

He said to us: "During the massacre, the Turkish government took away my innocent father and my older brother and they never returned home. They were murdered by the Turkish government. My younger brother died of cold and hunger and there was no one around to bury him. My second oldest sister was married to a Turkish man by force and she died of hunger and cold as well. All of our belongings: home, money, jewelry, clothing and our historic homeland, were taken away by the Turks."

My husband was an eyewitness to the massacre. He was exposed to a terrible tragedy. It changed his entire life. He saw bodies buried below the ground with their heads exposed to the sun. He saw men, women, and children lying on the ground dead.

The surviving members of my husband's family, his mother and two older sisters, ended up in a refugee camp. His mother worked hard for several years just so they could stay alive. She was a beautiful woman, and had offers to marry several Turkish and Armenian men, but refused to remarry. In the 1920s they were fortunate to emigrate to Israel, and then to the United States in the 1960s.

My husband experienced a great deal of sadness, tragedy, depression, and loneliness. He always loved his family and this country with all his heart. He acknowledged all the Presidents of the U.S. by hanging their pictures on the wall of our home. To him, these men stood for freedom. The freedom this Country gave him allowed him to live like a human being, and express his thoughts. It gave him the courage to speak freely and never be silent again about his beloved families.

As you know, the "Aloha state" proclamation makes Hawaii the 42nd state to recognize the Armenian Genocide. Countries around the world such as Switzerland, France, Canada, Italy, Sweden, Russia and others, have passed a resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide and proclaim a Day of Remembrance every year on April 24.

The U.S. government should have the willingness to join with countries around the world, and formally acknowledge and commemorate the Armenian genocide each and every year on April 24. If it is not taught in our school and if we ignore the history then we are destined to repeat the mistakes of the past.

Thank you for supporting the remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.

Sincerely,
Mary.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CLEAN UP ACT

HON. JOHN P. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2011

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Correction of Longstanding Errors in Agencies Unsustainable Procurements (CLEAN UP) Act. This legislation will reform the badly flawed competitive sourcing process—saving taxpayer dollars and reinvestigating our civil service.

Especially in our current era of budget deficits, efficient government is paramount. Over the last decade, we have been much too quick to outsource many of government's most basic functions to the private sector. The desire to

do so reflected a political ideology of shrinking the government workforce—even if it meant diminishing the quality or increasing the cost of government services that are overwhelmingly supported by American taxpayers. This course of action negatively impacted everything from national defense and border security to the collection of taxes and the stewardship of our public lands. In many cases, work was outsourced with little or no competition—subverting the public interest and wasting billions in taxpayer dollars.

This bill is not about punishing the contractor community or criticizing the work that they do. The vast majority of these firms want to do the right thing and have performed many important functions on behalf of the government. However, there is some government work that is not appropriately awarded to the lowest bidder. Often this work is about providing a service as a matter of policy without regard to profit. The process by which we make decisions to hire government workers or to contract with the private sector for certain functions must reflect a mature understanding of the real differences between the mission of government and that of business.

More recently, Congress has begun to rein in administrative procurement policy by requiring more robust competition in contracting and ensuring that the core functions of government are performed by government employees. The CLEAN UP Act seeks to reverse the damage that has already been done by requiring agencies to develop plans to bring inherently governmental work back in-house and ensuring that future procurement decisions are made based on the best interest of the government and the taxpayer.

The CLEAN UP Act will make the contracting process fair to Federal employees and accountable to taxpayers.

Congress has heard from Federal workers and advocates in and out of government and their conclusions are the same—the current system is broken. We must develop a clear, government-wide standard for what work should or must be performed by government workers and put in place a fair process for competing all other work.

That is why I have introduced the CLEAN UP Act.

The CLEAN UP Act will:

Impose a uniform, government-wide standard for government work, distinguishing between the functions which must be done by our civil servants and those functions that may be done competently by the private sector;

Incrementally bring work that should be performed by Federal employees back in-house;

Encourage agencies to consider assigning new work to Federal employees if they would be more efficient rather than pursuing a policy of contracting-out, frequently through sole-source or limited competition contracts;

Require agencies to determine where there are or will be shortages of Federal employees and develop plans to address these shortages;

Maintain the existing suspension of the use of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76 process until OMB determines that the reforms required by this legislation have been implemented;

Direct Agencies to implement an alternative to the A-76 process in order to continually im-

prove and streamline services—developing a more efficient process without the costs and controversies of the A-76 process.

We have some of the best and brightest in our civil service; public servants with a deep and abiding love for this country. They have important missions—to make the next scientific breakthrough; to protect our nation from foreign threats; to keep our communities safe from crime or disaster; to maintain our critical infrastructure. By enacting the CLEAN UP Act, we have an opportunity to support our Federal workforce, save taxpayer dollars, restore good government, and reduce waste, fraud, and abuse.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CAREER AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF GERARD TULLY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 13, 2011

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to seek Congressional recognition of the exceptional achievements and outstanding career of Gerard Tully. On May 25th, 2011, Mr. Tully will be recognized by the President, Chairman of the Board, and Board of Directors of the Flushing Savings Bank for his 44 years of tireless and dedicated service to the Bank and the Flushing Community.

After graduating from Hofstra College in 1950, Mr. Tully set to work in the construction industry, working for numerous businesses and creating countless jobs in the Queens and Long Island communities. In 1967, he joined the Flushing Savings Bank as a trustee. From 1981 through 1989, he served as the chief executive officer, and from 1980 until 2011, he was chairman of the board. His retirement as chairman on February 15th marks the end of an era for the Flushing bank. His decades of experience and wealth of knowledge have made him an invaluable asset for the bank and the customers it serves. Moving forward, he will continue his distinguished service as a member of the board.

Mr. Tully's success was not just confined to the realm of the business. For decades, he has been an active participant in a diverse group of community organizations. His support of Catholic Charities and the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation deserves special recognition. Mr. Tully's active participation and skilled leadership in a variety of charitable endeavors has changed countless lives for the better. Mr. Tully's legacy of selfless devotion to community service is something in which his wife, Frances, and their 17 grandchildren and five great grandchildren can take great pride.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to count Mr. Tully among my constituents in the 5th Congressional District of New York. He has stepped down as the Chairman of the Board of the Flushing Savings Bank after having contributed immeasurably his community. I am proud to recognize Mr. Tully and I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for a lifetime of selfless dedication to the community.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 754) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes:

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chair, today I want to highlight a critical issue facing the Intelligence Community: increasing reliance on contractors.

A 2010 Washington Post story reported that 30 percent of the workforce in our intelligence agencies is contractors. Furthermore, the Post estimated that out of 854,000 people with top-secret clearances, 265,000 are contractors. I encourage my colleagues to read this eye opening article.

These startling facts cause me great concern—we've learned the hard way time and time again what happens when we fail to monitor the work of federal contractors. The federal government has the responsibility to maintain its commitment to monitoring their use—with special attention made to the evolving nature of their work and the associated national security risks inherent to outsourcing these tasks. I look forward to working with the Select Committee on Intelligence to achieve this goal.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 2010]
NATIONAL SECURITY, INC.

(By Dana Priest and William M. Arkin)

In June, a stone carver from Manassas chiseled another perfect star into a marble wall at CIA headquarters, one of 22 for agency workers killed in the global war initiated by the 2001 terrorist attacks.

The intent of the memorial is to publicly honor the courage of those who died in the line of duty, but it also conceals a deeper story about government in the post-9/11 era: Eight of the 22 were not CIA officers at all. They were private contractors.

To ensure that the country's most sensitive duties are carried out only by people loyal above all to the nation's interest, federal rules say contractors may not perform what are called "inherently government functions." But they do, all the time and in every intelligence and counterterrorism agency, according to a two-year investigation by The Washington Post.

What started as a temporary fix in response to the terrorist attacks has turned into a dependency that calls into question whether the federal workforce includes too many people obligated to shareholders rather than the public interest—and whether the government is still in control of its most sensitive activities. In interviews last week, both Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates and CIA Director Leon Panetta said they agreed with such concerns.

The Post investigation uncovered what amounts to an alternative geography of the United States, a Top Secret America created since 9/11 that is hidden from public view, lacking in thorough oversight and so unwieldy that its effectiveness is impossible to determine.

It is also a system in which contractors are playing an ever more important role. The Post estimates that out of 854,000 people with top-secret clearances, 265,000 are contractors. There is no better example of the government's dependency on them than at the CIA, the one place in government that exists to do things overseas that no other U.S. agency is allowed to do.

Private contractors working for the CIA have recruited spies in Iraq, paid bribes for information in Afghanistan and protected CIA directors visiting world capitals. Contractors have helped snatch a suspected extremist off the streets of Italy, interrogated detainees once held at secret prisons abroad and watched over defectors holed up in the Washington suburbs. At Langley headquarters, they analyze terrorist networks. At the agency's training facility in Virginia, they are helping mold a new generation of American spies.

Through the federal budget process, the George W. Bush administration and Congress made it much easier for the CIA and other agencies involved in counterterrorism to hire more contractors than civil servants. They did this to limit the size of the permanent workforce, to hire employees more quickly than the sluggish federal process allows and because they thought—wrongly, it turned out—that contractors would be less expensive.

Nine years later, well into the Obama administration, the idea that contractors cost less has been repudiated, and the administration has made some progress toward its goal of reducing the number of hired hands by 7 percent over two years. Still, close to 30 percent of the workforce in the intelligence agencies is contractors.

"For too long, we've depended on contractors to do the operational work that ought to be done" by CIA employees, Panetta said. But replacing them "doesn't happen overnight. When you've been dependent on contractors for so long, you have to build that expertise over time." A second concern of Panetta's: contracting with corporations, whose responsibility "is to their shareholders, and that does present an inherent conflict."

Or as Gates, who has been in and out of government his entire life, puts it: "You want somebody who's really in it for a career because they're passionate about it and because they care about the country and not just because of the money."

Contractors can offer more money—often twice as much—to experienced federal employees than the government is allowed to pay them. And because competition among firms for people with security clearances is so great, corporations offer such perks as BMWs and \$15,000 signing bonuses, as Raytheon did in June for software developers with top-level clearances.

The idea that the government would save money on a contract workforce "is a false economy," said Mark M. Lowenthal, a former senior CIA official and now president of his own intelligence training academy.

As companies raid federal agencies of talent, the government has been left with the youngest intelligence staffs ever while more experienced employees move into the private sector. This is true at the CIA, where employees from 114 firms account for roughly a third of the workforce, or about 10,000 positions. Many of them are temporary hires, often former military or intelligence agency employees who left government service to work less and earn more while drawing a federal pension.

Across the government, such workers are used in every conceivable way. Contractors kill enemy fighters. They spy on foreign governments and eavesdrop on terrorist net-

works. They help craft war plans. They gather information on local factions in war zones. They are the historians, the architects, the recruiters in the nation's most secretive agencies. They staff watch centers across the Washington area. They are among the most trusted advisers to the four-star generals leading the nation's wars.

So great is the government's appetite for private contractors with top-secret clearances that there are now more than 300 companies, often nicknamed "body shops," that specialize in finding candidates, often for a fee that approaches \$50,000 a person, according to those in the business.

Making it more difficult to replace contractors with federal employees: The government doesn't know how many are on the federal payroll. Gates said he wants to reduce the number of defense contractors by about 13 percent, to pre-9/11 levels, but he's having a hard time even getting a basic head count.

"This is a terrible confession," he said. "I can't get a number on how many contractors work for the Office of the Secretary of Defense," referring to the department's civilian leadership.

The Post's estimate of 265,000 contractors doing top-secret work was vetted by several high-ranking intelligence officials who approved of The Post's methodology. The newspaper's Top Secret America database includes 1,931 companies that perform work at the top-secret level. More than a quarter of them—533—came into being after 2001, and others that already existed have expanded greatly. Most are thriving even as the rest of the United States struggles with bankruptcies, unemployment and foreclosures.

The privatization of national security work has been made possible by a nine-year "gusher" of money, as Gates recently described national security spending since the 9/11 attacks.

With so much money to spend, managers do not always worry about whether they are spending it effectively.

"Someone says, 'Let's do another study,' and because no one shares information, everyone does their own study," said Elena Mastors, who headed a team studying the al-Qaeda leadership for the Defense Department. "It's about how many studies you can orchestrate, how many people you can fly all over the place. Everybody's just on a spending spree. We don't need all these people doing all this stuff."

Most of these contractors do work that is fundamental to an agency's core mission. As a result, the government has become dependent on them in a way few could have foreseen: wartime temps who have become a permanent cadre.

Just last week, typing "top secret" into the search engine of a major jobs Web site showed 1,951 unfilled positions in the Washington area, and 19,759 nationwide: "Target analyst," Reston. "Critical infrastructure specialist," Washington, D.C. "Joint expeditionary team member," Arlington.

"We could not perform our mission without them. They serve as our 'reserves,' providing flexibility and expertise we can't acquire," said Ronald Sanders, who was chief of human capital for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence before retiring in February. "Once they are on board, we treat them as if they're a part of the total force."

The Post's investigation is based on government documents and contracts, job descriptions, property records, corporate and social networking Web sites, additional records, and hundreds of interviews with intelligence, military and corporate officials and former officials. Most requested anonymity either because they are prohibited from speaking publicly or because, they said,