

In these uncertain times, as we look for ways to promote job creation, educating America's youth about engineering and science needs to be a national priority. Each year, National Engineers Week seeks to do just this through events aimed at inspiring students and fostering public awareness of vital contributions made by engineers.

These events, including the Future City Competition, Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, and Discover Engineering Family Day, all impart an appreciation of the wonders of engineering to children of all backgrounds. The importance of these events is underscored by a 2012 survey by the Intel Corporation that found American teenagers are more likely to consider a degree in engineering after learning about what engineers do.

This year's theme is "7 Billion People; 7 Billion Dreams; 7 Billion Chances for Engineers to Turn Dreams Into Reality." This theme emphasizes the potential for growth among the community of engineers worldwide. It also highlights a challenge to our position as a global leader in engineering.

Last month, the latest Science and Engineering Indicators released by the National Science Board showed that the number of students obtaining engineering degrees in the United States continues to rise, but our production of new engineering degrees has been dramatically eclipsed by China, where 30 percent of all undergraduate degrees are in engineering, as compared to 4 percent in the United States. Inspiring bright young minds to consider careers in engineering is more important than ever for our economic competitiveness.

Growing up in Chicago, I was fascinated with figuring out how mechanical devices worked. I remember how my high school calculus and physics teachers at St. Ignatius helped mold this fascination into an interest in engineering. These teachers, together with informal experiences at places like the Museum of Science and Industry and the Brookfield Zoo, helped motivate me to pursue an undergraduate degree in mechanical engineering at Northwestern University and then a master's degree in engineering-economic systems from Stanford University. One of the central goals of National Engineers Week is to provide this kind of inspiration for the next generation.

During Engineers Week, I will be attending the Chicago Engineering Awards Benefit, where the Washington Award will be presented to a Chicago native and pioneer of the cell phone, Martin Cooper, and also where students will be honored for their participation in numerous competitions, including the Future City Competition. I am always greatly inspired when I go to this banquet to see one of the great pioneers of engineering talk about the work they've done, and to see the students and the work that they're doing today, and know the future of our country will be great with their help.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to encourage all of my colleagues to cosponsor

this resolution, but more importantly, to go home and participate in Engineers Week celebrations in your districts. This is a great opportunity for us to thank the engineers who contribute so much to our country and inspire the next generation of engineers that our country needs to stay competitive.

SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk for a few minutes about security. I know that almost no Member is willing to vote against something that has the word "security" attached to it, but I wish that most Members would consider these words from Ian Lustick. Professor Lustick is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, and he wrote several years after 9/11 about the war on terror money feeding frenzy. He wrote this:

After September 11, 2001, what accounts for the vast discrepancy between the terrorist threat facing America and the scale of our response? Why, absent any evidence of a serious domestic terror threat, is the war on terror so enormous, so all encompassing, and still expanding? The fundamental answer is that al Qaeda's most important accomplishment was not to hijack our planes, but to hijack our political system. For a multitude of politicians, interest groups, professional associations, corporations, media organizations, universities, local and State governments, and Federal agency officials, the war on terror is now a major profit center, a funding bonanza, and a set of slogans and sound bites to be inserted into budget, project, grant, and contract proposals. For the country as a whole, however, it has been a maelstrom of waste.

He pointed out an example that even Dunkin' Donuts franchises had received \$22 million in Federal counterterrorism loans.

Madam Speaker, in addition to that, shortly after 9/11, when every government, department, and agency was requesting more money for security, The Wall Street Journal carried an editorial that said:

Any bill with the word "security" in it should get double the public scrutiny and maybe four times the normal wait, lest all kinds of bad legislation become law under the phony guise of fighting terrorism.

Unfortunately, we haven't followed the guidance of Professor Lustick or The Wall Street Journal. I thought of these writings by Mr. Lustick and The Wall Street Journal when I read two recent articles. On December 20, 2 months ago, Vanity Fair magazine carried an article on its Web site which said:

As you stand in endless lines this holiday season, here's a comforting thought: all those security measures accomplish nothing at enormous costs.

The magazine said since 9/11, the government has spent more than \$1.1 trillion on homeland security. Then the article added this:

To a large number of security analysts, this expenditure makes no sense. The vast

cost is not worth the infinitesimal benefit. Not only has the actual threat been exaggerated, they say, but the great bulk of the post-9/11 measures to contain it are little more than security theater; actions that accomplish nothing but are designed to make the government look like it is on the job. In fact, the continuing expenditure on security may actually have made the United States less safe.

And then a second article by ABC News. Probably, Madam Speaker, the most needless, useless agency in the entire Federal Government is the Air Marshal Service. USA Today once reported that more air marshals had been arrested than were arrests by air marshals. Talk about a soft, easy job. All these people do is ride back and forth on airplanes, back and forth, back and forth, mostly in first class.

A few days ago, ABC News reported that air marshals took taxpayer-paid trips to visit families and to go to vacation spots. One supervisor was even photographed asleep on a flight while carrying a loaded pistol. ABC reported that managers at the Air Marshal Service acted like "a bunch of school yard punks," and that they "repeatedly made fun of blacks, Latinos, and gays," according to agency insiders. I guess they had too much time on their hands and too little to do.

I know, as I said earlier, that it's almost impossible to get Congress to vote against anything that claimed to be for security. But this almost \$1 billion that we give to air marshals each year is a total complete waste. When we go ridiculously overboard, Madam Speaker, on security, we are taking money away from individuals and families who really need it, and taking money away from other good things on which this money could be spent.

STOP MILITARY RAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise again today to highlight the epidemic of rape and sexual assault in the military.

This issue was recently brought up on Fox News by a commentator who ignorantly declared that women who join the military should expect to be raped. Yes, believe it or not, this was what the commentator said. I don't think our women choose to enlist in the military with the expectation that they might get raped.

This morning I'm going to tell you the story of U.S. marine Stephanie Schroeder, who was raped in a public restroom by a fellow marine. He shoved her down, beat her, and forced her on her back. He ripped down her pants and raped her. Then he ejaculated on her inner thigh and spit on her.

Private Schroeder reported the rape to command. Her commander laughed at her and said don't come "blankin" to me because you had sex and changed your mind.

□ 1100

Don't come "blankin" to me? That's the response that was given to Private

Schroeder. That was her leader. That was her commander saying that to her. Instead of helping her, her commander called her a liar and restricted her from seeking medical help or any type of counseling.

And what's worse is that her commander did nothing illegal. The military judicial system allows commanders complete discretion for handling cases of rape and sexual assault. To the current standard of justice, the commander did absolutely nothing wrong.

This story is one of thousands that happens in the military every year. By the Department of Defense's own statistics, 19,000 men and women are sexually assaulted or raped in the military every year. This is not a secret. Congress and the DOD have worked on this issue for a quarter of a century, but very little has changed.

The issue has been treated like a game of tag. Congress calls a hearing and then, tag, DOD submits a report, then, tag, Congress has a hearing, then DOD has a press conference about a new report. The game goes on and on, but no real changes actually occur.

Well, I have my own game. It's called "Truth Or Dare."

First, truth: the women in our military are more likely to be raped or assaulted by colleagues than they are to be killed by the enemy.

Truth: only 13.5 percent of victims report the crime.

Truth: only 8 percent of the cases are actually prosecuted.

Truth: the sole arbiters of reports of assaults in commands who decide which rapists are punished and will go free are, in fact, the commanders.

And now, there's a dare. I dare the Department of Defense to create a better, fairer process for handling rapes and sexual assaults. Instead of continuing a system that punishes victims and sweeps sexual offenses under the rug, I dare the Department of Defense to create an impartial office to review and handle these cases with experts in prosecution and investigation.

So what actually happened to Private Schroeder? Well, she got transferred away from her rapist to a new duty location. Prior to her arrival, her command called and told her new supervisor that she was a "trouble-maker."

Two weeks after the transfer, her new superior made a pass at her. She refused to have sex with him, and he retaliated by publicly harassing her at work. When she contracted pink eye, he asked her in front of formation if she let a guy ejaculate in her eye.

She reported the harassment to command. Nothing happened. A month later, she awoke to the same supervisor sexually assaulting her. Again, she reported it to her command.

This time the command took action—against Private Schroeder. She was disciplined for having a man in her room. Private Schroeder, the victim of sexual assault, was punished after a sex

offender broke into her room and harmed her.

Private Schroeder learned not to report crimes committed against her. So 6 months later, when she was sexually assaulted again by a marine in a truck, she told no one how he attempted to have sex with her, or how, when she refused, he began to masturbate in front of her and locked the doors so she could not leave. He said, Show me your tits; and, Help me masturbate; and, You masturbate for me.

This is outrageous conduct that should not be allowed in our military. For now, victims of rape and sexual assault must follow the chain of command, even if their commanding officer chooses to ignore the problem. We need to overhaul this system.

I've introduced H.R. 3435, the STOP Act, that would take these cases out of the chain of command and create an office in the military that will handle them.

I will continue to tell stories like Private Schroeder's until something changes. Survivors can email me at stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov if they would like to speak out.

For more information about this issue and opportunities to advocate for change, please visit ProtectOurDefenders.com.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Rudy Stevens, United States Army, Pinehurst, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Lord, too often, we Americans back home forget to pray for our leaders here in D.C. Forgive us, Lord. For those assembled here in the people's House, I pray that You give them courage, strength, and wisdom.

Give them courage from our convictions, strength from Your spirit, and wisdom for the future. For here decisions are made: choices that shape circumstances of years, if not generations, of all Americans.

All the way from California to North Carolina that airborne chorus sounds off loud and strong with, "This land is my land, and this land is your land."

And it is here in this room that chorus hits the ground and finds harmony reminding us that from many, we are one, one Nation under God that seeks liberty and justice for all, for all the fatherless and the oppressed.

So, Lord, hear our prayer and keep these leaders wise, strong, and courageous.

In Jesus' name, amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND RUDY STEVENS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me today to introduce Army Chaplain Rudy Stevens.

Captain Stevens lives in North Carolina's Sixth Congressional District and serves the 2-504 Parachute Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 82nd Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

During his tenure, Mr. Speaker, Captain Stevens has received many awards, most notably the Bronze Star, the Air Assault Wings, and Jump Wings. He has been deployed, Mr. Speaker, on separate occasions and will continue his duty with a deployment to Afghanistan in the coming months.

On behalf of the constituents of the Sixth District of North Carolina and my colleagues here in the people's House, Chaplain Stevens, we welcome you to the House of Representatives and extend our appreciation to you for having offered today's prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches from both sides of the aisle.

HONORING RETIRED COLONEL JOHN R. HED OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

(Mr. CRAVAACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my respects for retired Colonel John R. Hed of the United States Air Force.