

friend or payment to the electric company can be delivered online with a few quick keystrokes on your computer. This changing technology has meant serious new challenges for an organization that has serviced citizens of this Nation from its very beginning. It has served this Nation whether they live on city streets or rural routes.

Although the world the post office deals with has changed, the postal system's message and mission have not changed; that is, to deliver letters, packages, medicines—much of which is vital—online purchases, birthday cards, phone bills to hundreds of millions of Americans no matter how rural or how urban the places they call home. Neither has the current crisis changed the importance of that mission. Nearly half of rural households don't have broadband Internet access, making it difficult or impossible to pay bills or ship packages online. Rural families in Tuscarora, NV, or Baker, NV, in Elko County, NV, rely on the Postal Service. That is their way of communicating.

Small businesses benefit from cost-saving options offered at the post office, such as bulk mail. American businesses rely on the U.S. Postal Service. As I indicated earlier, 8 million people's jobs are dependent on the Postal Service.

For seniors who cannot leave their homes, mail carriers deliver lifesaving medications—an important link to the outside world. Elderly Americans rely on the U.S. Postal Service.

I will go home tonight to my home here in Washington, and there will be some mail there. A lot of it is what some people refer to as junk mail, but for the people who are sending that mail, it is very important.

And talking about seniors, seniors love to get junk mail. It is sometimes their only way of communicating or feeling they are part of the real world. Elderly Americans, more than any other group of people in America, rely on the U.S. Postal Service.

Unless we act quickly, thousands of post offices—I indicated there are more than 30,000 in America—many of them rural, will close. I said this earlier today, and I will repeat it. These rural post offices are the only way people in those small communities have to communicate with the outside world. There may be some medicine they are getting, it may be to keep in touch with their family or friends, but it is their way of keeping in touch with the world. Hundreds of mail-processing facilities will close, and the jobs of hundreds of thousands of dedicated postal employees are at risk.

Timely, dependable mail delivery is not the only thing at stake in this debate. Today the Postal Service employs, as I have indicated, more than half a million middle-class workers, and the postal system gives more than 130,000 men and women who volunteered for this country in the armed services a chance to serve again. A

quarter of all postal employees are veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces. So there is really a lot at stake in this debate.

The Postal Service has been playing an important role in the history of this country and the lives of its citizens for more than 200 years, but it has also seen a 21-percent drop in mail volume over the last 5 years and is on the verge of insolvency. Yesterday the Postal Service lost about \$20 million—1 day.

Changing times demand a leaner, more modern post office. To make that possible, we must pass legislation. The Senate must act. We must change the Postal Service business model. They cannot do it on their own. They need legislation. They need it to keep pace with technology and to keep up with the times.

The bipartisan bill before this body enacts reforms that are major but measured. The people who have worked on this so hard—I have already talked about Senator LIEBERMAN. His counterpart, Republican Senator COLLINS, has worked extremely hard. I have worked with her to maintain the 6-day delivery. This is something she believes in strongly. I really admire her for the fight she has put up to get the things that she feels are important in this legislation.

If we act, it would reduce the number of employees and facilities the Postal Service maintains in a responsible way, and that would protect employees and millions of Americans relying on the mail. It would responsibly restructure the postal system, while preserving overnight 6-day-a-week delivery. It would help the Postal Service innovate and grow by offering new products that will attract new customers and, most importantly, would save the Postal Service from insolvency. It will help an institution enshrined in the Constitution modernize to meet the challenges of a changing world.

What Senators LIEBERMAN and COLLINS have come up with is not perfect, and we all recognize that. It is not a perfect compromise. It will not make every Senator happy. It will not make every American happy. It will not save every post office. But it is a very good compromise and one that is bipartisan. It will save an institution that has been a part of the fabric of this Nation for more than 200 years. So let's work together to save the American Postal Service, which, by the way, is the best in the world.

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 minority leader is recognized.

GAS PRICES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, with gas prices hovering around \$4 a gallon, I think it is important for the American people to realize there are really two camps on this issue here in Washington: there are those who want to do something about the problem, and there are those who want people to think they are doing something about the problem. And let's be clear—President Obama is firmly planted in the "say anything but do nothing" camp. If there were any doubt about that, he dispelled it when he blocked the Keystone Pipeline and then again this week by embracing the age-old Democratic dodge of blaming gas prices on speculators.

Look, what bothers Americans is not that the President has unpopular views on this issue. Everyone knows he does not really support an all-of-the-above approach to energy. What bothers people is the fact that he pretends as though he does.

What bothers people is the President is blocking one-half of a pipeline one day and showing up at a ribbon cutting for the other half on another day. It is blocking domestic energy and then taking credit for increases that came about as a result of his predecessor's decision. It is pretending that speculators have a big impact on the price of gas when his own staff can't even point to any.

The President said he was different, and a lot of people believed him. But to a growing number of Americans that is just what he has become: just one more politician saying the same things they always say.

This week has been a real clarifier for people when it comes to this President. Whether it is the Buffett tax that would not lower the deficit or a commission on speculators that even the White House says would not lower the price of gas, what people have seen this week is a President who seems a lot more interested in looking like he is solving problems than actually solving them.

For years Washington Democrats have had the same totally rigid opposition to expanding domestic energy exploration. The only people they seem to listen to are extremists. But instead of just stating their position and letting the political chips fall where they may, they pull out the same poll-tested talking points they always do, on the assumption that reporters will just reprint them like it is the first time they have used them and that everybody else will just somehow forget.

But with gas prices at about \$4 a gallon, it is time somebody called them out on it. Ten years ago today Democrats voted down a bill to open a tiny

area of Alaska known as ANWR to drilling. They relied on the nonargument that it would take too long to get the oil to market. That was 10 years ago today. Every Democrat who was asked about it said the same thing, that it would take too long to get the oil to market. I have two pages of quotes from Democrats saying it would take at least 7 to 10 years to get the oil to market.

Well, here we are 10 years later. In some places gas prices are now three times what they were in April 2002. The United States still imports one-half of its oil. ANWR is still off-limits. If we ask Democrats why they oppose more domestic exploration, they will say the same thing they said 10 years ago.

This is precisely the kind of thing this President campaigned against 4 years ago. He was the one who was going to stop kicking the can down the road. He was the one who was going to tackle the problems everybody else was afraid to face. He was the one who was going to rise above petty squabbles and the tired talking points of the past and offer something different. He was going to be a different kind of politician who would usher in a new era of authenticity.

What did the American people get? They got the same gimmicks as before. They got someone whose idea of solving a problem is to give a speech about it or to blame whatever person, place, or thing doesn't happen to poll well that day. What the American people got was a President who absolutely refuses to lead.

It is the same thing they got from the Democrat-controlled Senate, the same tired talking points, the same evasion, the same refusal to address our problems at all.

Yesterday, the chairman of the Budget Committee made it official. For the third year in a row, Senate Democrats will refuse to do the basic work of governance by refusing to offer a budget blueprint for government spending—by the way, as required by the law.

After pledging both to me and his Republican counterpart on the committee that he would, in fact, mark up a budget this year, the chairman of the Budget Committee bowed, once again, to the political pressure and said he would not put his Democratic colleagues at any political risk by asking them to vote on a plan their constituents might not like; that is, not until after the election. The Democratic chairman did suggest, however, that if Europe implodes, he might change his mind.

Well, with all due respect, the statute doesn't say the majority must present a budget if the European economy implodes. It says it must present a budget, period, so that the American people can see how much they are going to be taxed and how their tax dollars are going to be spent.

I am having a hard time thinking of a word to describe the level of leadership we are getting from Democrats in Washington these days—whether it is

the President or the Democratic Senate. Frankly, it is a disgrace. There isn't a single issue I can think of that they are willing to do anything about.

Under this President's watch, Washington has been spending more than \$1 trillion a year more than it takes in. Senate Democrats don't even have the courage to put it all in black and white. They don't have any problem spending it; they just don't want to be on record voting for it. That is what passes for leadership in Washington these days.

Well, something has to give. Our challenges are too urgent. The status quo just would not cut it anymore.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I want to talk about the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. This is the Federal agency that ensures the safety of our Nation's nuclear powerplants.

Specifically, I want to bring attention to the reappointment of Kristine Svinicki—or, rather, the curious lack of action surrounding her reappointment.

Commissioner Svinicki is one of the most respected Commissioners ever to serve at the NRC. She is an experienced and fair-minded regulator whose leadership has earned her the admiration of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. She was confirmed for her first term without a single dissenting vote.

Prior to her 4 years on the Commission, Commissioner Svinicki spent more than two decades in public service working on nuclear safety issues in the Senate, at the Department of Energy, and with the Wisconsin Public Utilities Commission. A nuclear engineer, she is one of the world's foremost authorities on nuclear safety and nuclear power, and a great asset to the Commission.

Last year Commissioner Svinicki had the courage to stand up and blow the whistle on a sitting NRC Chairman, Gregory Jaczko, for bullying subordinates.

According to an Associated Press story from December:

The commissioners told Congress [that] women at the NRC felt particularly intimidated by Jaczko. Commissioner William Magwood—

Who is a Democrat, by the way—told the oversight panel that Jaczko had bullied and belittled at least three female staff members, one of whom told Magwood she was "humiliated" by what Magwood called a raging verbal assault.

This is the Democratic Commissioner on NRC, and here is an excerpt from the inspector general's report:

"Several current and former Commission staff members," it says, "said the Chairman's behavior caused an intimidating work environment. A former Chairman told OIG that the Chairman often yelled at people and [that] his tactics had a negative effect on people. He described the behavior as ruling by intimidation."

Commissioner Svinicki stood up to this guy, who somehow managed to avoid being fired in the wake of all of these revelations, in an effort to preserve the integrity of the agency and to protect the career staffers who were the subject of the Chairman's tactics. Now, for some mysterious reason, she is being held up for renomination.

The FBI completed its background check on Commissioner Svinicki 15 months ago. Her ethics agreement was approved around the same time. She has been ready to go for more than a year. There is no legitimate reason for Commissioner Svinicki not to have been renominated and reconfirmed by now. Any further delay is unacceptable.

If Commissioner Svinicki isn't renominated by June 30, NRC will lose one of its finest members, the Commission's work will be impaired, and we will be forced to conclude that the reason is related to her honorable actions as a whistleblower—that she is being held up in retaliation for speaking up against a rogue Chairman who bullies his subordinates.

There is a reason Congress charged five Commissioners with the responsibility to protect public health and safety. Ensuring the safety of our Nation's nuclear powerplants is serious business. So this morning I am calling on the White House to renominate Commissioner Svinicki today to ensure that this well-qualified and widely respected woman remains in place for another term.

The public is best served by a commission that is fully functional. There should be no question in anyone's mind that it will be fully functional. We cannot wait any longer for this nomination.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2011—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1925, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 1925, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the first hour will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first 30 minutes and the Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.