

make sure that you're able to do that by giving you the tools that you need for success.

One of those things for some students across this country—for many students, for 7 million students—is the ability to get student loans that are affordable, and to have some sense that over the period of time that they're in college and they graduate college and the economy is better and they get jobs that they will be able to repay those loans so that some other generation of students can also go to school and do the same thing.

So why am I passionate about this? I am passionate about it because it's my story, and because it's the story of middle class families all across this country who know that they want to do better, who struggle to do better, and who experience the rug being ripped out from under them because we want to ask our middle class families to either double your interest rates or sacrifice your health care. Those are the choices we're asking our middle class families to make. In today's economy, there is not a greater predictor of individual success than a good education. This is a fact. But if it's a fact, then we need to make the investment that makes that fact a reality for our students across this country.

Right now, as many have pointed out on this floor, the unemployment rate for Americans with a college degree or more is about half of the national average. That means that, when you graduate, even if you have student loans that are affordable and can be repaid, you have some opportunity to do that because you will have done better, and you will have had the opportunity to do better than the student who only gets a high school education. The incomes for those who graduate from college are twice as high as those who don't have a high school diploma.

□ 1430

Higher education, whether we're talking about a 4-year institution or a 2-year institution at a community college, is the clearest path that we have to middle class success. If we are going to build a ladder of opportunity for the American people, then one of those rungs has to be student loans and another rung is a Pell Grant; another rung is job training; another rung is to make sure that our families are eating and that our children are immunized. There are many rungs. And this Congress has an obligation to make sure those rungs of that ladder are available to the American people.

Democrats and Republicans both say they want to build a competitive workforce, but let's be clear that it's the Democrats—my colleagues here in the Congress—who time and time again actually stand up for the students with the skills that will be needed to comprise that competitive workforce.

So I look at the things Democrats have done over this period of time. We've increased the maximum Pell

Grant from \$4,050 in 2006 to \$5,550 in 2010. We created the American Opportunity Tax Credit that provides a maximum of \$2,500 in a tuition tax credit to eligible families and students. We created income-based repayment to ensure that graduates can manage their loan repayments during stressful economic times.

I remember when I came out of undergraduate school and law school and really wanted to work in the public-interest sector, and I did. But I wasn't paid as much as some of my colleagues who were going into law firms and other kinds of practice. Would that I could have paid my student loans back based on my income.

Well, that's the kind of opportunity that we've provided for students for the future. We've provided loan forgiveness for graduates who actually go into public-interest careers, who go into teaching careers after 10 years of loan payments. We've required schools to have an online calculator so that students and families can estimate their costs based on their family's financial situation. We've supported Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority-serving institutions. This is the way that Democrats have supported middle class families and poor families in their ability to achieve the American Dream. I would only ask that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle do the same.

With that, we have about 5 minutes left to continue our conversation with the American people. So I will yield just a moment to the Congresswoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank my friend from Maryland.

I want to add to her list because importantly when our party, the Democrats, took control, the interest rates were where they will go in July. They were at 6.8 percent. We felt the pain, and we lowered those rates to their present 3.4. But the way they were phased in, they would go up again to 6.8. Do you see what we were trying to do in 2007? We recognized this was a major issue and took those rates down, which I'm sure encouraged many people to go to college in the first place.

Now we have young people with an unemployment rate of about 14 percent if you're between 20 and 24. That's terrible when you consider that nationally it's about 8 percent. And I'm very distressed that already there is an almost 15 percent increase delinquency rates in student loans, which will add to the interest rates were talking about and the interest rates that we're trying to keep at least level.

I want to thank you again for leading this Special Order so that America knows before it's too late.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Now I would like to recognize for a moment the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I want to say that the gentlelady from the District of Columbia is right, Georgetown Law School is very expensive.

I too had student loans to go to law school and worked two jobs also as a waiter to do that. And I didn't know anybody who was in law school with me that wasn't there with some loan. I didn't know anyone that I met that either they or their parents wrote a check for the tuition. That's the experience of millions and millions of families all across this country.

I was listening to the gentlelady recount all of the work that the Democrats have done in investing in education, and it's because we realize it's not about us. It's about the future of our country. These are investments in young people who are going to be the leaders of this country, and access to education is so central to the American Dream.

I really just want to conclude by thanking the gentlelady for leading this conversation. I hope it will help really be a call to action for young people all across this country on Tuesday. I'm having a call-to-action in my district encouraging young people to demand that Congress do the responsible thing, prevent this rise in interest rates, but also continue to make the investments we need to make in education for their sake and for our sake.

I thank the gentlelady for the time.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman, and I thank all of our participants today in calling attention to the fact that Democrats have proposed ending tax subsidies for oil and gas companies so that we can use those savings and actually help to pay for need-based college loans where they are and to help pay down the deficit.

Republicans are cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans, and they're throwing that debt onto students and families.

To be clear, this is not a partisan issue. It's a student issue; it's a family issue; it's an American issue. It's about our competitiveness in the economy. And I want to call all young people across this Nation of all political persuasions to reach out to their Members of Congress and say, stop the increase on student loans from doubling from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, costing millions of dollars to students across this country.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE STUDENT LOAN RATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's always an honor to be able to speak here in the House of Representatives.

It has been a good day because here in the House, despite what some may think, we voted overwhelmingly to

leave student loan rates at the same rate they are right now, 3.4 percent. If the government had had to subsidize a rate, if interest rates were higher, that would be more difficult to justify because of how much overspending this administration has had as dictated during the time when Speaker PELOSI and HARRY REID had full control over all of the spending.

But while the President was very busy running around the country condemning Republicans for not caring about student loan rates and the plight of students, we were busy here at work making sure that student loan rates did not increase. While the President was out there telling students that Republicans don't care about you, that they're going to double the interest rates of your student loans, he didn't bother to come check and find out what was happening in Washington. If he had, he would have found out we felt the same way about the student loans.

Let's see which Democrats were as concerned as we were today about the student loan rates going up. This was bill H.R. 4628, and it's basically two pages, not 25 pages or 2,800 pages. It is two pages, and it keeps the rates at the same rate so they won't go up.

One of our clerks just brought the printout of the Democrats that voted with the Republicans to extend the current interest rates, and there were 13 Democrats who voted with Republicans to keep the interest rates where they are. All that's on the printout are the last names: BARROW, BISHOP of New York, BOREN from Oklahoma, DONNELLY, HIGGINS, HOCHUL, KISSELL, LIPINSKI, MATHESON, MCINTYRE, OWENS, PETERSON, and WALZ.

□ 1440

Those are the Democrats that voted today with the Republicans to keep the student loan interest rates the same.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's my great hope that while the President is running around the country condemning Republicans for not caring about the plight of students who have to pay student loans and about the fact that he says Republicans are going to double the student interest rate, I hope that somebody who's not out campaigning—like the President, as he flies around at government expense—I hope somebody down Pennsylvania Avenue, right down the street that way, will get something into the President's teleprompter that advises him, Hey, you may want to back off of that.

The Republicans, with only 13 Democrats voting with them, actually voted to extend the same interest rates. Now, I feel like the Democrats would agree with the fact that we believe that in order to keep from having expenses continue to go out of sight, as they did during the 2 years that Congress was completely controlled by Democrats and they had the White House, they did whatever they want, they passed a rule, pay-as-you-go.

Actually, I broke ranks and voted with them. Others told me they don't

really mean this pay-as-you-go thing. Yes, they're going to pass it, but they don't mean it. I go, But I do believe in pay-as-you-go. I do believe things should be paid for.

I found out from those who had been here longer than I had that they were right in their cynicism, because over and over big bills that our friends across the aisle brought when they were in control of things, they would make an exception. So this bill and that bill and this bill and that bill weren't paid for, so the pay-as-you-go didn't mean much.

But some of us believe that when we create a law we ought to either abide by the law or change it. This needed to be covered. In looking for ways to come up with funds to cover these current interest rates, some of us were reminded of the fact that ObamaCare, that most of the country didn't want—most of the country begged Congress, under Speaker PELOSI and HARRY REID, not to pass—and that Americans, even in Massachusetts and other places normally controlled by Democrats, expressed their will by electing Democrats, this time elected Republicans so they could stop ObamaCare. It took a procedural twist that was quite unseemly in order to get it passed, but the American people didn't want it.

I realize that since President Obama sees ObamaCare as his defining issue, his biggest issue, that he would not ever sign a bill that repealed ObamaCare in its entirety. I can get that. I understand that. I respect that. But it seemed to some of us that surely, as the President in every speech talks about being financially responsible, surely he would see that we shouldn't spend the \$105 billion implementing ObamaCare until we find out if it's constitutional; because to use \$105 billion to implement a bill, actually a takeover of people's rights, to implement that only to have it struck down would mean we had wasted tens of billions of dollars. My thought was, surely—surely—President Obama

would be willing to meet us at that point. Sure, he won't agree to a complete repeal, but let's just suspend the spending until we find out whether the Supreme Court says it's constitutional or not. How could you be against that?

Well, he was, because as the bill was shoved down the throats of Americans, it became very evident that they didn't care what Americans thought, don't really care what the Supreme Court thinks. Apparently, many don't even know what the Supreme Court thinks or says because the President, himself, said it would just be such a fundamental change from what the Supreme Court had ever done before.

Obviously, he was not aware of recent cases like *Marbury v. Madison*. I think that was around 1803. Not all schools have copies of those newer cases like that.

Anyway, it's not fundamentally different from what the Supreme Court has done in the past. What's fundamen-

tally different is to have a Congress push through a bill like ObamaCare that's about one thing, the "GRE," the government running everything, with a majority, a big majority of Americans saying, Please, don't do this. So it was done.

In looking for ways to pay for this bill today, it seemed to many of us that a good and appropriate course would be to say let's take some of that money, a tiny, tiny bit of that money from ObamaCare that many of us think will be struck down, that shouldn't be spent till we find out if it's going to be struck down, and let's use that to pay for the \$6 billion for this program. It made sense to some of us.

But as I have already read, there were 13 Democrats that stood up and said, Okay, we can go along with that. Let's wait and see if ObamaCare is struck down or not before we spend any more of that money on ObamaCare. In the meantime, we will use it to pay for the student loan rates that we're out there blasting Republicans for not caring about.

This was a way to be bipartisan, and 13 Democrats were bipartisan, and we appreciate them reaching across the aisle to pass this bill with us with a big majority. The President, on the other hand, apparently did get word that despite all his rhetoric that we don't care about the student loan rates on our side of the aisle, we don't care about students, as he runs around the country condemning us, somebody at the White House got word, because there was the issue of a veto threat if we passed this bill that keeps student interest rates where they are.

Now, when I first heard that we were going to potentially pass a student loan bill that would affect interest rates, I considered that I may have to vote "present" because my wife and I have student loans for our children that we are paying back. Well, it turns out this bill will not help me one bit. My interest rates are still way above this.

My wife and I took out student loans for our children. They're way above this. This doesn't affect our loans that we have, and, therefore, I was able to vote for this bill to help those students that are getting loans in the present.

The reason I feel compelled, my wife and I felt compelled to start taking out student loans and to take responsibility for paying those loans, was because, before I ever ran for office as a judge, my wife and I had set aside money in accounts that would pay for our kids' college when they got there, would increase in value, increase in value. By the time they got ready for college, the money would be there to pay for it.

But when we took, we believed it was, a calling for me to run for judge—they badly needed a new judge—we knew it would be a big hit financially. Just as when I ran for Congress, we had to really feel compelled that this was the course for our lives.

□ 1450

Once we felt that, we cashed out every asset except our home, our retirement accounts, everything. Now, a little scarier to some than others, I knew I could make a lot more money because I did before. I made a number of times more in the private sector a couple years before I started running. The practice was going good. I didn't want my children to have to be encumbered with massive college debt for one reason, because I felt called to be a public servant. So we've taken on those student loans.

So it doesn't go over too well with a person like me who has sacrificed all our assets except our home to come be a part of Congress and to try to get things on track. It doesn't make me feel too pleasant when people say that I don't care about students, student loans and their rates. We get it. We understand. We want students to do well. But more than that, we want them to have a vibrant economy and a job waiting for them when they get out of college.

And it should be an exciting time of renaissance and economic boon in America, except for this President. If he would simply get out of the way. We have found that we can be energy independent, and we don't have to send billions and billions of dollars, 42 cents out of every dollar of which we're borrowing, we don't have to send all that money to the Solyndras and all the cronies of this administration, if he could just get out of the way and allow the market to work and collect the revenue that comes pouring in from the income tax, from the businesses, including the oil companies and the independent oil and gas companies as they start producing more of our own energy.

It should be a new day in America. It should be a time of renaissance here. Instead, people are struggling to figure out how much food can I afford for my family when I'm paying \$70 and \$80 to fill up my gas tank when it shouldn't be more than \$40, because this administration has given every indication by its actions—not its words but by its actions—that it will do nothing to help us become energy independent.

We talk about, gee, natural gas, from this administration, natural gas can really help out. I'm for all of the above. Well, apparently that means the President is for all of the above up in the sky somewhere because he's doing everything he can to keep us from drilling and producing the energy we've got.

We should be thanking God every day for blessing this country with more energy than any country in the world. And people like the Chinese are wondering: What is going on with these people? They've got more energy than anybody in the world. We're having to run to South America, Africa, and other places to buy their energy because we just don't have enough. They've got all they'll need, but

they're putting it off-limits and won't produce it.

It's kind of strange to thinking people that we're not utilizing the blessings that are found in this country. Well, it's time we started, and if we do that, then the students will have jobs, and they can pay them back more quickly. We do care, and this bill today shows that.

Now, I want to take up another topic right quickly here, something called the United States Post Office. Now, there are some who think we ought to just get the government out of the post office business altogether, and normally I'm a guy that believes, if a private entity can do a better job than the government, then let's let the private entity do it. But there's a problem here, and it's called the U.S. Constitution, article 1, section 8: The Congress shall have power to—and you go through the listed empowerments—establish post offices and post roads.

If you go through our history, you will find out that actually they were quite concerned about the King being able to prevent them from sending newspapers, news and messages around that could inform people of what was really going on. They thought it was so important that there be a government post office, and I do think. But we can't be stupid about the way it's running, and we have people in management positions in the United States Post Office who have been worse than stupid. Incompetent doesn't begin to touch what some in management of the U.S. Post Office have been doing. It's as if they want to kill it off.

Now, there are a lot of issues, but I think the biggest issue is in the middle and upper management of the post office. Because I've seen, on more than one occasion, an announcement by the United States Post Office that we are going to close this post office, we're going to close this facility, and that was followed with a statement that, and therefore we are going to pay for an independent study to show that we should close these facilities.

Well, duh. If you go pay somebody to do a study to justify the decision you've already made, you've got no business being in a management position because you're not using the facts and information at hand to make your decisions. You make your decisions willy-nilly regardless of what the facts dictate should occur.

We got a good indication of that recently in east Texas. We got a map sent out by these brilliant managers of the U.S. Post Office explaining a decision they had made.

I'm going to get this up here because it's important that the management that sent this out understands how silly and how ridiculously incompetent they are.

Now, they were making a decision with regard to a postal processing facility near Tyler, Texas. Tyler, Texas is located in Smith County. Now, in Texas, though, we do have a Tyler

County, and in Tyler County you find towns like Woodville, Chester, and Warren, places like that; but you don't find Tyler, Texas, or the Tyler, Texas, processing facility in Tyler County. It's in Smith County. Yet we had a determination by the management of the U.S. Post Office that it would be more effective to shut down the Tyler processing facility, and they sent out this map to show this.

This is an exact enlargement of the map the U.S. postal management sent out to justify their closing a processing facility near Tyler, Texas. In the center of this circle is Tyler County. It's not near Tyler, Texas. It's not near the processing facility.

Now, you might say, well, surely they went out and talked to the people at the processing facility, looked to see if there were decisions that could be made to make it more efficient and more economically viable, those kinds of things, and the answer would clearly be: How can they go out and talk to them when they don't even know where Tyler, Texas is? They think it's in Tyler County.

We've got some morons. Maybe they're just incompetent. Who knows?

But when we look to see, okay, how is the post office adjusting, we figure, well, as any business would know, you don't want to hurt the retail business and you don't want to make it more difficult for people to use the retail end of your business. That would be the local post offices. So what have these mental giants done? They've said, We're going to close lots of post offices and make it much more difficult for you to use our services.

□ 1500

Not only that, we're going to close processing facilities that make the mail move many times more quickly, more efficiently, and save tremendous amounts of gasoline because we do the processing close to where it occurs. They're talking about closing a processing facility in Lufkin, Texas—I'm sure they don't know where that one is either. But when you look at what they've done, it makes no sense.

Now, this is the map they sent out with Tyler County as the center. This tells you, down here is Tyler County; up here is Tyler, Texas. They're not even close. They don't cover the same areas. And yet they were using information down here about Tyler County to justify closing a facility up here. Surely, they found their error, but they don't care because they're in middle management. What difference does it make? They're not accountable. They don't have to show a profit. They don't have to show efficiency.

So what do they do? Here's part of what's going on with the post office. Well, times are tough, so let's create more senior management staff. How about that. Percent management change from 1997 to 2012, up 41.25 percent. Wow, that's some smart folks. Gee, we need more retail, we need people using our services more; let's close

retail facilities, make it more difficult to use them. Let's get more senior management in there, and gee, that will make a lot of difference. We've gone up 1,006 percent on inspector generals, and local management losses have been rather dramatic. That's not the way to become more efficient.

Not only that, they could take a clue from what America is doing. It used to be that you pulled into a service station and you got service. Now you pull into a service station, the only service is what you get out of the car and do yourself. I prefer to do that anyway. I've worked in service stations, and I actually enjoyed it. So I don't want anybody else pumping my gas. When I finish and the thing clicks off, I raise the hose up and I get every bit of the gas that I've got in that hose.

Well, let's look at the routes. Right now, if you mail a letter in Tyler, Texas, to go to Lufkin, Texas, it will travel 84 miles. You mail one from Tyler to Palestine—and it is Palestine in East Texas—total is 47 miles. You mail a letter from Tyler to Longview, it's 38 miles.

Under the new plan—that's certainly not going to save any gasoline—our brilliant postal management will have you mail a letter from Tyler that's going to Longview, the 38 miles, now it will go to the Dallas area, then over to Shreveport, then back to Longview. We're not going to process it here. We're going to go from 38 miles to 389 miles to deliver a letter.

If you're going to send a letter down here, let's see, I can't tell where that is. It looks like down 35, so maybe that's to Waco or Austin. So you want to send it there—oh, I see. If you want to mail a letter from Tyler to Palestine, instead of 50-something miles, it will go Tyler to Dallas, down here to Austin, then back to Palestine. If you want to mail a letter the short distance to Lufkin, well, we're going to make it go 10 times further. We're going to go to Dallas, and then clear down—I guess that's to Houston, and then back up to Lufkin. We're going to go about 10 times as far to deliver a letter as we did before. This is nuts.

What we've seen in America is, as times got tough, service stations said, you know what, we're going to let you do your own pumping. That will help us save and be more efficient. As time has gone on, they said you know what, let's put other services in this gas station, so you see banks, you see other things. In some post offices, they were beginning to do that. They have agreements with the State. Let's let the State lease or pay us to do some of the State services here. Let's allow them to come in and get passports here. There were some people that were thinking—and thinking right—you combine other services, this post office will be the center of the community. It will be efficient, it will be local, it will bring people to our retail outlet, and they will have more people using our services at the post office.

Not the way these mental giants figure it; oh, no. We're going to close post offices. We're going to close processing facilities and make it cost a tremendous amount more. We're going to make these decisions, and then we're going to go out, and we're going to hire people to do a study to come to a conclusion—we tell them, all in the name of making the post office more efficient. That is nuts.

It's time to clean out the management of the United States Post Office. I've dealt with postal employees all my adult life. Those are hardworking folks. People that deliver the mail, people that stand there behind the counter, take abuse all day, lines getting longer because we're not replacing the people when they leave, they're good people. They're hardworking people. There are some issues with pensions, we can deal with those. But for heaven's sake, it's time to get rid of top-heavy management making ridiculous decisions, and we can improve our lot here.

One other thing. Last night, I was on a telephone town hall with Rusty Humphries and a lot of Tea Party folks. A question was asked—they slipped in a ringer in there, a Democrat, who said: Gee, you say you're a Christian. How could you vote to take money away from helping seniors with their health care? And how could you help the major oil companies by giving money to them? Quickly let me just say, a subsidy is a gift or grant of money. Look it up. No oil company is getting a gift or grant of money. They're getting deductions.

If you forget what the President said, he said he's going after major oil, declaring war on them. Ridiculous. We have, in the President's jobs bill, exactly what he's doing. He's eliminating the deductions that will bankrupt the independent oil and gas companies in America. It won't affect the major oil companies. He says he's declaring war on the major oil and big evil oil, but the truth is he's going to bankrupt the independent oil and gas producers that produce and drill and maintain 95 percent of the wells in America.

So what will be the effect of this President's so-called "war" on major oil? It will put the independents out of business, 95 percent of the wells will not be drilled and maintained. That will mean more profit than any time in the history of the world for the major oil companies. It's time to get that under control.

And to the gentleman that we got cut off with last night because we were out of time, let me just say: Son, dumb, dependent, and Democrat is no way to go through life.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, 112th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, May 7, 2012, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5827. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Ethyl-1-hexanol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0604; FRL-9342-5] received April 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5828. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acibenzolar-S-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0086; FRL-9343-3] received April 4, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5829. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the results of the pilot program for Foreign Language Proficiency Training, pursuant to Public Law 110-417, section 619(c)(3) (122 Stat. 4489); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5830. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's March 2012 Semi-Annual Report providing the progress toward destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions by the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) deadline of April 29, 2012, but not later than December 31, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5831. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice that the Department is taking essential steps to award a Joint Service multiyear contract for 98 V-22 aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5832. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting that the Department is taking essential steps to award a multiyear contract for 155 CH-47F aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5833. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed change to the U.S. Army Reserve Fiscal Year 2011 National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5834. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William T. Lord, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5835. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Donald J. Hoffman, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5836. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2011