

New Dawn, or any other contingency operation being conducted by the Armed Forces as of the date of such review.

(6) Existing mechanisms available to military spouses to express their views on the effectiveness and future direction of Department programs and policies on employment assistance for military spouses.

(7) The oversight provided by the Office of Personnel and Management regarding preferences for military spouses in Federal employment.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the review carried out under subsection (a). The report shall set forth the following:

(1) The results of the review concerned.

(2) Such clear and concrete metrics as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for the current and future evaluation and assessment of the efficacy and effectiveness of Department of Defense military spouse employment programs.

(3) A description of the assumptions utilized in the review, and an assessment of the validity and completeness of such assumptions.

(4) Such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for improving Department of Defense military spouse employment programs.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the number (or a reasonable estimate if a precise number is not available) of military spouses who have obtained employment following participation in Department of Defense military spouse employment programs. The report shall set forth such number (or estimate) for the Department of Defense military spouse employment programs as a whole and for each such military spouse employment program.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set those three amendments aside.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AUTHORITY TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, November 17, 2011, Senator BENNET be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1092

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order on the Levin-McCain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is the regular order. It is now pending.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

INTENTION TO OBJECT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to alert my colleagues that I intend to object to any unanimous consent agreement for the consideration of S. 1793 or its companion, H.R. 2076, the Investigative Assistance for Violent Crimes Act of 2011. Unless changes are made to address my concerns with the legislation, I will continue to object.

I oppose S. 1793/H.R. 2076 in its current form because it would expand the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by giving it authority to conduct investigations of State crimes, and I believe that that is a bad precedent to set. The FBI should not be turned into a roving national police force.

I do believe in allowing Federal law enforcement agencies to assist State and local agencies, when requested. Agents providing assistance should be afforded civil liability protection.

Unfortunately, the bill excludes all other Federal law enforcement agencies that routinely provide law assistance to local law enforcement when requested. For example, local police believed the Secret Service possessed the expertise they needed to assist in their investigation of the Boston "Craig'slist Killer." As a result of this expert assistance, the killer was captured. There is no reason to limit States and localities to the assistance of the FBI alone, when other agencies may have the particular expertise that is needed.

Too many people think that only the FBI helps local law enforcement. That's simply not true. State and local officers develop positive relationships with their Federal law enforcement counterparts. When a violent crisis occurs, they often request assistance from the Federal agents they already work with.

I support the idea behind the legislation: to allow State and local agencies to request the assistance of Federal law enforcement to address serious State and local crimes. But that should apply to all agencies, and should be done without expanding the authority of any Federal law enforcement agency to conduct investigations of State and local crimes on its own, at the expense of other State, local, and Federal law enforcement agencies.

The bill as reported also contains an ill-advised requirement that the Bureau cannot provide assistance to State or local law enforcement agencies unless three persons have died. Given that the bill purports to permit assistance in the case of attempted mass murder, a requirement that three people have died before assistance can be provided, is flawed. Moreover, there have been serious crimes involving mass shootings in which, fortunately, no one has died. No assistance could be provided to investigate such crimes under the bill in its current form.

Until these concerns are addressed and further changes are included in the bill, I support holding this legislation on the Senate floor.

TRIBUTE TO DANA SINGISER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a dear friend and native Vermonter, Dana Singiser. Dana has accepted the position of Vice President for Public Policy and Government Affairs for Planned Parenthood, and while I am sorry to see her leave President Obama's administration, I am proud to recognize Dana's hard work and wish her continued success in her career.

Dana was raised in the small rural town of Mendon, VT, where her mother—the Mendon town clerk—instilled in her the values of democracy and the importance of staying engaged in her community. Dana carried this spirit with her in her career on Capitol Hill and on several presidential campaigns. Dana came to my office as an intern in the summer of 1991 while attending Brown University. I was immediately impressed with her intelligence, work ethic, and gregarious personality. I knew she would go on to accomplish great things, and indeed she has. After graduating from Brown, she attended law school at Georgetown University and spent 7 years at a law firm before her return to public service, where she has remained.

Dana served as the Director of Women's Outreach for Hillary Clinton's presidential bid—an opportunity that allowed her to grow her career in politics. She later also quickly proved herself a valuable asset to President Obama's campaign, and following his election she was appointed Special Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs, where she has served for the last 3 years.

While she has enjoyed her time at the White House, Dana has also gained immeasurable experience that will certainly add to her already successful career. In Dana's new role with Planned Parenthood, she can continue her long fight to protect women's rights, and I am glad to see her continue to follow her passion. Vermonters are proud to recognize Dana Singiser's hard work, and we wish her continued success in her career.

I ask unanimous consent that an article about her achievements, from The

National Journal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUT OF THE FRYING PAN, INTO THE FIRE
[From the National Journal, Nov. 7, 2011]
(By Naureen Khan)

Dana Singiser remembers the glamour of her first job out of college: running a tiny field office in Vermont for Bill Clinton's 1992 presidential campaign for \$300 a month. Luckily, Singiser was a local and her mother was on hand to bring her laboring daughter dinner every night.

Public service was always a natural inclination for Singiser, she said. She was, after all, raised by parents who were actively involved in the small rural community of Mendon, Vt., population 1,056. Mom was the town clerk and a small-business owner while Dad kept busy with church activities.

An internship with Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., while she was still an undergraduate at Brown University gave Singiser her first taste of D.C. and there was no turning back. After working on Clinton's 1992 race, she landed a job in the White House with presidential personnel and packed her bags for Washington—"The last meritocracy," according to Singiser, "where you can work hard and get recognized."

Twenty years later, after jobs on several presidential campaigns, on Capitol Hill, and most recently with the Obama administration as special assistant to the president for legislative affairs, Singiser is headed to Planned Parenthood as vice president of public policy and government affairs.

"It's been great, and you can never leave a White House job without feeling incredibly bittersweet about it," Singiser said. "I feel like a mere mortal, and I can't keep up these hours and this intensity forever."

Not that Singiser is expecting an easy road ahead at Planned Parenthood. She becomes the organization's chief advocate and liaison to both state and national policymakers as the group continues to come under attack as one of the largest legal providers of abortion. The issue has become a lightning rod over the past several months as Republican lawmakers, GOP presidential candidates, and conservative activists have called for federal defunding of Planned Parenthood. Singiser said she hopes to help reframe the conversation in her new role.

"Those attacks are just misplaced," she said, pointing to the range of primary-care services that Planned Parenthood provides for men, women, and children. "The result of those sorts of efforts would be to erode women's health."

Singiser has been well-prepared for the role, working in both policy and politics for the past decade. After her stint with the Clinton administration, Singiser got her law degree from Georgetown University in December 1998 and practiced at the Washington firm Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld for five years, doing regulatory and lobbying work.

When the political bug bit her again, she went to work on Howard Dean's short-lived presidential campaign before a Senate job vacancy caught her eye. For three years, she was staff director for the Senate Democratic Steering and Outreach Committee under then-Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton, D-N.Y.

From there, Singiser went to work for Clinton's 2008 presidential campaign, focusing on women's outreach. When Clinton bowed out of the race and endorsed Barack Obama, her former rival, Singiser got on a plane almost immediately for Chicago to lend a hand to Obama's general-election effort.

She has been with the Obama administration since Day One, becoming an expert on everything from financial reform to health care as the president tackled an ambitious legislative agenda in his first two years in office.

"I'm really proud and honored to have served President Obama for three years, but I'm really excited to go on to this next chapter," she added.

FOSSIL ENERGY FUNDING

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the fossil energy funding in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

Fossil energy is a critical resource that we should not and can not just throw away. Providing the majority of our energy, we need to use these resources in a safe and responsible way. Harnessing domestic fossil energy could create jobs, lift up struggling communities, and provide jobs for our strong and dedicated workforce.

I know there are people who remain very much opposed to funding fossil energy research who want to move away from fossil fuels as quickly as possible. But the fact of the matter is that, at this time, our Nation is not capable of quickly moving away from fossil fuels, which provides that majority of the energy we use. We need fossil energy to help us move forward, and we should not pretend otherwise.

While I believe that our country will continue using fossil fuels for many decades, it is my hope that we will also continually seek better ways for using these resources.

We need to find more efficient ways of burning coal that emit fewer pollutants and protect public health. We need to find more environmentally friendly ways to extract natural gas and oil. And we need to find ways to design and build carbon capture and sequestration facilities that will allow us to reduce the impacts of using fossil fuels on the climate.

This is the type of work that fossil energy research and development goes towards, and work that I believe we must continue to support. Without it, we are only putting our country at a disadvantage.

In Morgantown, WV, the National Energy Technology Laboratory or NETL is doing this work and pioneering fossil energy research and development activities that are lighting a pathway for a new era of energy use that is critical to West Virginia and our nation.

Unfortunately, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill slashes fossil energy funding by 25 percent in just 1 year. In Fiscal Year 2011 the overall fossil energy Budget was \$586 million. The President only requested \$452.9 million for Fiscal Year 2012 and this bill only contains \$445.5 million.

In comparison, the overall Energy and Water bill cuts spending by less than 1 percent. The nuclear section of this bill cuts funding by 20 percent and the renewable section of this bill re-

mains flat—not facing any cut this year.

I recognize that in this budgetary climate cuts may be inevitable to many programs. But I firmly believe that in the Department of Energy budget no one account can be asked to shoulder that burden alone. But if cuts must be made they should be done in fair and reasonable way, when compared to funding for other energy programs.

Unfortunately, the fossil energy cuts in this bill are neither fair nor reasonable. The cuts to fossil energy in this bill are disproportionate compared to funding levels for other areas of research.

To correct this situation, I have introduced an amendment that would restore \$30 million to the fossil energy account, \$10 million for natural gas, \$10 million for unconventional fossil fuels and \$10 million for advanced energy systems in coal areas.

Again, I understand the budgetary times that we are facing in Washington. I understand that cuts have to be made. But what I strongly disagree with is the idea that fossil energy must shoulder more than its fair share of cuts.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join with me to restore a portion of funding for the fossil energy program.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing on whether to elevate the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was an important hearing for the men and women of our armed services, and I am grateful that the committee allowed me to submit a statement for the hearing record. In light of the upcoming National Defense Authorization Act, in which I expect these provisions to pass, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD before the full Senate, so that the rest of my colleagues may have a chance to read it.

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

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Chairman Levin, Senator McCain, Members of the Committee—thank you for holding this hearing on whether the Chief of the National Guard Bureau should be a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And thanks to all of the Chiefs of our armed forces—both active duty and reserve—for being here today. There is no question—as a matter of both principle and of national security—that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau should be elevated to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Guardians of Freedom Act, which passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives on May 25, would accomplish this goal. I hope that today's hearing will lead to swift action on this important legislation, and I look forward to the testimony of each of the witnesses.

It is important to acknowledge that the role of the National Guard has evolved over the last ten years. Since 9/11, National Guardsmen have mobilized more than 700,000 times to support overseas and domestic missions. They have played an essential role in the conflicts in both Afghanistan and Iraq