics, and philanthropists to the Commission and became a leading advocate for refugee issues on Capitol Hill, at the UN, and in the media. Under her leadership, the Women's Refugee Commission has shaped policies and practices in the U.S. and around the world to address the needs of women and children displaced by war, persecution, and natural disasters.

On behalf of the people of California, I send my gratitude and condolences to Cathy's husband, Richard Reeves, her daughter Fiona Reeves, sons Colin and Conor O'Neill, Jeffrey Reeves, her grandchildren, and her sister Mary Ann Garvey. Catherine O'Neill was an amazing person who made our world a better and more compassionate place, and we will miss her dearly.●

REMEMBERING FRANCIS JOSEPH CHASE

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a proud veteran, a committed Marylander, a great American, and my good friend, Francis Joseph "Frank" Chase. Frank passed away on December 11, 2012 in his Columbia, MD home after a brief illness. He leaves behind his beloved family: his wife of 50 years, Carole, a daughter Amy, and a granddaughter Grace.

Frank loved his country dearly, and he showed it through years of public service, which began in 1955, when he entered the Army for 3 years. Frank then joined the civil service, beginning at the Social Security Administration

and later moving to the Health Care Financing Administration, both in Baltimore. When he retired in January 1993, Frank left government service with far more than his Federal pension. For at SSA and HCFA, he had honed expertise that would for many years guide him to continue, as a volunteer, to improve the lives of retirees, persons with disabilities, and others.

A man of boundless energy, Frank was a valued confidant and a member of my health advisory group for the past 20 years. With nearly perfect attendance at meetings and conference calls, he could always be counted on for a warm greeting, sage advice, and wisdom born of compassion and clear-sightedness.

A graduate of Dartmouth College, Frank maintained strong ties with his alma mater, serving terms as president of the Dartmouth Alumni Association and president of the Dartmouth Club of Maryland. He also served his community through volunteer work at Common Cause of Maryland, United Seniors of Maryland, and the National Association of Retired Federal Employees.

Through his involvement in Maryland politics, Frank fought tirelessly for fair election practices, propelled by the belief that, regardless of their views, all Marylanders deserved to have their voices heard. Through my many conversations with him over the years, I discovered a man who loved democracy and justice, and who felt compelled to live his life in service to these causes.

In closing, when I think of Frank, I am reminded of the words of Robert Frost in "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening":

The woods are lovely, dark and deep.
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

Frank could have led a comfortable, quiet life after retirement, but he chose instead to keep going for many more miles, working for the causes he believed in deeply and the Nation he loved. Like all who were privileged to know him, I will miss my dear friend Frank Chase, and I ask you to join me in celebrating his life.●

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 Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, 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. 307. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

At 4:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 307. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 81. A bill to provide guidance and priorities for Federal Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 82. A bill to provide that any executive action infringing on the Second Amendment has no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes.

S. 83. A bill to provide for continuing operations of Government in a fiscally responsible manner.

S. 124. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-70. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval, Disapproval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Regional Haze Rule Requirements for Mandatory Class I Areas Under 40 CFR 51.309; Correction" (FRL No. 9771-9) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-71. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment for the San Francisco Bay Area Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements" (FRL No. 9766-7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-72. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment for the Nogales Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; Arizona; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements" (FRL No. 9766-8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-73. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Diego APCD, Northern Sierra AQMD, and Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD" (FRL No. 9732-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-74. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(D), Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Asbestos Management and Control; State of New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services" (FRL No. 9697-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-75. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Nevada; Redesignation of Clark County to Attainment for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9766-9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-76. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment for the Yuba City-Marysville Nonattainment Area for the 2006 Fine Particle Standard; California; Determination Regarding Applicability of Clean Air Act Requirements" (FRL No. 9768-2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-77. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Determination to Stay Sanctions, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9766-4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-78. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for California State Implementation Plan Revision; South Coast" (FRL No. 9767-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-79. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration Units: Reconsideration and Final Amendments; Non-Hazardous Secondary Materials That Are Solid Waste: Final Rule" (FRL No. 9764-1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-80. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants" (FRL No. 9758-6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-81. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional Boilers" (FRL No. 9698-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-82. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9760-4) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-83. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of Sulfur Emissions from Stationary Boilers" (FRL No. 9772-6) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-84. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9755-9) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-85. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Purposes; Alabama; Redesignation of the Birmingham 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9771-2) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-86. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts and New Hampshire; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program" (FRL No. 9754-6) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-87. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Alabama; Redesignation of the Birmingham 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9771-1) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-88. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Labeling of Pesticide Products and Devices for Export; Clarification of Requirements" (FRL No. 9360-8) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-89. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines; New Source Performance Standards for Stationary Internal Combustion Engines" (RIN2060-AQ58) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-90. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Revision to Increase Public Availability of the Administrative Record File" (FRL No. 9772-9) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-91. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport Requirements for 2006 PM2.5NAAQS" (FRL No. 9770-9) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-92. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Requirements for Determining General Conformity of Federal Actions to Applicable State Implementation Plans" (FRL No. 9770-4) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-93. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Reasonably Available Control Technology Requirements for Volatile Organic Compounds" (FRL No. 9770-6) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-94. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Findings of Failure to Submit a Complete State Implementation Plan for Section 110(a) Pertaining to the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9769-4) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-95. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NNSR) Permitting" (FRL No. 9770-8) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-96. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dispositioning Boiling Water Reactor License Noncompliance with Technical Specification Containment Requirements During Operations with a Potential for Draining the Reactor Vessel" (EGM 11-003, Rev 1) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-97. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dispositioning Violations of NRC Requirements Implementing the Decommissioning Planning Rule" (EGM 12-002) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-98. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment for RISK-INFORMED LICENSE Amendment Requests After Initial Fuel Load (ADAMS) Accession No. ML12193A107" (Updating SRP NUREG-0800 Guidance to Chapter 19.1 Rev. 3) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-99. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance for Performing a Tsunami, Surge, or Seiche Hazard Assessment" (JLD-ISG-2012006) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2013; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-100. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2011 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-101. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Golden Nematode; Removal of Regulated Areas in Livingston and Steuben Counties, NY" (Docket No. APHIS-2012-0079) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-102. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Traceability for Livestock Moving Interstate" ((RIN0579-AD24) (Docket No. APHIS-2009-0091)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-103. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Microloan Operating Loans" (RIN0560-A117) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-104. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Epoxy Polymer; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9369-7) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 18, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-105. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Spiromesifen; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9374-3) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-106. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; New Qualifying Country—Poland" ((RIN0750-AH82) (DFARS Case 2011-D049)) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-107. A communication from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the U.S. Army Audit Agency's review of an audit of the American National Red Cross's Annual Statement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-108. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a proposed change by the Air Force Reserve to the Fiscal Year 2011 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-109. A communication from the President of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to

the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 12947 with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-110. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Foreign Exchange Swaps and Foreign Exchange Forwards Under the Commodity Exchange Act" received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 7, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-111. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No. FEMA-2012-0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-112. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lost Security Holders and Unresponsive Payees" (RIN3235-AL11) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-113. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Persons From the Entity List Based on Removal Request; Implementation of Entity List Annual Review Changes; and Implementation of Modifications and Corrections to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AF82) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-114. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Existing Validated End User Authorizations: Advanced Micro Devices China, Inc., Lam Research Corporation, SK hynix Semiconductor (China) Ltd., and SK hynix Semiconductor (Wuxi) Ltd. in the People's Republic of China; Clarification of Scope of Entries in Supplement No. 7 to Part 748 of the EAR" (RIN0694-AF84) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-115. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Chile; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-116. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to South Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-117. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report for fiscal year 2012 of the Commerce Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-118. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursu-

ant to law, the Department of Commerce's 2013 Report of Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-119. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Electric Reliability Organization Definition of Bulk Electric System and Rules of Procedure" (RIN1902-AD51) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-120. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-SERC-01—Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding Requirements" (RIN1902-AE53) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 17, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-121. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2010"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-122. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Limited Supplier Solicitation of Prescribing Physicians Under Medicare DMEPOS Competitive Bidding Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-123. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Announcement of the Results of the 2011-2012 Allocation Round of the Qualifying Advance Coal Project Program" (Announcement 2013-2) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-124. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2013 Cost-of-Living Adjustments to Certain Tax Items" (Rev. Proc. 2013-15) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-125. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patel v. Commissioner" (AOD 2012-05) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-126. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2013-2) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 16, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-127. A communication from the Executive Secretary, U. S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), received during recess of

the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-128. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of an item not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-129. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of an item not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-130. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 12-188); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-131. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No. DDTC 12-089); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-132. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2013-0000—2013-0006); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-133. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Provisional Unlawful Presence Waivers of Inadmissibility for Certain Immediate Relatives" (RIN1615-AB99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-134. A communication from the Clerk of Court, United States Court of Federal Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Court's annual report for the year ended September 30, 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-135. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees" (RIN0651-AC54) received during recess of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 15, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 64. A bill to prohibit authorized committees and leadership PAC's from employing the spouse or immediate family members of any candidate or Federal office holder connected to the committee; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 65. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 66. A bill to establish a pilot program to evaluate the cost-effectiveness and project delivery efficiency of non-Federal sponsors as the lead project delivery team for authorized civil works flood control and navigation construction projects of the Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 67. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce or eliminate the risk of releases of hazardous chemicals from public water systems and wastewater treatment works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 68. A bill to enhance the security of chemical facilities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Anton Dodaj, Gjyljana Dodaj, Franc Dodaj, Kristjan Dodaj, and Kanto Macotaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 70. A bill for the relief of Marcos Antonio Sanchez-Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Josephina Valera Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 72. A bill for the relief of Luay Hadad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 73. A bill for the relief of Miguel Santillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 74. A bill for the relief of Momo Krcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 75. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Parlak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 76. A bill for the relief of Guy Yang, Genevieve Chong Fong, Caroline Yang, and Melanie Vang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms.

KLOBUCHAR):

S. 77. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for lower prices for Medicare prescription drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 78. A bill for the relief of Hussein Bazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 79. A bill for the relief of Al-Housseynou Ba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BURR, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 80. A bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide for Debbie Smith grants for auditing sexual assault evidence backlogs and to establish a Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 81. A bill to provide guidance and priorities for Federal Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached; read the first time.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 82. A bill to provide that any executive action infringing on the Second Amendment has no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 83. A bill to provide for continuing operations of Government in a fiscally responsible manner; read the first time.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 84. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 85. A bill to provide incentives for States to invest in practices and technology that are designed to expedite voting at the polls and to simplify voter registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 86. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the Coverdell education savings accounts to allow home school education expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 87. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax deduction for itemizers and nonitemizers for expenses relating to home schooling; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 88. A bill to amend the public charter school provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 89. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to authorize hunting under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 90. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow workers who attain age 65 after 1981 and before 1992 to choose either lump sum payments over four years totaling \$5,000 or an improved benefit computation formula under a new 10-year rule governing the transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 91. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 92. A bill to require that the Government give priority to payment of all obligations on the debt held by the public and payment of Social Security benefits in the event that the debt limit is reached; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 93. A bill to provide tax relief with respect to the Hurricane Isaac disaster area; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 94. A bill to terminate the \$1 presidential coin program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 95. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the United Nations until the

United Nations formally retracts the final report of the "United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 96. A bill to authorize the use of certain offshore oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico for artificial reefs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 97. A bill to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 98. A bill to ensure efficiency and fairness in the awarding of Federal contracts in connection with natural disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 99. A bill to provide for full and open competition for Federal contracts related to natural disaster reconstruction efforts; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 100. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to repeal certain designation authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to repeal the Payment, Clearing, and Settlement Supervision Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 101. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to State and local governments for payment of obligations, to prohibit the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from financially assisting State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 102. A bill to reduce the amount of financial assistance provided to the Government of Mexico in response to the illegal border crossings from Mexico into the United States, which serve to dissipate the political discontent with the higher unemployment rate within Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 103. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 104. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restricts on the use of national monuments; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 105. A bill to direct the General Accountability Office to conduct a full audit of hurricane protection funding and cost estimates associated with post-Katrina hurricane protection; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 106. A bill to provide for the establishment, on-going validation, and use of an official set of data on the historical temperature record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 107. A bill to prohibit the regulation of carbon dioxide emissions in the United States until China, India, and Russia implement similar reductions; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 108. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, Mr. COBURN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 109. A bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 110. A bill to establish a procedure to safeguard the Social Security Trust Funds; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 111. A bill to require all public school employees and those employed in connection with a public school to receive FBI background checks prior to being hired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 112. A bill to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 113. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. REED, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 114. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 115. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for increasing payroll; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 116. A bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 117. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

S. 118. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the use of public funds for political party conventions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 119. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance

under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 120. A bill to expand the number of scholarships available to Pakistani women under the Merit and Needs-Based Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 121. A bill to establish the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to review Federal Government policy on human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 122. A bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. COONS):

S. 123. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BURR, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 124. A bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills; read the first time.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S.J. Res. 2. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. VITTER):

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve to 3 in the House of Representatives and 2 in the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S.J. Res. 4. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 8. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress holds the sole authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States and shall not cede this power to the President; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 9. A resolution designating January 2013 as "National Mentoring Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. Res. 10. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Government of Antigua and Barbuda and its actions relating to the Stanford Financial Group fraud; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. Res. 11. A resolution expressing support for prayer at school board meetings; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 4

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4, a bill to create jobs and strengthen our economy by rebuilding our Nation's infrastructure.

S. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 5, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 5, supra.

S. 6

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 6, a bill to reauthorize the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011, to provide assistance to small businesses owned by veterans, to improve enforcement of employment and reemployment rights of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

S. 8

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 8, a bill expressing the sense of the Senate on the need to enact legislation to eliminate wasteful tax loopholes.

S. 10

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2018.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to secure the United States against cyber attack, to improve communication and collaboration between the private sector and the Federal Government, to enhance American competitiveness and create jobs in the information technology industry, and to protect the identities and sensitive information of American citizens and businesses.

S. 29

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 29, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 32

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of S. 32, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 40

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 40, a bill to restore Americans' individual liberty by striking the Federal mandate to purchase insurance.

S. 41

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes.

S. 43

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 43, a bill to require that any debt limit increase be balanced by equal spending cuts of the next decade.

S. 47

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 47, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

S. 51

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act.

S. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 4, a resolution to

limit certain uses of the filibuster in the Senate to improve the legislative process.

S. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 5, a resolution amending the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide for cloture to be invoked with less than a three-fifths majority after additional debate.

S. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 7, a resolution to permit the Senate to avoid unnecessary delay and vote on matters for which floor debate has ceased.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BURR, AND MR. KIRK):

S. 80. A bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide for Debbie Smith grants for auditing sexual assault evidence backlogs and to establish a Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 80

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reporting Act of 2013" or the "SAFER Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. DEBBIE SMITH GRANTS FOR AUDITING SEXUAL ASSAULT EVIDENCE BACKLOGS.

Section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(7) To conduct an audit consistent with subsection (n) of the samples of sexual assault evidence that are in the possession of the State or unit of local government and are awaiting testing.

"(8) To ensure that the collection and processing of DNA evidence by law enforcement agencies from crimes, including sexual assault and other violent crimes against persons, is carried out in an appropriate and timely manner and in accordance with the protocols and practices developed under subsection (o)(1)."

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) ALLOCATION OF GRANT AWARDS FOR AUDITS.—For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, not less than 5 percent, but not more than 7 percent, of the grant amounts distributed under paragraph (1) shall, if sufficient applications to justify such amounts are received by the Attorney General, be awarded for purposes described in subsection (a)(7), provided that none of the funds required to

be distributed under this paragraph shall decrease or otherwise limit the availability of funds required to be awarded to States or units of local government under paragraph (3)."; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(n) USE OF FUNDS FOR AUDITING SEXUAL ASSAULT EVIDENCE BACKLOGS.—

"(1) ELIGIBILITY.—The Attorney General may award a grant under this section to a State or unit of local government for the purpose described in subsection (a)(7) only if the State or unit of local government—

"(A) submits a plan for performing the audit of samples described in such subsection; and

"(B) includes in such plan a good-faith estimate of the number of such samples.

"(2) GRANT CONDITIONS.—A State or unit of local government receiving a grant for the purpose described in subsection (a)(7)—

"(A) may not enter into any contract or agreement with any non-governmental vendor laboratory to conduct an audit described in subsection (a)(7); and

"(B) shall—

"(i) not later than 1 year after receiving the grant, complete the audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A) in accordance with the plan submitted under such paragraph;

"(ii) not later than 60 days after receiving possession of a sample of sexual assault evidence that was not in the possession of the State or unit of local government at the time of the initiation of an audit under paragraph (1)(A), subject to paragraph (4)(F), include in any required reports under clause (v), the information listed under paragraph (4)(B);

"(iii) for each sample of sexual assault evidence that is identified as awaiting testing as part of the audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A)—

"(I) assign a unique numeric or alphanumeric identifier to each sample of sexual assault evidence that is in the possession of the State or unit of local government and is awaiting testing; and

"(II) identify the date or dates after which the State or unit of local government would be barred by any applicable statutes of limitations from prosecuting a perpetrator of the sexual assault to which the sample relates;

"(iv) provide that—

"(I) the chief law enforcement officer of the State or unit of local government, respectively, is the individual responsible for the compliance of the State or unit of local government, respectively, with the reporting requirements described in clause (v); or

"(II) the designee of such officer may fulfill the responsibility described in subclause (I) so long as such designee is an employee of the State or unit of local government, respectively, and is not an employee of any governmental laboratory or non-governmental vendor laboratory; and

"(v) comply with all grantee reporting requirements described in paragraph (4).

"(3) EXTENSION OF INITIAL DEADLINE.—The Attorney General may grant an extension of the deadline under paragraph (2)(B)(i) to a State or unit of local government that demonstrates that more time is required for compliance with such paragraph.

"(4) SEXUAL ASSAULT FORENSIC EVIDENCE REPORTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For not less than 12 months after the completion of an initial count of sexual assault evidence that is awaiting testing during an audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A), a State or unit of local government that receives a grant award under subsection (a)(7) shall, not less than every 60 days, submit a report to the Department of Justice, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall contain the

information required under subparagraph (B).

“(B) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—A report under this paragraph shall contain the following information—

“(i) the name of the State or unit of local government filing the report;

“(ii) the period of dates covered by the report;

“(iii) the cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence that, at the end of the reporting period—

“(I) are in the possession of the State or unit of local government at the reporting period;

“(II) are awaiting testing; and

“(III) the State or unit of local government has determined should undergo DNA or other appropriate forensic analyses;

“(iv) the cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence in the possession of the State or unit of local government that, at the end of the reporting period, the State or unit of local government has determined should not undergo DNA or other appropriate forensic analyses, provided that the reporting form shall allow for the State or unit of local government, at its sole discretion, to explain the reasoning for this determination in some or all cases;

“(v) the cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence in a total under clause (iii) that have been submitted to a laboratory for DNA or other appropriate forensic analyses;

“(vi) the cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence identified by an audit referred to in paragraph (1)(A) or under paragraph (2)(B)(ii) for which DNA or other appropriate forensic analysis has been completed at the end of the reporting period;

“(vii) the total number of samples of sexual assault evidence identified by the State or unit of local government under paragraph (2)(B)(ii), since the previous reporting period; and

“(viii) the cumulative total number of samples of sexual assault evidence described under clause (iii) for which the State or unit of local government will be barred within 12 months by any applicable statute of limitations from prosecuting a perpetrator of the sexual assault to which the sample relates.

“(C) PUBLICATION OF REPORTS.—Not later than 7 days after the submission of a report under this paragraph by a State or unit of local government, the Attorney General shall, subject to subparagraph (D), publish and disseminate a facsimile of the full contents of such report on an appropriate internet website.

“(D) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that any information published and disseminated as part of a report under this paragraph, which reports information under this subsection, does not include personally identifiable information or details about a sexual assault that might lead to the identification of the individuals involved.

“(E) OPTIONAL REPORTING.—The Attorney General shall—

“(i) at the discretion of a State or unit of local government required to file a report under subparagraph (A), allow such State or unit of local government, at their sole discretion, to submit such reports on a more frequent basis; and

“(ii) make available to all States and units of local government the reporting form created pursuant to subparagraph (A), whether or not they are required to submit such reports, and allow such States or units of local government, at their sole discretion, to submit such reports for publication.

“(F) SAMPLES EXEMPT FROM REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The reporting requirements de-

scribed in paragraph (2) shall not apply to a sample of sexual assault evidence that—

“(i) is not considered criminal evidence (such as a sample collected anonymously from a victim who is unwilling to make a criminal complaint); or

“(ii) relates to a sexual assault for which the prosecution of each perpetrator is barred by a statute of limitations.

“(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) AWAITING TESTING.—The term ‘awaiting testing’ means, with respect to a sample of sexual assault evidence, that—

“(i) the sample has been collected and is in the possession of a State or unit of local government;

“(ii) DNA and other appropriate forensic analyses have not been performed on such sample; and

“(iii) the sample is related to a criminal case or investigation in which final disposition has not yet been reached.

“(B) FINAL DISPOSITION.—The term ‘final disposition’ means, with respect to a criminal case or investigation to which a sample of sexual assault evidence relates—

“(i) the conviction or acquittal of all suspected perpetrators of the crime involved;

“(ii) a determination by the State or unit of local government in possession of the sample that the case is unfounded; or

“(iii) a declaration by the victim of the crime involved that the act constituting the basis of the crime was not committed.

“(C) POSSESSION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘possession’, used with respect to possession of a sample of sexual assault evidence by a State or unit of local government, includes possession by an individual who is acting as an agent of the State or unit of local government for the collection of the sample.

“(ii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to create or amend any Federal rights or privileges for non-governmental vendor laboratories described in regulations promulgated under section 210303 of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14131).

“(o) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTOCOLS, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AND DEFINITIONS.—

“(1) PROTOCOLS AND PRACTICES.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the SAFER Act of 2013, the Director, in consultation with Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and government laboratories, shall develop and publish a description of protocols and practices the Director considers appropriate for the accurate, timely, and effective collection and processing of DNA evidence, including protocols and practices specific to sexual assault cases, which shall address appropriate steps in the investigation of cases that might involve DNA evidence, including—

“(A) how to determine—

“(i) which evidence is to be collected by law enforcement personnel and forwarded for testing;

“(ii) the preferred order in which evidence from the same case is to be tested; and

“(iii) what information to take into account when establishing the order in which evidence from different cases is to be tested;

“(B) the establishment of a reasonable period of time in which evidence is to be forwarded by emergency response providers, law enforcement personnel, and prosecutors to a laboratory for testing;

“(C) the establishment of reasonable periods of time in which each stage of analytical laboratory testing is to be completed;

“(D) systems to encourage communication within a State or unit of local government among emergency response providers, law enforcement personnel, prosecutors, courts, defense counsel, crime laboratory personnel,

and crime victims regarding the status of crime scene evidence to be tested; and

“(E) standards for conducting the audit of the backlog for DNA case work in sexual assault cases required under subsection (n).

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—The Director shall make available technical assistance and training to support States and units of local government in adopting and implementing the protocols and practices developed under paragraph (1) on and after the date on which the protocols and practices are published.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘awaiting testing’ and ‘possession’ have the meanings given those terms in subsection (n).”.

SEC. 3. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year for which a grant is made for the purpose described in section 2(a)(7) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000, as amended by section 2, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) lists the States and units of local government that have been awarded such grants and the amount of the grant received by each such State or unit of local government;

(2) states the number of extensions granted by the Attorney General under section 2(n)(3) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000, as added by section 2; and

(3) summarizes the processing status of the samples of sexual assault evidence identified in Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Reports established under section 2(n)(4) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000, including the number of samples that have not been tested.

SEC. 4. REDUCING THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.

Section 2(c)(3) of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(c)(3)) is amended—

(a) in subparagraph (B), by striking “2014” and inserting “2018”; and

(b) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) For each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018, not less than 75 percent of the total grant amounts shall be awarded for a combination of purposes under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).”.

SEC. 5. OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

All grants awarded by the Department of Justice that are authorized under the SAFER Act of 2013 shall be subject to the following:

(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—Beginning in fiscal year 2013, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this Act to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(2) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this Act that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this Act during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the 12-month period described in paragraph (5).

(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this Act, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that, during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this Act, did not have an unresolved audit finding showing a violation in the terms or conditions of a Department of Justice grant program.

(4) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this Act during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under paragraph (2), the Attorney General shall—

(A) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the

grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(B) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(5) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term “unresolved audit finding” means an audit report finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within a 12-month period beginning on the date when the final audit report is issued.

(6) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section and the grant programs described in this Act, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General shall not award a grant under any grant program described in this Act to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under a grant program described in this Act and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Unless otherwise explicitly provided in authorizing legislation, not more than 7.5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used by the Attorney General for salaries and administrative expenses of the Department of Justice.

(8) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice under this Act may be used by the Attorney General or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this Act, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or the appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principal deputy as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audio/visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved by operation of this paragraph.

(9) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated under this Act may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, state, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a grant under this Act has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another grant under this Act for not less than 5 years.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

Effective on December 31, 2018, subsections (a)(7) and (n) of section 2 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135(a)(7) and (n)) are repealed.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 85. A bill to provide incentives for States to invest in practices and technology that are designed to expedite voting at the polls and to simplify voter registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, we are no longer in an election year, which makes this the perfect time for this Congress to take action on real and meaningful election reform. Regardless of which candidates we voted for last November, we can all agree that in the world’s greatest democracy, in the year 2013 we should put in place systems which ensure every voter will be able to cast their ballot without unnecessary delays, redtape, or restriction in our next elections. That is why I am looking forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate, with leaders in State and local governments across the country, and with folks in the U.S. Department of Justice to discuss ways we can reform our election process to make voting more accessible for more Americans.

In his second inaugural address delivered just this Monday, President Obama made a point to tie voting rights to civil rights. President Obama spoke of the long American march toward justice. He said:

And the first steps of that march—of the journey toward a better, fairer, more equal society, one where every American, regardless of their race, gender, sexual orientation or economic status, has the same shot at success—has always started at the ballot box.

President Obama mentioned Seneca Falls, a central moment in the movement for women’s suffrage, and Selma, the emotional heart of the fight for equal access to voting rights for African Americans. He said:

Our journey is not complete until no citizen is forced to wait for hours to exercise the right to vote.

He is right.

The 2012 elections were a wake-up call to those of us who treasure the right to vote. All over our country—in blue States and red States—Americans saw their fundamental right to vote

eroded by exceptionally long lines, confusing rules, and widespread voting machine malfunctions. There were problems in more than a dozen States documented in the media.

There were voting machine irregularities in Pennsylvania and Colorado; error-ridden voter rolls in Ohio; delays counting ballots in Arizona; voters waiting in lines 5 hours long in Virginia and 8 hours long in Florida. We have to do better than this.

As Americans, the right to vote is in our DNA. So just days after these 2012 elections, which had such widespread problems, I introduced the FAST Voting Act, the Fair, Accurate, Secure, and Timely Voting Act, along with Senator WARNER and colleagues in the House, Congressman CONNOLLY and Congressman LANGEVIN.

Our bill challenges States to implement commonsense changes well before the next election. It would provide incentives and competitive grants to those States that can turn around their poorest performing polling places, improve the administration of their elections, and make voting faster and more accessible to all voters.

As a former county executive myself, I know States and local governments are laboratories of democracy. When it comes to administering elections, many States and counties are getting it right. We can learn from them and replicate their successes elsewhere in the country to ensure these same problems do not plague the next national elections.

For example, Florida was one of many States with rampant election problems in 2012. There were long lines, limited early voting, and other issues that may have disenfranchised as many as 49,000 Floridians, according to a study by Professor Theodore Allen of Ohio State University.

Floridians such as Richard Jordan waited more than 3 hours in a line that just was not moving to try and cast his ballot on election day 2012. He had already worked a 10-hour shift that day. He was exhausted, his back hurt, he was hungry, and ultimately in anger decided he could not wait anymore. He simply gave up and walked away. He was denied the opportunity to cast his ballot by an unprepared, underresourced, or just incompetent election system.

On behalf of voters across the State such as Richard, earlier this month Florida’s elections administrators presented Florida’s Governor Rick Scott with a list of reforms they would like to see implemented to prevent these problems from happening again. Governor Scott admitted that his own State’s election process was clearly in need of improvement. He said he agreed with some of the election supervisors’ proposals. In my view, this is a very positive step forward, and one which should be undertaken in every State where there is documented need for stronger, fairer, faster, and freer elections.

In my view, the government can and should play a role in incentivizing that process to ensure that election improvements are made to last. It can help States move forward in using available technology, and it can ensure States do a better job of enforcing laws that are already on the books.

For example, the National Voter Registration Act, commonly known as the motor voter law, requires States to allow voters to register when they renew their driver's license at the DMV or at other governmental agencies. Yet there are substantial and credible allegations that some States all across this country—whether blue, red, or purple—are not fulfilling their obligations under this act.

In talking with elections administrators from around the country, it is clear to me that compliance with existing law is not complete. We have to do more to ensure voters are afforded the rights given to them under current law and that State agencies are doing what is required to simplify the registration process to maintain uniform and non-discriminatory voter rolls and provide widespread registration opportunities. Enforcing existing law is just part of the solution to the voting problems we saw across our country in 2012.

We also have to look forward at ways to deliver the best and most efficient voting process to all Americans. There is still much more we can do to meet that goal, and I think part of the solution is the mechanism of the FAST Voting Act.

Our legislation focuses on cost-effective reforms, such as making it easier to register online and ensuring citizens who move to a new jurisdiction can easily transfer their voter registration. If we use modern technology that we already have at our disposal, we can make it easier for all eligible American citizens to cast their ballot and ensure every vote is counted.

President Obama was right to mention election reform alongside the most essential civil rights struggles in our country's history in his inaugural address on Monday. Making it harder for citizens to vote is a violation of their civil rights. Long lines are just another form of voter disenfranchisement. Running out of ballots can be just another form of voter suppression. The fact is access to vote is denied when registration is cumbersome or inaccessible and when early voter vote-by-mail options are just not available.

Let's do something now when we are no longer hamstrung by election year politics in the Senate so that changes that last and make a difference can be implemented well before the next election.

As someone who serves on the Foreign Relations Committee and who often speaks with foreign heads of State, civil society leaders, and voting advocates from around the world, it is an embarrassment that in 2012 our Nation could not overcome the simple challenges to ensuring fair and accurate elections all across our country.

If we ignore these assaults on America's civil rights that we saw last November, we are certain to have to endure them the next time around. We cannot stand by and allow that to happen. Our democracy needs to be a model to the rest of the world for how to ensure that every citizen gets to exercise the right to vote.

Let's find a way to come together to put meaningful election reforms in place now before we deny one more American their fundamental right to vote for the candidate of their choice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 85

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Louis L. Redding Fair, Accurate, Secure, and Timely Voting Act of 2013" or the "FAST Voting Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. INCENTIVES FOR STATES TO INVEST IN PRACTICES AND TECHNOLOGY THAT ARE DESIGNED TO EXPEDITE VOTING AT THE POLLS AND SIMPLIFY VOTER REGISTRATION.

(a) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this section are to—

(1) provide incentives for States to invest in practices and technology that are designed to expedite voting at the polls; and

(2) provide incentives for States to simplify voter registration.

(b) **RESERVATION OF FUNDS.**—From the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year, the Attorney General may reserve not more than 10 percent of such amount to carry out activities related to—

- (1) technical assistance; and
- (2) outreach and dissemination.

(c) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From the amounts made available under subsection (h) for a fiscal year and not reserved under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to States in accordance with subsection (d)(2), to enable the States to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) **NUMBER OF GRANTS.**—A State may not receive more than 1 grant under this section per grant period.

(3) **DURATION OF GRANTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A grant under this section shall be awarded for a period of not more than 4 years.

(B) **CONTINUATION OF GRANTS.**—A State that is awarded a grant under this section shall not receive grant funds under this section for the second or any subsequent year of the grant unless the State demonstrates to the Attorney General, at such time and in such manner as determined by the Attorney General, that the State is—

- (i) making progress in implementing the plan under subsection (d)(1)(C) at a rate that the Attorney General determines will result in the State fully implementing such plan during the remainder of the grant period; or
- (ii) making progress against the performance measures set forth in subsection (e) at a rate that the Attorney General determines will result in the State reaching its targets and achieving the objectives of the grant during the remainder of the grant period.

(d) **APPLICATIONS.**—

(1) **APPLICATIONS.**—Each State that desires to receive a grant under this section shall

submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require. At a minimum, each such application shall include—

(A) documentation of the applicant's record, as applicable—

(i) in providing various voter registration opportunities;

(ii) in providing early voting;

(iii) in providing absentee voting;

(iv) in providing assistance to voters who do not speak English as a primary language;

(v) in providing assistance to voters with disabilities;

(vi) in providing effective access to voting for members of the armed services;

(vii) in providing formal training of election officials;

(viii) in auditing or otherwise documenting waiting times at polling stations;

(ix) in allocating polling locations, equipment, and staff to match population distribution;

(x) in responding to voting irregularities and concerns raised at polling stations;

(xi) in creating and adhering to contingency voting plans in the event of a natural or other disaster; and

(xii) with respect to any other performance measure described in subsection (e) that is not included in clauses (i) through (xi);

(B) evidence of conditions of innovation and reform that the applicant has established and the applicant's proposed plan for implementing additional conditions for innovation and reform, including—

(i) a description of how the applicant has identified and eliminated ineffective practices in the past and the applicant's plan for doing so in the future;

(ii) a description of how the applicant has identified and promoted effective practices in the past and the applicant's plan for doing so in the future; and

(iii) steps the applicant has taken and will take to eliminate statutory, regulatory, procedural, or other barriers and to facilitate the full implementation of the proposed plan under this subparagraph;

(C) a comprehensive and coherent plan for using funds under this section, and other Federal, State, and local funds, to improve the applicant's performance on the measures described in subsection (e), consistent with criteria set forth by the Attorney General, including how the applicant will, if applicable—

(i) provide flexible registration opportunities, including online and same-day registration and registration updating;

(ii) provide early voting, at a minimum of 9 of the 10 calendar days preceding an election, at sufficient and flexible hours;

(iii) provide absentee voting, including no-excuse absentee voting;

(iv) provide assistance to voters who do not speak English as a primary language;

(v) provide assistance to voters with disabilities, including visual impairment;

(vi) provide effective access to voting for members of the armed services;

(vii) provide formal training of election officials, including State and county administrators and volunteers;

(viii) audit and reduce waiting times at polling stations;

(ix) allocate polling locations, equipment, and staff to match population distribution;

(x) respond to any reports of voting irregularities or concerns raised at the polling station;

(xi) create contingency voting plans in the event of a natural or other disaster; and

(xii) improve the wait times at the persistently poorest performing polling stations within the jurisdiction of the applicant;

(D) evidence of collaboration between the State, local election officials, and other stakeholders, in developing the plan described in subparagraph (C), including evidence of the commitment and capacity to implement the plan;

(E) the applicant's annual performance measures and targets, consistent with the requirements of subsection (e); and

(F) a description of the applicant's plan to conduct a rigorous evaluation of the effectiveness of activities carried out with funds under this section.

(2) CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS.—

(A) AWARD BASIS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this section on a competitive basis, based on the quality of the applications submitted under paragraph (1), including—

(i) each applicant's record in the areas described in paragraph (1)(A);

(ii) each applicant's record of, and commitment to, establishing conditions for innovation and reform, as described in paragraph (1)(B);

(iii) the quality and likelihood of success of each applicant's plan described in paragraph (1)(C) in showing improvement in the areas described in paragraph (1)(A), including each applicant's capacity to implement the plan and evidence of collaboration as described in paragraph (1)(D); and

(iv) each applicant's evaluation plan as described in paragraph (1)(F).

(B) EXPLANATION.—The Attorney General shall publish an explanation of how the application review process under this paragraph will ensure an equitable and objective evaluation based on the criteria described in subparagraph (A).

(C) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Each State receiving a grant under this section shall establish performance measures and targets, approved by the Attorney General, for the programs and activities carried out under this section. These measures shall, at a minimum, track the State's progress—

(1) in implementing its plan described in subsection (d)(1)(C);

(2) in expediting voting at the polls or simplifying voter registration, as applicable; and

(3) on any other measures identified by the Attorney General.

(D) USES OF FUNDS.—Each State that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds for any purpose included in the State's plan under subsection (d)(1)(C).

(E) REPORTING.—A State that receives a grant under this section shall submit to the Attorney General, at such time and in such manner as the Attorney General may require, an annual report including—

(1) data on the State's progress in achieving the targets for the performance measures established under subsection (e);

(2) a description of the challenges the State has faced in implementing its program and how it has addressed or plans to address those challenges; and

(3) findings from the evaluation plan as described in subsection (d)(1)(F).

(F) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 103. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Justice

Thurgood Marshall's Elementary School Study Act. The elementary school that Justice Marshall attended, known as PS 103, located in my hometown of Baltimore, is a place of national significance because it marks the site where one of our Nation's greatest legal minds began his education.

Thurgood Marshall is well known as one of the most significant historical figures of the American civil rights movement. By the time he was 32, he was appointed the chief legal counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. He served at the NAACP a total of 25 years and was a key strategist to end racial segregation throughout the United States.

Perhaps the greatest illustration of this effort was his victory before the Supreme Court overturning the Plessy doctrine effectively ending school segregation with the landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, KS*, in 1954. Not only did this case open up educational opportunity and sparked the civil rights movement in this Nation, it also marked the beginning of Thurgood Marshall's career, still a young attorney from Baltimore, as one of the greatest legal minds in all the land. This case was just one of the 29 cases he won before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Fittingly, Marshall was the first African American confirmed to the Supreme Court. He was nominated by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1967 and served 24 years, until 1991. On the high court, Marshall continued his fight for the Constitutional protection of individual human rights.

But Thurgood Marshall was not always a legal giant. He was once a young boy growing up in West Baltimore. He received the first 6 years of his public education at PS 103. An apocryphal story goes that a young Thurgood Marshall studied the U.S. Constitution in the basement of the building while serving detention. Regardless of whether or not this is true, the building powerfully tells the story of racial segregation in America, PS 103 was a "blacks only" school when Justice Marshall was a student, and marks the academic beginning of one of the country's most brilliant legal thinkers and a pioneer of the civil rights movement.

The building is located at 1315 Division Street in the Upton Neighborhood of Old West Baltimore. The building is part of the Old West Baltimore National Register Historic District, and is listed as a contributing historic resource for the neighborhood. The Old West Baltimore historic district is one of the largest predominately African American historic districts in the country, and its significance is centered on the African American experience in the area.

In Baltimore, we are fortunate to have the National Park Service operate two historical sites, Fort McHenry and

the Hampton Mansion. Adding PS 103 is a unique opportunity for the National Park Service to work in Baltimore's inner-city and to reach out and engage people about African American history.

Needless to say, Thurgood Marshall's legacy is one that should be preserved. He was one of our country's greatest legal minds and a prominent historical figure of one chapter of our country's great history—the civil rights movement. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of PS 103 to evaluate the suitability and feasibility of establishing the building as a unit of the National Park Service. Preserving the building that was Justice Marshall's elementary school will give Americans insight into Justice Marshall's childhood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 103

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Thurgood Marshall's Elementary School Study Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) STUDY AREA.—The term "study area" means P.S. 103, the public school located in West Baltimore, Maryland, which Thurgood Marshall attended as a youth.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the study area.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the study area;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the study area by the Federal Government, State or local government entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) consult with interested Federal agencies, State or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations, or any other interested individuals;

(5) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives; and

(6) identify any authorities that would compel or permit the Secretary to influence local land use decisions under the alternatives.

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 8 of the National Park System General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a-5).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the results of the study; and
 (2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 113. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce two pieces of legislation: the Know Before You Owe Act and the Fairness for Struggling Students Act. These bills will take critical steps toward addressing the student debt crisis facing America.

Every week my office is contacted by young people and their families who share with me their horror stories about student debt. Many of them are college students or graduates who are getting crushed by student loans the size of mortgages. All too often, these young people were lured into attending worthless, for-profit colleges that left them with worthless diplomas and mountains of debt. It is disgraceful. But it is not only young people facing this debt crisis, it is their parents, their siblings, even their grandparents who did them a favor by cosigning on these loans. They, too, are being held responsible when the loans go into default.

Many of these people contact my office because they don't know where to turn. Their debt loan leaves them feeling helpless. They are putting off major life decisions such as buying a home or even starting a family because of crushing student debt. We can't stand idly by any longer and ignore this reality. We have to step up and recognize that this student debt bomb is ticking away.

Student loan debt among college students surpassed \$1 trillion last year. The New York Fed reports that balances of student loans have now exceeded the balances on automobile loans and credit card debt in America—student loans. That makes student loans the largest form of consumer debt outside of home mortgages.

Last year, 37 million borrowers held student loan debt. That is more than 10 percent of the population of this country. The average balance is \$24,300. But, remember, that is an average. This is a massive amount of debt, and it is having a profound impact on the lives of students and their families across America.

The overall growth in student debt is troubling. The most pressing concern is what is known as private student loans. If a student goes to college, they could qualify for a government-guaranteed loan with dramatically lower interest rates with accommodations based on their employment and even some loan forgiveness. Not so when it comes to private student loans in most cases. Students who take out Federal loans receive affordable interest rates,

a lot of protections and repayment options. Private student loans are totally different. Private student loans often have high variable interest rates, hefty origination fees, lack of repayment options, and, unfortunately, crushing penalties.

In 2012 the amount of outstanding private student loans exceeded \$150 billion. Students are being steered into these private loans while they are still eligible for the better government loans. Why? Because somebody is making more money when they sign up for private student loans. As a result, many students are being saddled with debt they don't have to be saddled with and sometimes debt they can never repay.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau last year reported that at least 850,000 individual private student loans were in default amounting to more than \$8 billion.

Let me tell my colleagues about one of those students. I have opened on my official Web site a place where those who have student loans and want to share their stories can come. Anna Wilcox, who is 31 years old, did. She attended the Brooks Institute of Photography, a for-profit college owned by the Career Education Corporation.

Anna Wilcox saw a TV ad one day about this so-called Brooks Institute of Photography and decided she would call and inquire. The school called her twice a day until she finally enrolled. The recruiter at the school—this Career Education Corporation School—told her that a Brooks degree would help her make \$85,000 a year as a photographer. So Anna enrolled, and when she graduated in 2006, she had a debt of about \$170,000, almost all of it in private student loans.

Anna was 24 years old with \$170,000 in student debt from this for-profit school. With a variable interest rate that went as high as 18 percent, her balance just kept growing. Her monthly payments on her private student loan now exceed \$1,000 a month. Her Federal loans she took out as well had low interest rates. She said those payments are reasonable, and she can handle them. Her parents decided to help her out and cosigned on the loans. Now her parents, in their sixties, are on the hook as well. They have to change their life plans because they wanted to help their daughter, and now they are stuck with a debt of \$170,000 for a worthless diploma from a for-profit school.

Well, Anna did find a job, but the job doesn't pay anywhere near \$85,000 a year. She just can't keep up with these staggering monthly loan payments. She said she would like to file for bankruptcy, clean the slate, and start over. She can't borrow money to go to a real school. She has wasted her borrowing power on these for-profit schools.

It doesn't do her any good to want to file for bankruptcy. Private student loans are not dischargeable for bank-

ruptcy. If a person signs up as a college student for one of these student loans, it is debt that will follow that person for a lifetime. There is no way to escape it. It is something to think about long and hard when students make that decision.

Anna is very blunt and despondent. She said she made a big mistake going to the school. It was a waste. She thought she would get a better life by going to college. She didn't realize these for-profit schools by and large are a waste of money and cause debt that most students can never pay back. She has bad credit now and a mountain of debt to show for it.

So what are we going to do about it? Are we going to say: Well, Anna, you should have been a little bit smarter when you were 19 years old and sat across the desk from somebody who said: We want you as a college student. You made your mistake, girl. That is the way it works in America, and now you have to pay the price. Is that the answer? Is that the answer when these for-profit schools depend on the Federal Government and taxpayers for 85 to 95 percent of all of the revenue they take in?

These for-profit schools, if we took the Federal money we send their way—if these for-profit schools were a Federal agency, it would be the ninth largest Federal agency in America. That is how much money we are pouring into these for-profit schools.

Let me just put three numbers out for people to reflect on: 12 percent of the students out of high school go to for-profit schools. We know their names. They are students who gather in Washington and come to the galleries. They know what I am talking about. Go on the Internet and try to escape an ad for a for-profit school: University of Phoenix, DeVry, Kaplan. Ring a bell? Well, I can tell my colleagues these are the biggies, but there are hundreds of them. Twelve percent of the students after high school go to for-profit schools.

For-profit schools, though, account for 25 percent of all of the Federal aid to education. They just soak it up. Students borrow and turn it over to the for-profit schools. The student is stuck with the debt. The for-profit school may never graduate you, but they have their money.

There is a third number to remember. The first is 12, the second is 25. The third number is 47. Forty-seven percent of the student loan defaults in America are students from for-profit schools, students being dragged into these schools that charge way too much for tuition and then the student either can't finish the school or gets out of school and can't find a job and they are stuck.

I tell my students back home, if you are not sure, start at a community college. It is affordable. It has a wide array of courses to be offered to you. You will learn a lot about yourself, you will learn a lot about what you want to

do in school, and you will not end up sunk in debt like these for-profit schools want to do to you.

We have to do something about Anna Wilcox's plight and many others just like her.

I wish to commend especially one community college in my State, the Elgin Community College. I have been visiting that school regularly and always come home thinking: This college gets it. They have implemented a financial counseling program that goes above and beyond anything I would put into law. All of the students at Elgin Community College in Elgin, IL, must submit a monthly budget detailing all their costs when they are seeking financial aid. The student then has a mandatory, one-on-one meeting with a counselor to review the loan balance, the repayment options, and what happens if they default. This community college has implemented a workshop for students who will be graduating during the upcoming semester to discuss repayment options and give them a complete summary of every loan they have taken out.

These students are facing debt the likes of which they have never seen in their lives. They are motivated by all of the preaching they have heard from their parents, like me, saying: Go to school. Get a degree. They are ready to sign up because they want to do what they think is the right thing. They do not know that the for-profit school is worthless, they do not know that the thousands and thousands of dollars of debt will never be able to be repaid, and they do not know that debt will be with them for a lifetime. So here are some bills I am introducing to address it.

I believe students will benefit more if they have the kind of loan counseling we see at the Elgin Community College. I am joining Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa, chairman of the HELP Committee, in reintroducing the Know Before You Owe Private Student Loan Act of 2013.

The legislation requires colleges to confirm a student's enrollment status, cost of attendance, and estimated Federal financial aid assistance before any private student loan can be approved for that student. In other words, if you are eligible for the government loan, for goodness' sakes, take that first. The private student loan is much more expensive, and it is tougher to pay it back. So we want to make sure students who are eligible for government loans know that before they sign up for the private student loans. Often, students have not even applied for Federal aid before they are encouraged by some of these schools to apply for private student loans, or students have not exhausted their eligibility for Federal aid. Requiring school certification would give the school the opportunity to make students aware of Federal student aid options and the most affordable options.

The bill would also require schools to counsel the students about their loan

options. Schools would be required to inform students about the differences between Federal student loans and private student loans, and they are stark and dramatic. For students who decide to take out private student loans, the bill would require lenders to provide them with quarterly up-to-date information about their balance and interest accrued. It is not one of these deals where you just keep borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and finally when you are about to finish school—or years later—they give you the total, and you look at it and say: My goodness, I did not realize I had signed up for all of that debt.

This legislation is supported by a large coalition of educational, student, and consumer organizations and has been recommended by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

The other bill I am reintroducing today is the Fairness for Struggling Students Act. This bill, cosponsored by Senators WHITEHOUSE, FRANKEN, HARKIN, and JACK REED, would restore the Bankruptcy Code's pre-2005 treatment of private student loans.

As I said earlier, since 2005 private student loans have enjoyed a privileged status under the Bankruptcy Code. They cannot be discharged in bankruptcy except under the most extreme circumstances. Only a few other types of debt cannot be discharged in bankruptcy—criminal fines, child support, taxes, and alimony. In contrast, nearly all types of private, unsecured debt—credit card debt, doctor bills—are dischargeable in bankruptcy, but not student loans.

There was no good reason for Congress to give such preferred treatment to these financial institutions that are peddling these private student loans. It was a provision—a sweetheart provision—tucked into a massive bankruptcy reform bill with very little debate and even less justification. There is no evidence that private student loan borrowers were abusing the bankruptcy system before this law was changed. In fact, the private student loan market has been growing—even before this measure was enacted into law. But the private student loan industry got a sweetheart deal out of Congress, and now we are in a situation where many students have overwhelming private student loan debt, and they cannot repay, and they cannot escape. This is devastating for those students and a drag on our overall economy.

There was an article a few months ago in the New York Times, and it talked about a grandmother who was having her Social Security check garnished because she had signed on as a cosigner of her granddaughter's student loan. Her granddaughter dropped out of college and could not pay back the loan, and now we are going after grandma's Social Security check. That is how serious this can be.

A large coalition of student, educational, civil rights, and consumer or-

ganizations support this bill. I hope we can move forward with legislation this year. It is time to restore fairness to our Bankruptcy Code when it comes to student debt.

Let me be clear: When used appropriately, student loans are valuable and important. I would not be standing here today if I had not borrowed money from the Federal Government to go to college and law school. I never could have afforded it otherwise. It was called the National Defense Education Act. If I told you the numbers that I borrowed, you would realize how old I am. But at the time, it was scary to have that much debt coming fresh out of law school. I paid it back just like I was supposed to so the next generation could take over. But what I faced, the debt I incurred to go to school and law school, does not even come close to matching what many students have to borrow in the first semester, and that, unfortunately, leads to a debt that some will be crushed with for a lifetime. In many instances, student loans help Americans get a quality higher education and the job skills they need to repay their loans and have a rewarding life and career. But, unfortunately, there are far too many Americans who have been steered into high-cost private loans that will burden them for life and prevent them from fully contributing to our economy.

It is about time we woke up to the reality of what students—millions of students—across America are facing, and their families. We have a responsibility to them over and above the profits that are being earned by for-profit schools and the financial institutions peddling these private student loans with these outrageous interest rates and terms. It is time for this Congress to listen to working families and their kids all across America to restore transparency, fairness, and common sense to private student loans. I urge my colleagues to support these bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bills was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

S. 113

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Know Before You Owe Private Student Loan Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution's certification of—

“(i) the enrollment status of the student;
 “(ii) the student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and
 “(iii) the difference between—
 “(I) such cost of attendance; and
 “(II) the student’s estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor’s request for such certification—

“(i) the requested certification; or
 “(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

“(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

“(i) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

“(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

“(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

“(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

“(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORT.—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(7)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(2) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (9) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (a). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

“(28)(A) The institution shall—

“(i) upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, provide certification to such private educational lender—

“(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

“(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

“(III) of the difference between—

“(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

“(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable; and

“(i) provide the certification described in clause (i), or notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request—

“(I) within 15 business days of receipt of such certification request; and

“(II) only after the institution has completed the activities described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) The institution shall, upon receipt of a certification request described in subparagraph (A)(i), and prior to providing such certification—

“(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

“(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private education lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

“(I) The availability of, and the borrower’s potential eligibility for, Federal financial assistance under this title, including disclosing the terms, conditions, interest rates, and repayment options and programs of Federal student loans.

“(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

“(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

“(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application

and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in section 2(c).

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under section 2(c), the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of institutions of higher education and private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by section 2, and section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)), as amended by section 3. Such report shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility and lowering student private education loan debt.

S. 114

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fairness for Struggling Students Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. EXCEPTIONS TO DISCHARGE.

Section 523(a)(8) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking “dependents, for” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “dependents, for an educational benefit overpayment or loan made, insured, or guaranteed by a governmental unit or made under any program funded in whole or in part by a governmental unit or an obligation to repay funds received from a governmental unit as an educational benefit, scholarship, or stipend;”.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BEGICH):

S. 116. A bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senators MURKOWSKI, DURBIN, COLLINS, TOM UDALL, MURRAY, LAUTENBERG, BLUMENTHAL, COONS, KLOBUCHAR, and STABENOW in the introduction of the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Reauthorization.

This legislation is named for the son of Senator Gordon Smith, our former colleague, who took his own life at the young age of 22. After this tragedy, Senator Smith rallied support from members across the aisle and in both chambers to prevent other children from doing the same with passage of the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act in 2004. Since then, it has retained its bipartisan support among Members of Congress and over 40 member organizations of the Mental Health Liaison Group.

However, the recent horrific mass shooting in Newtown, CT shows that more work must be done to address the mental and behavioral health of children and young adults before they hurt themselves and others. Indeed, what is so clear now from this terrible tragedy is that we have young people who desperately need help. Parents also need help in identifying early warning signs of mental illness and accessing the appropriate treatment before it is too late.

The Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act authorizes critical resources for schools, elementary schools through college where children and young adults spend most of their time, to be able to reach at risk youth. Currently, this law supports 40 States, 38 tribes and tribal organizations, and 85 colleges and universities in their efforts to address mental health and prevent suicides among their youth.

The bill my colleagues and I are introducing today would increase the authorized grant level to States, tribes, and college campuses for the implementation of proven programs and initiatives designed to address mental illness and reduce youth suicide. It will enable more schools to offer critical services to students and provide greater flexibility in the use of funds, particularly on college campuses.

Suicide is now the second leading cause of death for adolescents and young adults age 10 to 24, up from the third leading cause of death in this population just a few years ago, and results in 4,800 lives lost each year, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Additionally, the CDC reports that 157,000 young adults in this age group are treated for self-inflicted injuries annually, often as the result of a failed suicide attempt.

We can play a role in helping these children and their families. I am pleased that President Obama and Vice President BIDEN recognized this and included in their Plan to Protect Our Children and Our Communities by Reducing Gun Violence a recommendation to increase support for young adults ages 16 to 25, a population with high rates of mental illness, substance abuse, and suicide that is unlikely to seek help. Indeed, passing the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act Reauthorization is one way we can better address the mental health needs of this population.

My colleague, Chairman HARKIN, will be holding a hearing on the status of the mental health system in our country tomorrow. I look forward to continuing to work with him and others to act on the President's recommendations to improve mental and behavioral health care services, particularly for children and young people. This should be something that we do automatically when it comes to the welfare of our children but is even more urgently required in the wake of the terrible recent tragedies in Connecticut and elsewhere.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 122. A bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about our Tax Code as well as our economic future. There is a problem with our Tax Code, one that hits home with nearly all Americans; that is, its complexity. In the past few years I have met with hundreds of constituents who are worried about this issue. Individuals, small businesses, farms, and large corporations alike struggle with meeting their obligations to the IRS because of the complexity of our current Tax Code.

Earlier this month the IRS Taxpayer Advocate revealed some startling figures in the Agency's annual report to Congress. It estimates that individuals and businesses spend 6.1 billion hours each year complying with the IRS tax filing requirements. The complexity of the Tax Code is so burdensome that 9 out of 10 taxpayers now pay a professional preparer or use often costly commercial software to assist in tax preparation.

Then there is the problem with our corporate taxes. The United States has the highest marginal effective tax rate among the largest developed nations in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. According to recent studies by the Cato Institute, that rate for U.S. corporations is almost 36 percent. In fact, only Argentina, Chad, and Uzbekistan have higher tax rates than does the United States. While the U.S. corporate rates have remained high, other countries are lowering their rates. Sweden, for example, has become the latest country to announce that it will lower corporate tax rates, in part to help attract more foreign investment. Our corporate tax rates continue to be higher than they should, and we lose our competitive advantage to other nations in part because of that high tax rate.

I want to talk about a way to fix both these problems. Since joining the Senate, I have introduced in each new Congress the Fair Tax Act. Today I am reintroducing this legislation because of my belief that the Fair Tax Act can fix the problems built into our current Tax Code. The fair tax will promote freedom and economic opportunity by eliminating our current archaic and inefficient Tax Code and replacing it with a simpler, fairer means of collecting tax revenue. It will repeal the individual income tax, the corporate income tax, capital gains taxes, all payroll taxes, self-employment taxes, and the estate and gift tax in lieu of a 23-percent tax on the final sale of goods and services. Elimination of these inef-

ficient taxing mechanisms will not only bring about equality within our tax system, it will also bring about simplicity. It will provide tax relief for business-to-business transactions. These transactions, including those for used goods that have already been taxed, are not subject to the sales tax, so there would be no double taxation.

Some of my colleagues have asked how the fair tax would affect our revenue on our entitlement programs. Social Security and Medicare benefits would remain untouched under the Fair Tax Act. There would be no financial reductions to either of these vital programs. Instead, the source of the trust fund revenue for these two programs would be replaced simply by the sales tax revenue instead of by payroll tax revenue.

Another question I get is how the fair tax would affect impoverished Americans. Under the Fair Tax Act, every American would receive a monthly rebate check equal to the spending up to the Federal poverty level, according to Department of Health and Human Services guidelines. This rebate would ensure that no American pays taxes on the purchase of necessities.

We have made nearly 5,000 changes to the Tax Code since 2001—I have supported some of them, and I have not supported others—all in the name of improvement and economic benefit. I believe we can do better than simply lowering our taxes. I know we can make a bigger impact on our economic future by ridding ourselves of a tax structure that is holding us back.

Ronald Reagan once said:

I believe we really can, however, say that God did give mankind virtually unlimited gifts to invent, produce and create. And for that reason alone, it would be wrong for governments to devise a tax structure or economic system that suppresses and denies those gifts.

With that statement, I could not agree more.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 8—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS HOLDS THE SOLE AUTHORITY TO BORROW MONEY ON THE CREDIT OF THE UNITED STATES AND SHALL NOT CEDE THIS POWER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHANNIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 8

Whereas it is Congress' prerogative and duty to decide how much the Nation will borrow and for what purposes;

Whereas Congress has the responsibility under the Constitution to regulate the terms and conditions under which the Nation borrows funds;

Whereas Congress has the power and the obligation to ensure that payments are made on the national debt;

Whereas Congress is directly accountable to the people concerning any tax and spending burdens placed upon the public;

Whereas these Constitutional powers and responsibilities create an appropriate check on the executive branch and preclude the President from raising taxes and issuing debt;

Whereas on November 29, 2012, the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the President, proposed that Congress should surrender its authority to establish the debt limit of the United States to the executive branch; and

Whereas for 6 decades Congress and the President have routinely used the necessity of increasing the debt limit as a vehicle for debate and broader reforms on the path of spending and future deficits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress—

(1) should not relinquish its long utilized authority vested in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution to “borrow money on the credit of the United States” by refusing to debate, amend, and vote on a bill to address the debt limit; and

(2) should not provide the executive branch with exclusive power to issue debt on behalf of the United States Government.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I am rising to submit a resolution making it absolutely clear that Congress, and only Congress, has the authority and responsibility to set the Federal debt limit. I should not even have to submit a resolution such as this, but I feel it is absolutely necessary.

Raising the Federal debt limit—the limit we place on government borrowing—as everybody knows, has been a hot topic around Washington. It is a key issue for the start of the 113th Congress. It is another case where if we could just maintain regular order, regular authority to address our problems, that is the best way for us to approach the task of getting our fiscal house in order.

I know there is a lot of dispute over what breaching the limit means. There is a lot of talk about that. It is clear a great deal of the public and our financial markets are extremely concerned about the Federal Government’s ability to meet its financial obligations once we do hit the limit.

The President has asked for a very large increase in the debt ceiling, and some in the administration have called for no limit at all. Others of the administration and in the House are calling for Congress to give up its authority to set the debt limit—rather amazing—thus giving the executive branch unilateral authority to borrow. This is not a good idea.

If the Federal Government does not collect enough revenue to pay for all its spending obligations, it must borrow to make up the shortfall. Everybody knows that. We are borrowing now about 42 cents of every \$1 we are obligated to spend.

This is clearly—I think everybody would agree on either side of the aisle and the public—an unsustainable situation which will only get worse if we do not begin meaningful discussions over our spending priorities, including—in-

cluding—entitlement spending to strengthen and preserve those programs for future generations.

The national debt is growing. Everybody has seen that chart. It is about \$16.4 trillion. The total public debt outstanding at the end of the third quarter just passed was \$16.07 trillion. That is up from \$15.86 trillion reported in June 2012. We are on the wrong path.

The Federal debt is now equivalent to at least 73 percent of the Nation’s gross domestic product—nearly double the level as a percentage of GDP that we had back in 1990. That is not too long ago.

According to some measures, there has been a 60-percent increase in the debt limit since 2009. At the rate we are going, in a few short years we will be spending more to pay interest on the debt than we will on all discretionary programs outside of defense. Even defense now is going through a very difficult time with the sequester and has already been cut about one-half trillion dollars.

Let me just say that means no money for education. That means no money for agriculture. That means no money for the environment. That means no money for health care. It all goes to pay off interest on the debt.

The Federal debt is the accumulation of this borrowing, including all bills, notes, and bonds issued by the Department of the Treasury.

The current statutory debt limit is \$16.394 trillion, which was established on January 28 of last year, 2012—about 1 year ago—under the procedures of the Budget Control Act of 2011.

According to the Department of the Treasury, as of December 31—just last month—total debt outstanding subject to the limit was only \$25 million—million; it used to be a lot of money—below the current limit.

Once the amount of outstanding debt reaches the debt limit, the government can no longer issue additional debt to cover the cash shortfalls needed to fund government operations and meet legal obligations.

Similar to the power of the purse, Congress’s powers over borrowing are firmly rooted in our constitutional traditions. The Founders understood the potential danger of permitting the executive branch to unilaterally incur new public debt. Article I of the Constitution empowers only—only—Congress “to borrow money on the credit of the United States.”

The debt limit is the means by which Congress—Congress—exercises this critical legislative responsibility.

I can remember well that lesson, that lecture, if you will, from Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, the institutional flame of the Senate, who would have repeated that Congress cannot give debt limit authority to the executive, should not, cannot. It is not constitutional.

To implement this congressional prerogative, the amount of money the Federal Government is allowed to bor-

row is subject to a specific statutory limit.

From time to time, Congress considers and adopts legislation to change this limit and has done so more than 100 times since the first modern debt limit was set way back in 1939, and we will do so again shortly. We have to.

So preserving this role and establishing the debt limit is vital to encourage deficit reduction and to uphold our constitutional tradition of legislative control over borrowing. Not only does the debt limit provide an essential check on executive borrowing, it provides public accountability—everybody is talking about transparency—for Congress’s borrowing and debt management practices. We cannot duck that responsibility. We cannot pass this debt limit simply to the Executive and duck our responsibility and the public accountability.

In other words, debates over the debt limit, as difficult and as contentious as they are—and they are; I know that—shed the light of day on the overall financial condition of the Federal Government. Precluding these discussions by removing Congress’s authority over the debt limit would lead to a less well-informed decisionmaking over fiscal policy. That is probably the understatement of my remarks. It is a nice way to put it.

We can do this. In the past, legislation to raise the debt limit has frequently been coupled with legislation to reduce the overall Federal debt and deficit. That is the way we should do it. These extensions, often approved on a bipartisan basis, have been important catalysts for fiscal reform. In this respect, the debt limit is a strong mechanism, a strong tool, a way for Congress to evaluate fiscal policy and to maintain control over such policy.

Abdicating this role would fundamentally alter the checks and balances embedded in the Constitution. This is a power that should not be bargained away.

The necessary and critical battle to control spending is far from over. I view the debt ceiling debate as a critical means in what has to be an ongoing effort to tighten the government’s fiscal belt—if we can just do that. But we cannot settle our national finances by fundamentally altering the constitutional structure and processes governing those finances. We cannot cavalierly give up one of our most important tools in evaluating and reining in the Federal Government’s runaway spending.

Equally clear, we cannot keep spending what we do not have. We must continue to fight for spending cuts, for debt reduction, and against tax increases and, I might add, the tidal wave of regulations that continue to pour out of Washington.

In response to calls to give up this vital congressional authority over debt issuance, I am submitting today a simple resolution. Let’s put the Senate on record. The Congress holds the sole authority to borrow money on the credit

of the United States and cannot cede this power to the President.

I invite everybody to cosponsor this important measure and look forward to passage of this resolution. This should be a bipartisan effort, and it is absolutely necessary.

SENATE RESOLUTION 9—DESIGNATING JANUARY 2013 AS “NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH”

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 9

Whereas mentoring is a longstanding tradition in which a dependable, caring adult provides guidance, support, and encouragement to facilitate the social, emotional, and cognitive development of a young person;

Whereas continued research on mentoring shows that formal, high-quality mentoring focused on developing the competence and character of the mentee promotes positive outcomes, such as improved academic achievement, self-esteem, social skills, and career development;

Whereas further research on mentoring provides strong evidence that mentoring successfully reduces substance use and abuse, academic failure, and delinquency;

Whereas mentoring, in addition to preparing young people for school, work, and life, is extremely rewarding for the people who serve as mentors;

Whereas more than 5,000 mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the United States focus on building strong, effective relationships between mentors and mentees;

Whereas approximately 3,000,000 young people in the United States are in formal mentoring relationships due to the remarkable vigor, creativity, and resourcefulness of the thousands of mentoring programs in communities throughout the United States;

Whereas, in spite of the progress made in increasing mentoring, the United States has a serious “mentoring gap”, with nearly 15,000,000 young people in need of mentors;

Whereas mentoring partnerships between the public and private sectors bring State and local leaders together to support mentoring programs by preventing duplication of efforts, offering training in industry best practices, and making the most of limited resources to benefit young people in the United States;

Whereas the designation of January 2013 as “National Mentoring Month” will help call attention to the critical role mentors play in helping young people realize their potential;

Whereas a month-long celebration of mentoring will encourage more individuals and organizations, including schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, faith institutions, and foundations, to become engaged in mentoring across the United States; and

Whereas, most significantly, National Mentoring Month—

(1) will build awareness of mentoring; and
(2) will encourage more people to become mentors and help close the mentoring gap in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of January 2013 as “National Mentoring Month”;

(2) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring adults and students who are already volunteering as mentors; and

(3) encourages more adults and students to volunteer as mentors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 10—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE GOVERNMENT OF ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA AND ITS ACTIONS RELATING TO THE STANFORD FINANCIAL GROUP FRAUD

Mr. VITTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 10

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda has committed numerous acts against the interests of United States citizens and operated the financial sector and judicial system of Antigua and Barbuda in a manner that is manifestly contrary to the public policy of the United States;

Whereas 20,000 investors, including many United States citizens, lost \$7,200,000,000 in an alleged Ponzi scheme involving fictitious certificates of deposit from Stanford International Bank, an offshore bank chartered in Antigua and Barbuda;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda violated the order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas regarding the receivership proceeding initiated at the request of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (referred to in this preamble as the “Securities and Exchange Commission”), in which the court took exclusive control of all the assets owned by Allen Stanford and Stanford-affiliated entities around the world and documents relating to those assets;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda challenged the authority of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas by—

(1) initiating a separate and competing liquidation proceeding for Stanford International Bank; and

(2) appointing liquidators who have defied the orders of the court in multiple jurisdictions around the world by litigating for control of hundreds of millions of dollars in bank accounts in the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Canada;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda challenged the authority of the United States Department of Justice by seeking to obtain control of hundreds of millions of dollars in bank accounts in the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Canada that had been frozen at the request of the Department of Justice in accordance with multilateral criminal asset forfeiture treaties;

Whereas the courts of Antigua and Barbuda have denied recognition of the United States district court-appointed receiver for all assets of Allen Stanford and Stanford-affiliated entities;

Whereas the Stanford International Bank liquidators appointed by the Eastern Caribbean Court of Appeals now seek recognition of the Antigua and Barbuda liquidation proceeding as a foreign insolvency proceeding under chapter 15 of title 11, United States Code, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda acknowledged in a statement in March 2010 that—

(1) Stanford International Bank “was operating in Antigua as a transit point and for purposes of registration and regulation”; and

(2) “[t]he business of Stanford International Bank, Ltd. was run from Houston, Texas, and its books maintained in Memphis, Tennessee”;

Whereas Allen Stanford, the Stanford Financial Group, and the Government of Antigua and Barbuda enjoyed a mutually beneficial business relationship involving numerous economic development projects and loans to the government of at least \$85,000,000, and forensic accounting reports have identified those loans as having been made from Stanford International Bank certificate of deposit funds;

Whereas, in June 2010, the Securities and Exchange Commission alleged that Allen Stanford bribed Leroy King, the chief executive officer of the Financial Services Regulatory Commission of Antigua and Barbuda, to persuade Leroy King to—

(1) not investigate Stanford International Bank;

(2) provide Allen Stanford with access to the confidential files of the Financial Services Regulatory Commission;

(3) allow Allen Stanford to dictate the response of the Financial Services Regulatory Commission to inquiries by the Securities and Exchange Commission about Stanford International Bank; and

(4) withhold information from the Securities and Exchange Commission;

Whereas, in June 2010, the United States Department of Justice indicted Leroy King on criminal charges and ordered Leroy King to be extradited to the United States;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda has failed to complete the process of extraditing Leroy King to the United States to stand trial;

Whereas Dr. Errol Cort, who served as the Minister of Finance of Antigua and Barbuda from 2004 to 2009, allegedly received more than \$1,000,000 of fraudulently transferred Stanford investor funds either directly or indirectly through his law firm, Cort & Cort;

Whereas Cort & Cort, the law firm of Dr. Errol Cort, served as the official registered agent for Stanford International Bank until June 2009;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda, along with the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank—

(1) seized control and possession of the Allen Stanford-owned Bank of Antigua without compensation to the United States district court-appointed receiver;

(2) renamed that bank the “Eastern Caribbean Amalgamated Bank”; and

(3) allocated a 40 percent ownership position to the Government of Antigua and Barbuda and 60 percent ownership to 5 Eastern Caribbean Central Bank member banks;

Whereas, after the fraud that the Stanford Financial Group allegedly perpetrated was made public, the Government of Antigua and Barbuda expropriated numerous Allen Stanford-owned properties in Antigua and Barbuda worth up to several hundred million dollars, and the government has not turned over those properties to the United States district court-appointed receiver;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda expropriated without compensation the property known as the Half Moon Bay Resort, which is owned by a group of 12 United States citizens; and

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda—

(1) has sought and obtained loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association (commonly known as the “World Bank”) and the International Monetary Fund; and

(2) is the recipient of other direct and indirect aid from the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) provision of all further direct or indirect aid or assistance, including assistance

derived from Federal funds, by the United States Government to the Government of Antigua and Barbuda should be suspended until the Government of Antigua and Barbuda provides complete redress of the issues described in the preamble, including through—

(A) the full cooperation of the Government of Antigua and Barbuda and any appointee of that government, including the joint liquidators of Stanford International Bank, with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Department of Justice, the United States district court-appointed receiver, and the United States district court-appointed Stanford Investors Committee, in investigating the Stanford Financial Group fraud and marshaling the assets of Allen Stanford and all Stanford-affiliated entities;

(B) an agreement by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda to be subject to the jurisdiction and bound by the judgment of any United States court that adjudicates the claims relating to the Stanford Financial Group fraud;

(C) the transfer of the assets seized by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda, or obtained by the joint liquidators of Stanford International Bank, to the United States district court-appointed receiver for the benefit of victims of the Stanford Financial Group fraud;

(D) a contribution by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda to the United States receivership estate for the benefit of victims of the Stanford Financial Group fraud, in an amount equal to the amount of any funds that Allen Stanford or any Stanford-affiliated entity provided to the Government or government officials of Antigua and Barbuda;

(E) a contribution by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda to the United States receivership estate for the benefit of victims of the Stanford Financial Group fraud, in an amount equal to any payments that Allen Stanford or the Stanford Financial Group made to Leroy King or any other official of the Government of Antigua and Barbuda for the purpose of subverting regulatory oversight of Stanford International Bank;

(F) the fulfillment by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda of its obligations relating to the expropriation of the Half Moon Bay Resort; and

(G) an agreement by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda to not—

(i) interfere with the receivership commenced by the United States Government; and

(ii) seek control of assets claimed by the United States Government; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should direct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Development Association (commonly known as the "World Bank") and the International Monetary Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to ensure that any future loan made by the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund to the Government of Antigua and Barbuda is conditioned on providing complete redress of the matters, and satisfaction of the requirements, described under paragraph (1).

SENATE RESOLUTION 11—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR PRAYER AT SCHOOL BOARD MEETINGS

Mr. VITTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 11

Whereas the freedom to practice religion and to express religious thought is acknowledged to be a fundamental and unalienable right belonging to all individuals;

Whereas the United States was founded on the principle of freedom of religion and not freedom from religion;

Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States intended that the First Amendment to the Constitution would prohibit the Federal Government from enacting any law that favors one religious denomination over another, not that the First Amendment to the Constitution would prohibit any mention of religion or reference to God in civic dialogue;

Whereas, in 1983, the Supreme Court held in *Marsh v. Chambers*, 463 U.S. 783, that the practice of opening legislative sessions with prayer has become part of the fabric of our society and invoking divine guidance on a public body entrusted with making the laws is not a violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution, but rather is simply a tolerable acknowledgment of beliefs widely held among the people of the United States;

Whereas voluntary prayer by elected bodies should not be limited to prayer in State legislatures and Congress;

Whereas school boards are deliberative bodies of adults, similar to a legislature in that they are elected by the people, act in the public interest, and hold sessions that are open to the public for voluntary attendance; and

Whereas voluntary prayer by an elected body should be protected under law and encouraged in society because voluntary prayer has become a part of the fabric of our society, voluntary prayer acknowledges beliefs widely held among the people of the United States, and the Supreme Court has held that it is not a violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution for a public body to invoke divine guidance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that prayer before school board meetings is a protected act in accordance with the fundamental principles upon which the United States was founded; and

(2) expresses support for the practice of prayer at the beginning of school board meetings.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 23, 2013, at 9 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled, "Benghazi: The Attacks and the Lessons Learned."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on January 23, 2013, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Judicial Nominations."

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jacqueline Emanuel, who is a fellow in Senator MARK UDALL's office, be granted floor privileges for the Senate's sessions of the 113th Congress for the remainder of the month of January 2013.

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

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that from Wednesday, January 23, through Monday, January 28, the majority leader be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—S. 81, S. 82, S. 83, AND S. 124

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am told there are four bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 81) to provide guidance and priorities for Federal Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached.

A bill (S. 82) to provide that any executive action infringing on the Second Amendment has no force or effect, and to prohibit the use of funds for certain purposes.

A bill (S. 83) to provide for continuing operations of Government in a fiscally responsible manner.

A bill (S. 124) to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request on all four of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2013

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 24, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for debate only until 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that time, with the majority controlling the first half-hour and the Republicans controlling the second half-hour.

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

**RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., recessed until Thursday, January 24, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GENERAL LLOYD J. AUSTIN III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT L. CASLEN, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

KORY D. BINGHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL A. COOPER
LOREN J. JANKE
SUSAN MICHELLE MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

VICTOR DOUGLAS BROWN
DAVID P. DOROFF
DAVID L. MOYER
RODNEY M. WAITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

WALTER S. ADAMS
RANDY A. MARSHALL
DAVID L. SUMRALL
CARL E. SUPPLEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN J. BARTRUM
WILLIAM H. CRAIG
KRISTIN A. HILLERY
GREGORY C. STAUDENMAIER
ANTHONY A. TREZZA
GEORGE L. VALENTINE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIMBERLY L. BARBER

DIANE DIFRANCESCO
MARY C. GOETTER
THOMAS M. HANSEN
JO ANNE HOWARD
LIESELOTTE J. KENNEDY
DOROTHY ANNE KLEINERT
JANET L. SETNOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DINA L. BERNSTEIN
CHRISTOPHER DAVID CAREY
MICHELLE S. CRAMER
GEORGE A. KIRKPATRICK
LORRAINE M. MINK
JULIA D. RIVERA
DANIEL L. ROUSE
CHRISTOPHER A. SANTORO
RANDALL G. SNOW
CORNELIA P. WEISS
WILLIAM R. YOUNGBLOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY LEE BRININGER
JEANINE M. CZECH
DAVID L. DAWSON
KARL J. EDELMANN
ERIC S. JOHNSON
COLLEEN ELIZABETH KELLEY
JOHN T. LANGELL
DAVID J. LUTHER
MARY E. NEWMAN
BRIAN S. PINKSTON
THOMAS E. QUINN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER J. RYAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

FRANCIS XAVIER ALTIERI
MICHAEL EDWARD AMIRAULT
BRYAN G. ANDERS
BRADFORD T. ANDERSON
ANTHONY P. ANGELLO
DAVID SCOTT ARGYLE
CHARLES D. ASSUMMA
KEVIN J. AUNAPI
ROBERT E. BALSERAK
PAUL NATHAN BARNES
BRIAN CHRISTOPHER BATAILLE
DAVID B. BAYSINGER
LESLIE A. BEAVERS
PAMELA ANNE BERGSON
RICARDO J. BERUVIDES
ROBERT M. BLAKE
BRETT A. BOLAN
BRIAN S. BOWMAN
ANN L. BROWN
STEPHEN M. BROWNING
FAMELA JUNE BRUNER
ROBERT OTIS BUCHANAN
MICHAEL ALPHONS BUONICONTI
GREGORY P. BUTLER
ERIC MARTIN BUTTER
DEAN C. CALDWELL
LEE WILLIAM CAREY
BARBARA ELISABETH CARSON
JOHN YOUNG CHOL CARTER
ELIZABETH J. CHAMBERLAIN
TODD WILLIAM CHAY'ANNE
MICHAEL A. CHRISTOPH
MELISSA ANN COBURN
CHRISTINA M. COLLINS
GLENN COLLINS
JOSEPH A. COLLINS
DAVID J. CONDIT
MATTHEW CHRISTOPHER CONRAD
ARTHUR T. COPPAGE
STANLEY D. CROW, JR.
PETER V. CULLINAN
CHRISTOPHER C. CUNNINGHAM
RAYMOND J. DANOWSKI
LISA D. DAY
MICHAEL P. DAY
JOSEPH LOUIS DELLARCIPRETE
LAWRENCE R. DISALVI
TIMOTHY SEAN DONNELLY
VANESSA J. DRNHOEFER
BARNABAS DUDAS
ROBERT GREEN DUNHAM
SAM T. DUPRE
ALAN M. EDMIASTON
BRIAN M. FARAR
TERRY J. FRADY
KENNETH T. FRANKENBERY
RALPH L. FRED
CHESTER V. FROST III
DARRIN L. GAMBLIN
SEAN ALAN GARRETT
ROBERT P. GRAHAM
MARK M. GRUNEWALD
ROBERT A. HADPDX
GREGORY D. HALEN
JEROME S. HAYES
LYNNETTE J. HEBBERT
WILLIAM M. HEISER
DIANE L. HIGGINBOTHAM
JEFFREY FRANK HILL
MARK D. HOLTEN

MELANI S. HOWARD
PAUL B. HOWARD
GERALD L. HROMOWYK
WILLIAM T. HUBBARD
THOMAS WILSON HUDNALL
MARTY A. HUGHES
BRYAN D. HUNTLEY
ERIC P. JENKINS
ERIC R. JENKINS
BARRY K. JONES
FRANCEEN KAKAVOULISPERERA
CATHERINE J. KASSUBE
JAMES W. KELLOGG, JR.
JOSEPH W. KING
JOHN L. KITCHELL III
DETLEF KLANN
ANN P. KNABE
STEPHEN R. KOENIG
ROBERT BRYAN KOWNACKY
TANYA R. KUBINEC
NEAL J. LANDEEN
MICHAEL J. LATTANZI
ANDREW J. LEONE
HAROLD W. LINNEAN III
JEFFREY S. LONG
KAREN L. MAGNUS
JAMES D. MARSHALL
DOUGLAS S. MARTIN
JACQUELYN L. MARTY
THOMAS C. MATSCHEK, JR.
KURT A. MATTHEWS
JEANINE M. MCANANEY
TERRY W. MCCLAIN
SCOTT T. MCLEAN
THOMAS CHRIS MCNURLIN
RUTH MEYER
JOEL M. MILTON
THOMAS O. MOFFATT, JR.
MARTHA M. MONROE
LEON H. MORRIS
CHARLES E. MORTON
BRIAN J. MUELLER
NICHOLAS W. MYERS
MARK A. NEVILLE
CHRISTOPHER D. OGREN
SHANNON O'HARRIN
ERIC J. OISTAD
MICHAEL J. OTT
RAYMOND C. OTTO
DAVID A. OWENS, JR.
EDWARD G. PAYLOR
JAMES M. PAYNE II
REX EUGENE PELTO
LINDA N. PEPIN
ROBERT L. PERCY
ROBERT E. PEREZ
ANTHONY M. PERKINS
DEAN E. PETERS
KURT M. PETERS
MICHAEL H. PHAN
DAVID A. PIFFARERIO
PAUL RICHARD PINKSTAFF
RAYMOND M. PLATT
DAVID C. POLACHECK
ANTHONY G. POLASHEK
RICHARD C. POSTON
SCOTT M. REED
JOSEPH MATTHEW REVIT
DAVID WAYNE ROBERTSON
STANLEY ROGERS
KATHRYN A. RUSSEL
PAUL A. SAINSBURY
SCOTT D. SANDBERG
GREGORY R. SAUNDERS
JOHN L. SCHMIDT III
DAVID E. SCHOBEL
TODD MICHAEL SEGER
LORENZA H. SHAW III
JAMES M. SHEALY III
CRAIG B. SHENKENBERG
DORNEEN W. SHIPP
JEFFREY B. SHORES
LENNIE B. SIMPSON
MARK V. SLOMINSKI
DAVID L. SMITH
GEORGE HUMPHREY SMITH III
MICHAEL J. SMITH
SCOTT A. SNYDER
ADAM J. SPEARS
RANDY P. SPEARS
ROBERT J. STANTON
CLIFTON D. STARGARDT
STEPHEN J. STASO
ROBERT J. STEFANOWICZ
CHRISTOPHER L. STEGNER
ANDREW H. STEPHAN
PAUL K. STERNAL
CAROLYN ANN STICKELL
MICHAEL A. STOLT
MICHAEL LEROY TAYLOR
SHERRY L. TEAGUE
KIMBERLY G. TEBRUGGE
KEVIN B. THOMAS
STUART A. TOFT
MIGUEL F. TORREALDAY
STEVEN G. TREE
CHARLES D. TUCK
LUTHER L. UPTON, JR.
ANTHONY DOMINIC VALLERA
CAROL ANN MARIE VELDHIJZEN
SAMUEL R. VENEY
NICHOLAS A. VOLPE
ANNE M. VONLUHTE
JEFFREY S. WALLACE
CLIFFORD W. WALLER
ROBERT J. WALTZ
JAMES F. WARD

JOHN K. WELCH
 CRAIG R. WELLS
 ADRIAN K. WHITE
 MARIA EARNHARDT WHITE
 CHRISTOPHER T. WHITEHEAD
 ROBERT D. WHITEHOUSE
 STEPHANIE W. WILLIAMS
 ADAM B. WILLIS
 GARY A. WOLF
 SHANNON L. YENCHESKY
 KEVIN M. ZELLER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JONATHAN A. FOSKEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARION J. PARKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KAREN A. PIKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

DEREK S. REYNOLDS
 BRIAN D. VOGT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

EDWARD A. FIGUEROA
 MICHAEL C. VANHOVEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JACK C. MASON
 TODD B. WAYTASHEK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RUTH E. APONTE
 EDWARD R. ARMSTRONG
 WARREN F. BACOTE
 TIMOTHY F. BANE
 MARSHALL D. BANKS
 CRAIG A. BARKLEY
 ROSBELL BARRERA
 THOMAS E. BARTOW
 HARRY C. BLANCO
 ROBERT I. BLAND
 CURTIS T. BOTH
 NORMA J. BRADFORD
 MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS
 DOUGLAS A. CHERRY
 TYRONE D. CLIFTON
 ELIZABETH A. COBLE
 MARK W. COLVIS
 ROSANNA L. DOLPHIN
 MICHAEL J. FALGNANT
 JON M. GOFORTH
 NIKKI L. GRIFFINOLIVE
 WILLIAM I. GRYMES
 KENNETH M. HAMMOND
 MICHAEL T. HARVEY
 CURTIS R. HENRY
 SEAN P. HIGGINS
 DEBRA A. HOWER
 DAVID R. JAMES
 RICARDO A. JAVIER
 CHARLES M. JENKS
 LINDA C. JOHNSON
 PATRICK N. JOYNER
 MICHAEL L. KASNIC
 DANIEL A. KELLER
 ROBERT J. KENNEDY
 ERIC A. LAWSON
 SAMUEL E. LICORISH, JR.
 TERRY D. LINDON
 RONALD L. LUNDY
 JOSE M. MADERA
 GASPARE MAGADDINO
 JOHN D. MANNING
 EDWARD B. MCLEACHERN
 THOMAS P. MCLEARY
 GREGORY S. MCMILLAN
 ELIZABETH A. MEDINA
 DONNA M. MIKULIC
 WILLIAM N. NUTTER
 JAMES R. ORBOCK
 THOMAS B. PENTECOST
 WILLIAM PHILLIPS
 LUIS POMALES
 DEREK W. PRUITT
 DEREK J. REMINGTON

DALE B. RIVERS
 PAUL R. ROSEWITZ
 MICHAEL C. ROWELLS
 GLENN W. SANDERS
 EDUARDO C. SANNICOLAS
 EASTER K. SHARPE
 RICHARD T. SHEVLIN
 DUSTIN A. SHULTZ
 ROBERT F. SINGLER, JR.
 GREGORY W. SMITH
 PAUL M. SOEHNLEIN
 MICHAEL P. SPEARS
 MARK A. TOWNE
 MICHAEL J. TROMBLEY
 MICHAEL J. VARGAS
 FRANCISCO S. VELEZ III
 JOHN B. VINZANT
 THERESA J. WALSH
 FLETCHER V. WASHINGTON
 KURT H. L. WEINAND
 BRADLEY P. WELCH
 MATTHEW Z. WEST
 PAMELA L. WRIGHT
 TWANDA E. YOUNG
 MICHAEL J. ZINNO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

LESLIE E. AKINS
 RONALD ALCALA
 ADRIAN T. ALLISON
 NATHANIEL H. BABB
 JASON S. BALLARD
 SEAMUS K. BARRY
 KRISTA L. BARTOLOMUCCI
 CHRISTOPHER B. BERHOW
 TRICIA L. BIRDSSELL
 KENNETH W. D. BORGNO
 CARL J. BROMLEY
 JAY S. BURNS
 JOHN W. CAULWELL
 CINNAMON J. CHIELENS
 JOHN CIULLA, JR.
 GILBERT J. COMLEY
 BRENDAN R. CRONIN
 CHRISTOPHER J. CURRAN
 MELISSA DASGUPTASMITH
 NICHOLAS D. DEMBINSKI
 JOHN G. DOYLE
 BRADLEY ENDICOTT
 CHAD M. FISHER
 CHRISTOPHER T. FRANCA
 JEFFREY A. GILBERG
 MEGHAN D. B. GLUSHENKO
 BRENT A. GOODWIN
 CLYDE B. GORE
 TERRY J. GRIDER
 JOHN R. GUENARD
 RAUDEL GUERRA
 ERAD T. GWILLIM
 JEREMY A. HAUGH
 JENNIFER M. HEALY
 THOMAS S. HONG
 LARRIS HUTTON
 STEWART HYDERKHAN
 MATTHEW W. JEPSON
 DURWARD JOHNSON
 JOSHUA W. JOHNSON
 ASHLEY A. JORLISSAINT
 JOSEPH E. JORGENSEN
 CAOILTE K. JOY
 TAKASHI KAGAWA
 BRIAN J. KARGUS
 SAMUEL K. KIM
 MICHAEL KORTE
 JOSHUA W. KRUPA
 CHRISTOPHER A. LACOUR
 BRETT A. LAMBORN
 MICHAEL H. LAMPHIER
 SANDRA N. LEEBER
 SHAUN B. LISTER
 MARK W. MALCOLM
 ROBERTO C. MARTENS
 DANIEL D. MAURER
 ALLISON D. MCFEATTERS
 JENNIFER A. MCKEEL
 MARCUS L. MISINEC
 JODEAN MORROW
 DUSTIN P. J. MURPHY
 ALAN J. NEF
 WILLIAM A. OBRINGER
 GREGORY T. OMALLEY
 MEGHAN OSULLIVAN
 BENJAMIN M. OWENSFILICE
 JOY L. PREMO
 ARMANDO RANCANO
 JESS R. RANKIN
 THEODORE B. REITTER
 JAMAL RHINEHARDT
 STEPHEN J. RUETTER
 ANDREW W. SCOTT
 BRETT C. SHEPARD
 JOSHUA J. SMITH
 NATHANIEL G. SMITH
 SHAHARA T. TIMBROOK
 VIRGINIA H. TINSLEY
 BRUCE TYLER
 KYLE C. VANDEWATER
 STEVEN VARGO
 CHRISTOPHER C. WAITE
 RYAN T. WARDLE
 JOSEPH H. WHEELER
 MELVIN L. WILLIAMS

JASON D. WRIGHT
 MATTHEW E. WRIGHT
 MARC W. ZELNICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY G. ABRELL
 SCOTT E. ADAMS
 ROBERT C. ALLISON, JR.
 JOHN C. ANDONIE
 RAMON M. ANGELOUCCI
 GARY P. APPEL
 NICHOLAS R. ARANDA
 BRUCE C. BALZANO
 THOMAS C. BARNETT, JR.
 MARTIN J. BASHAM
 JEFFREY K. BECKER
 MATTHEW J. BEDWELL
 MAUREEN E. BELLAMY
 JANEEN L. BIRCKHEAD
 ROBYN J. BLADDER
 RONALD L. BRAZELL II
 THERESA L. BROWN
 JONATHAN D. BUONAMICI
 JOHN E. BURICK
 TODD R. BURTON
 JAMES J. CARUOLO
 DAVID G. CHACON
 PAUL B. CHAUNCEY III
 KENNETH D. CHAVEZ
 PHILIP W. CLAYTON
 DENNIS S. CLEAVELAND
 CHRISTOPHER J. COLE
 SCOTTE. COLLINS
 MARGARET L. COMPTON
 DAVID M. COOLEY
 JEFFREY L. COPELAND
 ROBERT C. CROSETT
 HOLLIE A. CRISSY
 LISA CRUM
 DAVID M. DAHLE
 DARRELL W. DANIELS
 JONATHAN T. DAVENPORT
 MATTHEW L. DAVIS
 BARRY A. DEATON
 DARRELL W. DEMENT
 JOY L. DEW
 MICHAEL P. DIETZ
 AMANDA E. DIGRE
 MARTIN C. DINAN
 TONY D. DIVISH
 JONATHAN R. DOLS
 ROBERT A. DWAN, SR.
 ANITA R. EASLEY
 ROBERT D. EGERLY
 FRANK D. EMANUEL
 DAVID H. ESTES
 GREGORY L. ESTES
 MICHAEL V. ETCHEVERRY
 CURTIS W. FAULK
 RICHARD B. FENNELLS
 KYLE G. FERLEMANN
 JOHN W. FINDLEY
 MICHAEL S. FINER
 GEORGE L. FISHER
 THOMAS C. FISHER
 ADAM R. FLASCH
 CHRISTOPHER M. FLEMING
 DANIEL M. FRICKENSCHMIDT
 MARTIN S. FRIES
 MARK S. FRITZ
 DOUGLAS C. GAGNON
 ELIZABETH K. GAYTON
 FREDERICK P. GILSON
 NELL C. GLAD
 NORBERT L. GLADNICK, JR.
 MICHAEL J. GLISSON
 SETH M. GOLDBERG
 CHRISTOPHER M. GOLNICK
 ESTEBAN L. GONZALES
 SAMUEL W. GOULD
 DOUGLAS T. GRBERT
 RODNEY M. GRAHAM
 ANDREW L. GRANTHAM
 JON R. GREENHAW
 WARREN R. GRIFFIS
 STEVEN T. GRIGSBY
 FORREST M. GRIMES, JR.
 DAVID A. GUIDO
 JEFFREY J. HAFNER
 WILLIAM M. HALL
 JOHN P. HARDY
 TODD R. HARLESS
 TERRY B. HARPER
 GEORGE J. HARRINGTON
 CYRO D. HARRISON
 JOHN F. HARRISON
 JET M. HAYS
 ROBERT F. HEPNER, JR.
 BARBARA A. HERRINGTONCLEMENS
 STEVEN L. HIBLEY
 GARY M. HOFFMANN
 DEDRICK W. HOSKINS
 ANDREW F. HUTCHINSON
 ENIS A. JAMES
 ROGER L. JENNINGS, JR.
 DANIEL M. JOHNSON
 ANDREA J. JOHNSONHARVEY
 JOHN D. JOHNSON
 LYNDON C. JOHNSON
 ANGELA B. JONES
 DAVID V. JORDAN
 PETER D. JORDAN
 TROY D. JOSLIN

JOHN E. KAJANDER
 RAYMOND M. KENT
 THOMAS J. KILMARTIN
 CECIL W. KING
 DANIEL J. KNIGHT
 JOHN D. KOVAC
 GARY D. LADD
 GENE K. LAMBRECHT
 RICHARD J. LEBEL
 JOHN J. LEE
 DAVID A. LEGER
 DAVID C. LEONARD
 THOMAS R. LEONARD
 TODD W. LEWIS
 JAMES D. LORD
 SONJA M. LUCAS
 CLYDE A. LYNN III
 AMY S. LYONS
 MICHAEL A. LYONS
 MICHAEL D. LYTLE
 THOMAS M. MALEE II
 BARRY W. MANLEY
 TERRY L. MAST, JR.
 JUDY M. MAVROLEON
 SCOTT C. MAYLATH
 DANIEL C. MCCARROLL
 GARY L. MCGINNIS
 EDWARD M. MCINNIS
 LES A. MELNYK
 MICHAEL K. MESSICK
 STEVEN E. METZE
 MARK K. MIERA
 MILO W. MOODY
 RENE MORENO
 ALBERT C. MORRIS
 ROBERT E. MOSCARELLO
 MAX E. MOSS, JR.
 ERIC T. MULLAI
 RALPH R. MYERS, JR.
 MARTY R. NICHOLS
 LEE G. NORDIN
 DANIEL A. NORMAN
 NATALIE D. NORTHERN
 JEFFREY A. OLIVE
 KEVIN A. OLSON
 JOHN E. PARKER
 MICHAEL E. PATTERSON
 LISA A. PEAKE
 WILLIAM H. POPPLER
 DAVID C. POULTON
 ROGER A. PRESLEY, JR.
 RICKY C. PRESSNELL
 MIGUEL A. RAMOSNIEVES
 JASON J. RECKARD
 RAFAEL A. RIBAS
 MARK T. RICCARDI
 RYON A. RICHMOND
 TIMOTHY R. RICKERT
 TIMOTHY L. RIEGER
 GARY A. ROBINSON II
 ROBERT D. ROBINSON II
 JEFFREY L. RYAN
 MARK J. SCHINDLER
 RONALD J. SCHWICKERATH
 LAWRENCE P. SEABERG
 JAMES S. SELCHERT
 JOHN A. SEPRODI
 DAVID P. SHAFER
 DAVID R. SHAUL
 TODD C. SHEALY
 JAMES T. SHUTO
 JAMES B. SLAGOWSKI
 ELIZABETH B. SMART
 RONALD J. SPENCER
 DEAN T. SPENZOS
 CHRISTOPHER S. STANGER
 JEFFREY S. STEVENS
 JOHN A. STEVENS
 LORI A. STRODE
 ANTHONY K. SUTTER
 GERALD A. TAKASE
 WILLIAM H. TAYLOR
 STUART J. TOMASA
 KENNETH S. TOUSSAINT
 DANIEL L. TOWNSEND
 THEODORE F. TRACY
 TRYGVE B. TROSPER
 HERMAN P. VALENTINE
 VINCENT L. VANNOORBEECK
 LARRY B. VAUGHN
 KEVIN A. VEDDER
 ADAM C. VOLANT
 MICHELE R. VOORHEES
 DAVID L. WARD
 LOREN A. WEEKS
 JOHN M. WELLS
 ROBERT M. WHITE
 MICHAEL D. WICKMAN
 DAVID L. WILLIAMS
 MICHAEL W. WILLIAMS
 WARREN R. WINTRODE
 STEVEN F. WOLF
 ANDREW M. WOOD
 RUSSELL W. WOODLIEF
 JOHN J. WRANEK III
 RICHARD M. WRIGHT
 WILLIAM R. YOUNG
 JAMES A. ZOLLAR
 JOHN A. ZULFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RAFAEL E. ABREU
 LESLIE L. ACHTERBERG

THOMAS B. ADAMS
 DAVID F. ALBANESE
 RANDELL ALICEAORTIZ
 DERRIC H. ANDERSON
 JON T. ANDERSON
 TRAVIS J. ANGLIN
 TROY J. ANHALT
 MICHAEL T. ANSAY
 DANIEL E. ARZONICO
 EDGARDO AVILES
 LISA D. A. BACA
 MICHELLE M. BAILEY
 GREGORY L. BAISCH
 HARLAN E. BALLARD
 DANIEL J. BASIK
 MILLER L. BELMONT
 CURTIS A. BENNETT
 JAMES M. BERRY
 KARL J. BERSCHIED
 ANDREW P. BESSMER
 HERALD E. BIRCHFIELD, JR.
 BARRY N. BIRDWELL
 GARY A. BISSELL
 MICHAEL L. BLAND
 JON T. BLATT
 RICHARD J. BOEHNING
 GLENN A. BOGDANSKI
 JIMMY D. BOWIE
 MICHAEL W. BRANER
 STEPHEN J. BROADFOOT
 BUDDY B. BROOK
 MICHAEL E. BROWNE
 JAMES C. BULKOWSKI
 JOHN W. BUSTERUD
 CLARENCE D. BUTLER
 WINDSOR S. BUZZA
 KENNETH W. CARLSON
 ANGELO J. CARMELLO
 DONALD E. CARTER, JR.
 WILLIAM E. CARTER
 WALTER C. CARLETT
 SHAWN R. CHENEY
 WALTER J. CHWASTYK
 RICHARD E. CIOCHON
 ELIZABETH L. COFFMAN
 ROYELLE D. COMER
 GEORGE W. COOK, JR.
 TIMOTHY P. COON
 THOMAS M. COONEY
 MICHAEL D. CRADER
 GEORGE C. CRESSMAN, JR.
 KENNETH R. DASILVA
 GLENN M. DAVIS
 STEVEN A. DAVIS
 DONALD L. DEAS
 STEVEN J. DEBRUIN
 GENE J. DELBIANCO
 STEVEN E. DEVORE
 TERRY L. DEWITT
 BRIAN T. DIEFFENBACHER
 GEORGE K. DIXON
 RONALD D. DIZ
 ROY J. DOWNEY
 JOHN M. DRESKA
 TIMOTHY D. DYE
 JOSEPH F. DZIEZYNSKI
 MATTHEW P. EASLEY
 VALERIE D. ECHOLS
 HOWARD W. ECKSTEIN
 ANNE D. EDGECOMB
 JOSEPH A. EDWARDS II
 GREGORY T. ELPERS
 JOHN T. FARNSWORTH
 RICHARD A. FAULKNER, JR.
 MICHAEL A. FITZGERALD
 KENNETH W. FORMELLA
 LOVOYD L. FOUNTAIN
 MITCHELL H. FRIDLEY
 SAMUEL A. FRYER
 JAMES W. FULKS
 GERALD J. GAFFORD
 DANIEL A. GAJEWSKI
 WILLIAM H. GALBREATH
 THOMAS M. GANTT
 THOMAS C. GEORGES
 DARRIN A. GERMAN
 SCOTT A. GIACOBBI
 TONI A. GLOVER
 SCOTT J. GORDON
 PETER GORKY
 SUZANNE M. GOULETTE
 ELIZABETH L. GROSSI
 MICHAEL W. GROSZ
 ROBERT A. GRUMBERG
 MICHELE M. HABERLACH
 TYRA A. HARDING
 JEROME R. HEATH
 RALPH D. HENNING
 JON A. HEWITT
 ROBERT HILDEBRANDT
 JOHN A. HILL
 EDWARD HRICZOV, JR.
 TEDDY R. HUGHART
 RONALD S. HUNTER
 GARTHA INGRAM III
 LAWRENCE M. IWANSKI
 BRYDON D. JACKSON
 JAY S. JACKSON
 MATTHEW A. JENKINS
 SHAWN M. JIRIK
 GARRETT P. JOHNSON
 KIT D. JONES
 REX W. JONES
 WOLFGANG E. JUNGE
 TIMOTHY W. KELLEY
 PHILIP B. KEYES
 GOTTFRIED H. KOBLITZ

STANLEY J. KORYTA, JR.
 FRANK A. KUCZYNSKI
 KELLY E. KYBURZ
 STEVE J. LANCASTER
 RUBY R. LARDENT
 RICHARD E. LAUBER
 KENNETH J. LAVOY
 TODD M. LAZAROSKI
 SCOTT R. LEATHERMAN
 PETER H. LEE
 BRUCE R. LEMOINE
 BETHANY I. LENDERMAN
 EVAN K. LITTMAN
 WILLIAM S. LONGINO
 JOHN C. LOOMIS
 DOUGLAS A. LUEHE
 MARK J. MAIER
 GAYNA C. MALCOLMPACKNETT
 RODNEY C. MANOR
 PABLO MANZO
 DANIEL J. MAROUN
 DANIEL F. V. MCCARTHY
 JULIANA K. MCCAUSLIN
 REX E. MCCULLOUGH
 JAMES A. MCDONALD
 FRANCESCA M. MCFADDEN
 MOLLY S. MCGLAUGHLIN
 ERIC J. MCGRAW
 KEVIN W. MCKELVY
 JEFFERY W. MCKONE
 WILLIAM J. MCLEEN
 WILLIAM H. MILLARD
 CAROL S. MOMOHARA
 THOMAS O. MONAHAN
 JOHN C. MOORE, JR.
 DION B. MOTEN
 DAVID C. MUNDFROM
 KARL E. NELL
 GARY L. NICHOL
 MILFORD C. NICHOLS
 LUIS F. NIEVES
 MICHAEL D. NYENHUIS
 MICHAEL A. OHEARN
 CLARE P. OKEEFFE
 MICHAEL G. OLIVERI
 TERI L. OMAN
 ANDREW PARKER
 MICHAEL D. PARRISH
 RICHARD A. PEMBER
 ELDON D. PENCE III
 GEORGE C. PENROD
 JOHN H. PHILLIPS
 JOHN S. PHILLIPS
 LAURENCE K. PIKE
 JAMES O. POSEY, JR.
 JONATHAN M. PULEO
 RONALD QUIETT
 PETER J. RAYNA
 GEORGE W. REAGAN
 ANNA L. REGO
 DAVID A. ROSCOE
 RONALD A. SALAS
 DAVID W. SCHEIDLER
 KARL R. SCHELLY
 MARTIN C. SCHULZ
 WILLIAM P. SCHWAB
 KIMBERLY G. SELL
 CHARLES S. SENTELL III
 MITCHELL R. SHAFPER
 DARYL N. SHRYOCK
 JOHN W. SIMMA, JR.
 DOUGLAS S. SMITH
 JAMES E. SMITH
 GEOFFREY M. SMYTH
 SUSAN M. SOISSON
 JOHN C. SPEAR
 GREGORY W. SPEARS
 ROBERT W. SPINELLI
 JOHN E. STEFULA
 DONALD P. STEWART
 KEITH F. STUBBS
 PETER T. SULLIVAN
 BRIAN TACKETT
 AMY M. TAITANO
 AMY L. TALBERT
 CARL D. TAYLOR
 JEANETTE L. THOMPSON
 DAVID G. TORGERSEN
 ANDREW J. TROSKE
 LAWRENCE L. TUBBS
 DARRYL L. UNDERWOOD
 ALOK K. UPADHYAYA
 PETER A. VANDERLAND, JR.
 ALEXANDER J. VERRER, JR.
 EDWARD D. WAGNER
 HOWARD G. WENGER
 RICHARD P. WHITAKER
 ROBERT M. WILKINSON
 JOHN D. WILLIAMSON
 CHRISTOPHER J. WILSON
 GARY W. WINCH, JR.
 TERESA B. WOLFGANG
 MICHAEL J. WORTH
 HARRY G. YOUNGER
 JAMIE D. ZUCKER
 R010075

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DARREN M. GALLAGHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DUSTY C. EDWARDS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JACKIE W. MORGAN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DANA R. FIKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SAMUEL W. SPENCER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LARRY MIYAMOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SAL L. LEBLANC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MAURO MORALES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

GEORGE L. ROBERTS

PAUL A. SHIRLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD D. KOHLER

GARY J. SPINELLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JAMES B. THOMPSON

JASON A. WOODWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ERIC T. CLINE

ROBERT S. SCHMIDT, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSE L. SADA

BRIAN J. SPOONER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

FREDERICK L. HUNT

PARIMA IN

CHAD E. TIDWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

TODD E. LOTSPEICH

DAVID L. OGDEN, JR.

DONALD E. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JASON B. DAVIS

JOHN DIGIOVANNI

JOHN F. REYNOLDS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

TRAVIS M. FULTON

MARK L. HOBIN

GARY S. LIDDELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRYAN DELGADO

MARK R. DOEHRMANN

KELLY M. JONES

RODOLFO D. QUISEP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID B. BLANN

KEVIN J. GOODWIN

WILLIAM W. INNS III

ALLEN L. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MICHAEL GASPERINI

THESOLINA D. HUBERT

ERIC S. KIRCHNER

DAVID P. KRAKLOW

TIMOTHY W. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

STEPHEN R. BYRNES

LUKE A. CROUSON

CRAIG A. ELLIOTT

JASON C. FLORES

MICHAEL J. MALONE

JAMES N. TIMMER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

PETER K. BASABE, JR.

JAMES R. BURNS, JR.

KENNETH E. CUPP

KURT D. GARRIOTT

BRIAN KOVAL

SEAN M. MELANPHY

MICHAEL A. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL A. BROWN

DAVID W. EDSON

STEVEN G. GODINHO

DERRICK R. HEYL

BART L. PESTER

FRANCIS P. PICCOLI

MICHAEL E. SAMPLES, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER C. ABRAMS

GEOFFREY M. ANTHONY

STEPHEN F. ARMES

JOHN B. ATKINSON

STEPHEN C. AUGUSTIN

FAUL D. BAKER

SCOTT A. BALDWIN

JOHN M. BARNETT

TIMOTHY E. BARRICK

WILLIAM C. BERRIS

CHAD A. BLAIR

BRET A. BOLDING

ROBERT J. BRAATZ

DAVID P. BRANEY

RONALD C. BRANEY

ROLIN D. BREWSTER III

VICTOR J. BUNCH

RUSSELL C. BURTON

MICHAEL J. CALLANAN

JENNIFER E. CARTER

MELVIN G. CARTER

IAN R. CLARK

WILLIAM P. CLARK

JAIME O. COLLAZO

SAMUEL C. COOK

ROBERT D. COOPER

PAUL D. CUCINOTTA

DREW E. CUKOR

MATTHEW C. CULBERTSON

ROMIN DASMALCHI

CHARLES M. DUNNE

THOMAS C. EULER III

THOMAS M. FAHY, JR.

TODD W. FERRY

CHRISTOPHER A. FEYEDELEM

JAMES W. FREY

ROBERT C. FULLFORD

JAMES R. FULLWOOD, JR.

PETER S. GADD

DOUGLAS V. GLASGOW

DAVID P. GRANT

DANIEL Q. GREENWOOD

JAMES F. HARP

CLARENCE T. HARPER III

MARK D. HOROWITZ

LAWRENCE E. HUGGINS, JR.

PETER D. HUNTLEY

JAN M. JANUARY

JEFFREY L. JAROSZ

DAVID E. JONES

SEKOU S. KAREGA

DANIEL R. KAZMIER

PATRICK J. KEANE III

JEFFREY J. KENNEY

SCOTT S. LACY

FRANK N. LATT

WENDELL B. LEIMBACH, JR.

JOSEPH P. LEVREAUULT

JOSEPH A. LORE

LORNA M. MAHLOCK

GEORGE G. MALKASIAN

THOMAS G. MCCANN II

WILLIAM P. MCCLANE

DONALD B. MCDANIEL

JOHN E. MCDONOUGH

ELDON E. METZGER

MICHAEL J. MOONEY

JASON L. MORRIS

PAUL J. NUGENT

DAVID S. OWEN

PATRICK R. OWENS

LOUIS J. PALAZZO

CHRISTOPHER D. PATTON

THOMAS A. PECINA

SCOTT W. PIERCE

ROBERT J. PLEVELL

MARVIN REED

BRENDAN REILLY

GEORGE B. ROWELL IV

JOSEPH J. RUSSO

JOHN M. SCHAAR

FREDERICK G. SCHENK

WILLIAM H. SWAN

MICHAEL J. TARGOS III

TODD S. TOMKO

CASEY C. TRAVERS

HENRY E. VANDERBORGH

WILLIAM H. VIVIAN

GAINES L. WARD

MICHAEL R. WATERMAN

PAUL R. WEAVER

JAMES B. WELLONS

STEVEN M. WOLF

CRAIG R. WONSON

KEVIN S. WOODARD

MICHAEL P. WYLIE

DANIEL L. YAROSLASKI

JOSEPH J. ZARBA, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT

TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JESSICA L. ACOSTA

BRIAN S. ALBON

MICHAEL F. ARNONE

ERIC M. ASCHENBRENNER

RICHARD B. ASHFORD

SHERIF A. AZIZ

MICHAEL J. BABILOT

MATTHEW A. BALDWIN

DAX C. BATTAGLIA

GINGER E. BEALIS

BRADLEY P. BEAN

JAMES M. BECHTEL

DAVID A. BECKER

ERIC M. BECKMANN

EDWARD Y. BLAKISTON

DAVID A. BOGLE

JONATHAN A. BOSSIE

KEVIN H. BRIGHT

CHRISTIAN J. BROADSTON

KAREN B. BROCKMEIER

BRANDON C. BROOKS

JEFFREY T. BROOKS

MICHAEL L. BROOKS

JOSEPH D. BROOME

MAURICE A. BROWN

DESMOND F. BROWNE, JR.

CHRISTOPHER A. BROWNING

SAMUEL G. BRYCE

BENEDICT G. BUERKE

ASHLEY K. BURCH

DOUGLAS R. BURKE, JR.

GREGORY K. BUTCHER

TAMARA L. CAMPBELL

TROY H. CAMPBELL

CHRISTOPHER K. CANNON
 EDWARD M. CARICATO, JR.
 FOSTER T. CARLILE
 BRADFORD R. CARR
 ROBERT E. CATO II
 JOSHUA B. CHARTIER
 JOHN R. CHERRY
 DARREL L. CHOAT
 ANDREW CHRISTIAN
 LEE K. CLARE
 CHRISTOPHER J. COLLINS
 JAMES A. COOPER
 LEE K. COOPER
 MARK E. COVER
 ROBERTO CUEVAS
 GREGORY R. CURTIS
 ROBERT B. DAVIS
 TIMOTHY A. DAVIS
 JOSE M. DELEON, JR.
 ANDREW M. DELGAUDIO
 BRIAN P. DENNIS
 SAMUEL N. DEPUTY
 KEVIN B. DEWITT
 PATRIZIA M. DIENHARTSTABILE
 JEFFREY S. DINSMORE
 JOHN F. DOBRYDNEY
 KEVIN M. DOHERTY
 HENRY DOLBERRY, JR.
 LINA M. DOWNING
 CHARLES E. DUDIK
 DAVID D. FAIRLEIGH
 JENNIFER M. FARINA
 RORY M. FEELY
 WILLIAM B. FENWICK
 FRANK E. FILLER
 RYAN M. FINN
 MARY K. FLATLEY
 DUANE C. FORSBERG
 JOHN M. FRASER
 JASON A. GADY
 ROBERT B. GARISON
 WILLIAM J. GIBBONS
 CARL D. GIDEON
 BRIAN J. GILBERTSON
 MAXX GODSEY
 MATTHEW J. GORBATY
 BRANDON W. GRAHAM
 MICHAEL A. GRAZIANI
 CHRISTOPHER D. HAFFER
 DENNIS L. HAGER II
 JASON M. HAMILTON
 AMEDEI I. HANSON
 DANE HANSON
 GREGORY A. HANWECK
 DAVID J. HART
 CRAIG L. HARVEY
 BRYAN C. HATFIELD
 TREVOR A. HEIDENREICH
 MONROE A. HENDERSON
 PHILIP R. HERSCHELMAN
 JASON W. HEUER
 BRENT E. HEYL
 JIMMY S. HICKS
 BRADLEY D. HITCHCOCK
 SEAN P. HOEWING
 MARK D. HOWARD
 HENRY E. HURT III
 DAVID C. HYMAN
 TIMOTHY W. IRWIN
 JOHN J. JAESKI
 CHARLES D. JENNINGS
 FERNANDO V. JIMENEZ
 GRANT M. JOHNSON
 JASON JOHNSON
 KIMBERLY A. JOHNSON
 PAUL K. JOHNSON III
 GREGORY L. JONES
 KEMPER A. JONES
 DAVID C. JOSEFORSKY
 GREGORY K. JOSEPH
 JAY J. KAJS
 ANDREW M. KELLEY
 MARK A. KIEHLE
 JOHN P. KIRBY
 JONATHAN D. KNOTT'S
 NOAH J. KOMNICK
 PAUL B. KOPACZ
 SPEROS C. KOUMPARAKIS
 PETER J. LANG II
 LANCE J. LANGFELDT
 JEFFREY J. LARSON
 GOTTFRIED H. LAUBE, JR.
 ISAAC G. LEE
 SAMUEL K. LEE
 ADAM V. LEFRINGHOUSE
 LEONARD J. LEVINE
 CARL A. LEWANDOWSKI
 JON B. LIVINGSTON
 ROBERT J. LIVINGSTON, JR.
 DAVID S. LOWERY
 JOHN P. MAHER
 MICHAEL J. MANIFOR
 RHONDA C. MARTIN
 DAVID M. MARTINEZ
 IRVIN MARTINEZ
 JAMES K. MCBRIDE
 JOHN S. MCCALMONT
 MATTHEW N. MCCONNELL
 JEFFREY S. MCCORMACK
 FREDERICK J. MCELMAN
 AMY M. MCGRATH
 JAMES R. MCGRATH
 GREGORY A. MCGUIRE
 ELVINO M. MENDONCA, JR.
 JASON B. MITCHELL
 JAMES D. MULLIN
 BRIAN T. MULVIHILL

PETER J. MUNSON
 GERALD E. MURPHY
 CHRISTOPHER M. MURRAY
 KATHRYN M. NAVIN
 ANDREW J. NELSON
 LAWRENCE D. NICHOLS
 EDWIN NORRIS
 CHARLES M. NUNALLY III
 NICHOLAS C. NUZZO
 DEREK S. OST
 ANDREW M. OTERO
 MICHAEL C. PALMER
 VASILIOS E. PAPPAS
 ANDREW J. PETRUCCI
 STEPHANIE M. POLESNAK
 CASEY J. POLKINGHORNE
 JAMES P. POPPY
 MONTE S. POWELL
 EDWARD W. POWERS
 CARL C. PRIECHENFRIED
 CHRISTOPHER D. PRITCHETT
 RONALD J. REGA, JR.
 JACOB L. REYNOLDS
 PATRICK J. REYNOLDS, JR.
 JAMES E. RICHARDSON, JR.
 DUANE T. RIVERA
 CHRISTOPHER D. ROBERSON
 NATHANIEL K. ROBINSON
 GREGORY S. ROOKER
 COLLEEN J. SABAT
 MARK D. SADOWSKY
 ANDRE P. SALVANERA
 AARON C. SAMSSEL
 BRIAN K. SANCHEZ
 KURT M. SANGER, JR.
 TODD R. SCHIRO
 KARL T. SCHMIDT
 TIMOTHY W. SCHNELLE
 WILLIAM J. SCHRANTZ
 ANTONIO SCOFFIELD
 ROBERTO C. SCOTT
 GEORGE J. SEEGEL
 MARISA P. SERANO
 JACK A. SILE
 DAVID B. SLAY
 TIMOTHY M. SLINGER
 LISA M. SOUDERS
 DAVID W. SPANGLER
 ROBERT A. STEELE
 DAVID R. STENGRIM
 JONATHAN M. STOPKA
 ERIC A. STRONG
 JOSEPH C. TAMMINEN
 BRIAN R. TAYLOR
 THOMAS N. TAYLOR
 ROGER N. THOMAS
 ROBERT A. TOMLINSON
 RENE TORRES
 JONATHAN E. TOWLE
 RENE TREVINO
 RANDALL G. TURNER
 JOSHUA B. TUTTLE
 QUENTIN R. VAUGHN
 ROMAN P. VITKOVITSKY
 JARED C. VONEIDA
 MATTHEW L. WALKER
 MELVILLE J. WALTERS IV
 MICHAEL P. WARD
 LARRY R. WARFIELD II
 THOMAS M. WARREN
 ALTON A. WARTHEN
 LISA M. WEBB
 MICHAEL E. WEBB
 PATRICK WEINERT
 JAMES W. WEIRICK
 JODY E. WHITE
 JOHNNY J. WIDENER
 ANDRE L. WILLIAMS
 HILARY H. WILLIAMS
 WADE L. WORKMAN
 MATTHEW S. YOUNGBLOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MA-
 RINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RICO ACOSTA
 MICAH L. ADKISON
 KYLE J. ANDREWS
 MATTHEW A. ANKER
 PETER E. ANKNEY
 ANDREW R. APEPZ
 ROBIN J. ARANT
 RICHARD M. ARBOGAST
 JAMES G. ARGENTINA, JR.
 KELLY R. ATTWOOD
 MICHAEL J. AUBRY
 DOUGLAS F. BAHRNS
 LUCAS A. BAIKE
 DAVID S. BARBER
 BRANDON W. BARNETT
 NEWEL R. BARTLETT
 MATTHEW J. BAUMANN
 GARY R. BECHTOLD
 JOSEPH C. BECLEY
 BRIDGET N. BEMIS
 CASEY BENEFIELD
 STEVEN G. BERCH
 PAUL R. BERTOLONE
 DAVID C. BJERKE
 JUSTIN L. BLACKMON
 CASEY R. BLASINGAME
 MATTHEW D. BOHMAN
 WYATT J. BORSHEIM
 STEVEN M. BOST
 OWEN M. BOYCE
 JONATHAN H. BRANDT
 AMANDA M. BRANNON
 MATTHEW D. BRONSON
 STEVEN R. BROUSSARD
 JASON P. BROWN
 ANDREW M. BUDENZ
 SCOTT S. BUERSTATTE
 JOSEPH T. BUFFAMANTE
 AARON D. BURCIAGA
 KIMBERLY R. BYRD
 JOHN A. CACIOPPA
 JEFFREY J. CAHILL
 MOLLY S. CAHILL
 BRENT J. CANTRELL
 JAMES W. CARLSON
 JUSTIN E. CARLSON
 ERIC A. CATTO
 RYAN M. CAULDER
 ARTHUR CHAPMAN III
 JOSEPH E. CLEMMY, JR.
 MATTHEW P. COOK
 BRANDON A. CORDILL
 TRAVIS J. COVEY
 ERIC P. CRECELIUS
 JOSEPH C. DADIOMOFF
 ANDREW D. DAMBROGI
 BRAD A. DANKS
 RAMIRO DEANDA, JR.
 ANTHONY C. DELLIACOSTA III
 THOMAS J. DENEVAN
 ANDREW P. DIMITRUK
 NATHAN P. DMOCHOWSKI
 THOMAS R. DOLAN
 CASEY C. DORAN
 BRYAN A. DUDLEY
 IAN J. DUNCAN
 WESLEY J. EARHART
 BARRY L. EDWARDS
 DUSTIN B. ELLIOTT
 JASON M. ELLIS
 PATRICK J. FAHEY
 JOSEPH I. FARINA
 STEPHEN R. FELTS
 TIMOTHY J. FENTON
 JOHN L. FERRITER
 DEREK A. FILIPE
 CAMERON A. FITZSIMMONS
 DANIEL L. FLATLEY
 RAYMOND A. FORBES
 ROBERT A. FOLKES
 MAX D. FRANK
 RYAN J. FRANZEN
 JAMES R. FRIEDLEIN
 ANTHONY L. FRIE
 PETER K. FUKUSHIMA
 DONALD L. GALLOWAY
 CLAYTON D. GARD III
 JEFFREY A. GARZA
 LYLE L. GILBERT
 MARC H. GINEZ
 DANIEL E. GOOD
 EVAN R. GORDON
 NATHANIEL D. GREEN
 JOSHUA A. GREGORY
 MATTHEW E. GREY
 WILLIAM H. GRIMBALL
 GIDEON F. GRISSITT
 JEREMY H. GROBSEMA
 MATTHEW S. GUNESCH
 JOHN D. HAFEMANN
 RHETT A. HANSEN
 JOHN P. HARLEY
 EDWARD B. HART
 TYLER J. HART
 KIRBY C. HARWELL
 JEREMY C. HAWKINS
 JASON F. HAYES
 JEREMY L. HENDERSON
 JOSE R. HERNANDEZ
 ROBERT J. HILLERY
 ALDEN E. HOLLIG III
 BRIAN E. HOLLIER
 JOHN A. HOOKS, JR.
 JOSEPH L. HORNACKY
 DOUGLAS H. HOWARD
 ETHAN M. HOWELL
 MICHAEL S. HRITZ
 JASON A. HVIZDAK
 LEIGH G. IRWIN
 MARVIN L. JACKSON
 KIRK A. JOHNSON
 CHARLES R. JOHNSTON
 MICHAEL L. JONES
 SEAN D. JONES
 CHRISTOPHER M. KAPRIELIAN
 ANDRE A. KARPOWICH
 KEVIN M. KEENE
 ERIC A. KEIM
 TRAVIS B. KEMPF
 JUSTIN O. KENNEDY
 SUNG G. KIM
 RYAN T. KING
 MICHAEL T. KINGEN
 PATRICK E. KINSER
 ADAM W. KINTOP
 BRETT J. KNICKERBOCKER
 ZACHARY M. KNIGHT
 TOPHER S. KOREIN
 ROMAN Y. KOSKIN
 CHIP D. KOSKINEMI
 KEVIN H. KOYAMA
 MICHAEL P. KUSNERAK
 MARK A. LAQUILON
 PATRICK V. LAVOIE
 BENJAMIN D. LAWLESS
 JARED W. LEDBETTER
 BOBBY W. LEE, JR.

DOUGLAS G. LEE
 TIMOTHY J. LEONARD
 GARY A. LINGEN
 GARRETT G. LITFIN
 THOMAS R. MACKESY
 ROGELIO MAESE
 MATTHEW J. MAHONEY
 JASON J. MARAFFI
 DANIEL C. MARTIN
 QUINCI D. MARTIN
 TRISTAN G. MARTINEZ
 JESSICA G. MARTZ
 ROHIT Y. MASIH
 SETH W. MCCOLLOUGH
 MICHAEL J. MCDONALD
 BLAISE T. MCFADDEN
 SCOTT J. MCGUIGAN
 GREGORY S. MCSWEEN
 MATTHEW T. MELLOTT
 MELINA MESTA
 JOHN R. MILLSAP
 DIEGO A. MIRANDA
 JOSEPH F. MONAHAN
 PETER S. MOON
 JASON C. MOORE
 NATHAN M. MOORE
 SAMUEL C. MOORE
 MATTHEW S. MORENO
 JASON L. MORRIS
 BRET W. MORRIS
 CHRISTOPHER J. MYETTE
 JAMES R. NEAGLE
 CHRISTOPHER M. NELSON
 DENNIS R. NICHOLS
 JOSHUA N. NUNN
 STEVEN D. NYLAND
 BRANDON J. OATES
 DANA R. OGLE
 DOUGLAS R. ORR
 BYRON J. OWEN
 JUSTIN D. OWENS
 ROBERT E. PATMORE
 JEFFREY J. PATTERSON II
 NICHOLAS R. PERGAR
 MICHELLE L. PETERS
 JONATHAN L. PETERSON
 TROY M. PETERSON
 JONATHAN J. PFUNTNER
 MICHAEL A. FIGFORD
 CHRISTOPHER F. POLIDORA
 LOTTIE A. PORTELLI
 JASON W. POTTER
 MICHAEL J. PRUDEN
 MICHAEL A. REEL
 KELLY J. REPAIR
 LAWRENCE G. RIBBLE, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER R. RICHARDELLA
 CATHERINE E. RICHARDSON
 JAMES A. RICHARDSON
 ANDREW S. ROBERSON
 PHILLIP G. ROBERTS, JR.
 JOSHUA J. ROBINSON
 ERIC R. RODRIGUEZ
 ROBERT A. ROGERS
 DOUGLAS M. ROSENSTOCK
 PETER B. ROTTKAMP

GIANOULIS ROUSSOS
 DUSTIN R. ROWLAND
 GREGG SAFINSKI
 DANIEL M. SCHIERLING
 KARL W. SCHLEGEL
 SCOTT M. SCHMITZ
 AARON P. SCHNETZLER
 RYAN D. SCHRAMEL
 DANIEL H. SCHWARTZ
 GREGORY R. SCOTT
 MATTHEW A. SEAVITTE
 DAVID C. SEGRAVES
 MORRIS M. SHARBER, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER R. SHERWOOD
 NATHAN B. SHIVELY
 DOUGLAS B. SHORES
 CURTIS I. SHREVE
 ROBERT E. SHUFORD
 MICHAEL J. SHULL
 CHRISTOPHER M. SIEKMAN
 MICHAEL D. SIMON
 JENNIFER A. SIMPSON
 DANIEL M. SINGER
 COREY J. SMITH
 JAMES N. SNYDER
 GREGORY S. SORELLE
 MICHAEL J. SOUZA
 REBECCA G. SPAHR
 ROBERT E. SPALLA
 RICHARD B. STANDARD
 JEFFERY L. STARR
 ROLLIN A. STEELE
 JEFF M. STEINKAMP
 CHRISTOPHER A. STEPHENSON
 JILL L. STEPHENSON
 THOMAS J. STONA
 JOSHUA T. SUMMERS
 BRETT R. SWAIM
 MARK C. SYKES
 PAULA D. TAIBI
 RYAN E. THOMPSON
 KURT R. THORMAHLEN
 MARC R. TILNEY
 RALPH B. TOMPKINS
 JOHN W. TORRESALA
 CHRISTOPHER A. TRENT
 JULIAN M. TSUKANO
 JUAN O. TURNER
 DAVID W. VANDYNE
 MICHAEL J. VANWYK
 SABRINA M. VILLARREAL
 MICHAEL E. VINCENT
 SAMUEL F. WATTS
 MICHAEL A. WEATHERS
 MATTHEW J. WEAVER
 JUSTIN M. WELAN
 NATHAN E. WERVE
 ROBERT A. WILHELMSEN
 ERIC M. WILLIAMS
 SEAN M. WILLIAMS
 GREGORY A. WILSON
 SCOTT A. WILSON
 WILLIAM C. WOODWARD, JR.
 JUSTIN M. WORTENDYKE
 GREGORY J. YOUNGBERG
 JOHN A. ZAAL

ESTEBAN ZAMORA
 ANDREW J. ZETTS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

HARRY E. HAYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

SHEMEYA L. GRANT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

CHRISTOPHER J. KANE

To be lieutenant commander

LUKE C. SUBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

JEANINE F. BENJAMIN
 TIMOTHY S. BREWER
 JUSTIN M. BUMMARA
 LLOYD R. EDWARDS
 BRIAN J. EHRHARDT
 PAUL K. EVANS
 BALTAZAR FERNANDEZ III
 ALEXANDER J. FRANZ
 DAEHYUN J. GILLESPIE
 NICHOLAS E. GURLEY
 FREDERICK G. HETTLING
 NICHOLAS G. HOFFMAN
 MICHAEL JACKSON
 DEREK C. JASKOWIAK
 JADA E. JOHNSON
 RYAN D. JOHNSON
 DAVID W. KING
 LUCIAN D. KINS
 DONALD E. LEE II
 GREGORY E. LEVEQUE
 TYLER B. MCDONALD
 ERNEST L. MILLER III
 JOHNNY L. MINCEY
 DANIEL C. PATRICK
 ANDREW D. PYLE
 JOSEPH R. SHERMAN
 MARK D. STANLEY
 JAMIE E. VANDYKE
 BENJAMIN F. VISGER