

unanimously that the letter they talked about was a client secret and that Mr. Helmick acted in good faith. So those criticisms don't really stand the test of time in that way.

Again, I thank Senator LEAHY and the Judiciary Committee for moving as quickly as they could move. This is a difficult time. At times, there is Senate dysfunction and the minority party blocks or slow-walks some of these nominees.

Jeffrey Helmick has been supported by a bipartisan, rigorous committee of 17 who come from the Southern District of Ohio and who help to choose nominees for the Northern District of Ohio. I spoke personally with all but 1 or 2 of those 17 Republicans and Democrats around whom consensus was formed in support of Jeffrey Helmick. They think he is an outstanding lawyer, jurist, and potential Federal judge. The other Federal judges in the western region of the Northern District Court in Ohio, which is out of Toledo—including a judge nominated by President George W. Bush—enthusiastically support Jeffrey Helmick.

Senator GRASSLEY said he was a controversial nominee. He is only controversial in the Senate Judiciary Committee and among some of my colleagues. He is not controversial in Ohio, where they know Jeffrey Helmick the best. He is not controversial in the Toledo bar. He is not controversial among people who know Jeffrey Helmick and who have watched him perform his service to his community and watched him professionally and the way that he does his job as a lawyer in Toledo, OH, in Federal court or in State court. So the fact is, he is not a controversial nominee. He is only a controversial nominee in the U.S. Senate and in some places in Washington, DC. But we know he is qualified, and we know he is ready to serve.

I ask my colleagues to vote today to confirm Jeffrey Helmick to the U.S. Federal court in the Northern District of Ohio.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Jeffrey Helmick was rated "well qualified" by a substantial majority of the ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary. In his 22-year legal career as a litigator in private practice, Mr. Helmick has tried approximately 40 cases to verdict or judgment. Currently a principal at his law firm, Mr. Helmick has the strong support of his home State Senators who have spoken in support of this nomination. He was also voted out of the Judiciary Committee nearly 3 months ago by a bipartisan majority. Given his distinguished record in private practice and his bipartisan support, I trust that he will be confirmed.

Some have chosen to criticize Mr. Helmick for his role as court-appointed defense counsel. Those who criticize him may not understand how our justice system works. Our legal system is an adversary system, predicated upon legal advocacy for both sides. That is

what Mr. Helmick did at the request of the court.

No nominee should be disqualified for representing clients zealously. At his confirmation hearing to become the Chief Justice of the United States, John Roberts made the point:

"[I]t's a tradition of the American Bar that goes back before the founding of the country that lawyers are not identified with the positions of their clients. The most famous example probably was John Adams, who represented the British soldiers charged in the Boston Massacre. He did that for a reason, because he wanted to show that the Revolution in which he was involved was not about overturning the rule of law, it was about vindicating the rule of law.

Our Founders thought that they were not being given their rights under the British system to which they were entitled, and by representing the British soldiers, he helped show that what they were about was defending the rule of law, not undermining it, and that principle, that you don't identify the lawyer with the particular views of the client, or the views that the lawyer advances on behalf of the client, is critical to the fair administration of justice."

Mr. Helmick was appointed by the court to represent a defendant and he had an ethical obligation to advocate zealously for that client. That was what he did, and he should not now be punished for doing his duty.

In addition, there has apparently been an objection to Mr. Helmick's handling of an ethical dilemma where he refused to disclose a client secret. This is particularly odd because the Ohio Court of Appeals who heard the case stated that Mr. Helmick "should be commended for his professional and ethical behavior in a very difficult situation." In addition, although a divided Ohio Supreme Court ultimately ordered disclosure of the letter based on a balancing test in a 4-3 decision, the Court nevertheless agreed unanimously with Mr. Helmick that the letter was a client secret. Indeed, the Ohio Supreme Court stated that Mr. Helmick acted in good faith.

Let us confirm this good man and not try to tarnish his distinguished reputation. I join Senator BROWN and Senator PORTMAN in urging a vote for confirmation.

I yield back the remaining time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, will the Senate Advise and Consent to the nomination of Jeffrey J. Helmick, of Ohio, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Akaka	Gillibrand	Murray
Alexander	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Portman
Bennet	Inouye	Pryor
Bingaman	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Blumenthal	Kerry	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown (MA)	Kohl	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Landrieu	Schumer
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Snowe
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Tester
Collins	Lugar	Udall (CO)
Conrad	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Coons	McCaskill	Warner
Corker	Menendez	Webb
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—36

Ayotte	Enzi	McCain
Barrasso	Grassley	McConnell
Blunt	Hatch	Moran
Boozman	Heller	Paul
Burr	Hoeven	Risch
Chambliss	Hutchison	Roberts
Coats	Inhofe	Rubio
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Crapo	Kyl	Toomey
DeMint	Lee	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Kirk Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislation session.

AGRICULTURE REFORM, FOOD, AND JOBS ACT OF 2012—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

WISCONSIN RECALL ELECTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the results of last night's recall election in the State of Wisconsin. After nearly 2 years of heated political debate, the people of Wisconsin made it clear last night that they are not suffering from buyers' remorse. Two years ago, they elected leaders committed to solving their State's budget crisis. Last night, they stood by those leaders for making the hard choices that turned Wisconsin's deficit into a surplus.

Yesterday's election was very important. It was important because of the example it provides to the Nation and the world of how a democracy should work, with citizens who disagree vehemently about policy nonetheless coming together to accept the results of an open and fair election.

It was important because of the message it sends with respect to public employee unions. Last night's results serve as yet another reminder that the

American people want serious answers to our Nation's fiscal problems, and they are tired of having labor unions dictate the terms of our economic recovery.

Scott Walker never hid his agenda. He ran for office on a platform of reducing State spending, and Governor Walker immediately began addressing the State's problems after taking office. So what egregious acts did Governor Walker commit during his first months in office to trigger this recall? First of all, his budget repair bill actually required Wisconsin State employees to contribute more to their pensions. Prior to passage of the Walker budget, many State employees did not contribute to their retirement benefits.

You heard that right. Facing a massive State deficit, Governor Walker determined that Wisconsin taxpayers should no longer foot the entire bill for the generous pensions of public employees. In other words, he asked State public employees to do what private sector employees have done for a generation, contribute to their own retirement plan.

Next, he required that State employees pay a larger share of their health care premiums. The new law requires State employees to pay 12.6 percent of their health care premiums. By contrast, Federal employees pay at least 25 percent of their health care premiums.

To put these reforms in terms that his liberal detractors might appreciate, the Governor was just asking for a little shared sacrifice. Instead of pitching in, however, the State's public employees pitched a fit. Then, most significantly, Governor Walker reformed a collective bargaining system for State employees. Above all else, it was this decision that triggered the meltdown in Wisconsin last year and ultimately led to the recall.

Facing the possibility that a State might successfully limit union influence and excesses, national labor groups turned Wisconsin into the frontlines of labor agitation. I know some have tried to give me a reputation of being anti-union. That is ridiculous because I was raised in a union movement. I held a card for basically 10 years as I worked as a skilled tradesman in the construction industry.

But, in fact, I am not opposed to unionization if that is what employees truly want. I simply believe workers should be free to choose whether to unionize and do so in an environment that is free of coercion or intimidation.

Once unions are formed, I do not believe they should enjoy disproportionate bargaining power in their negotiations with management. That said, unions of public sector employees present a unique set of issues for taxpayers and voters. Public sector unions have inherent advantages in negotiations that private sector unions do not. Most notably, public sector unions use their substantial influence in State politics to elect the very officials with

whom they will be negotiating their union contracts.

As the academic Dan DiSalvo and many others have recognized, when the Ford Motor Company negotiates with the American Auto Workers, it is an arm's length negotiation, with both parties having an interest in the ongoing success of the firm. Yet public employee unions effectively negotiate with themselves. There is no distance between them and the public officials they helped to elect and expect pay-back from.

Franklin Roosevelt understood that because public employee unions could elect their own boss, "the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service."

George Meany, the first head of the AFL CIO, knew this relationship made it "impossible to bargain collectively with the government."

These critical points are lost on today's Democratic Party, which increasingly depends on the foot soldiers and largesse provided by these unions. As a result, we have an untenable situation, where public sector unions are, in effect, negotiating against the taxpayers. After all, their salaries and benefits come at the expense of the taxpayers.

The fiscal impact of these rigged negotiations is most evidence in States with the biggest budget problems. California faces a budget deficit of nearly \$16 billion this year alone. It has \$65 billion in unfunded liabilities in its teachers' pension system and \$136 billion in unfunded liabilities for its largest city and county employee pension system.

The Illinois public employee pension system now has \$83 billion in unfunded liabilities. So far, comprehensive efforts to reform these systems and bring down costs have been stymied for one simple reason: Politicians in those States do not have the courage of people such as Gov. Scott Walker.

Our folks here who support the unions ought to be happy this is happening because they themselves may not be able to accomplish this. The courageous Governors, such as Governor Walker, can, and in the end they are better off as Democrats because they have some reasonable approach toward some of these enormous problems that are affecting our States.

Instead of reforming their systems, these States have more often opted to raise taxes to attempt to eliminate the shortfalls. Yet most of the States with the highest unfunded liabilities already have higher-than-average tax rates.

Despite their many faults, private sector unions have a stake in the U.S. economy and the profitability of American businesses. Indeed, they have a built-in incentive to ensure continued economic growth. True enough, they do not always act in accordance with that interest, which is probably the biggest reason why today less than 7 percent of private sector workers belong to a union. But, nevertheless, they need

some level of continued growth in order to further their existence.

Public sector unions are an entirely different animal with a completely different set of interests. Unlike private sector businesses, State governments are not required to turn a profit. State officials are accountable to voters, but, unlike stockholders, most voters do not have the same expectations to see returns on their investments.

That being the case, public sector unions lack the same incentive to see their negotiating counterparts succeed. There are no forces limiting their incentive to simply maximize benefits for their membership, regardless of what it might cost their employers. In order to succeed, even the most ambitious and shrewd private sector union needs to account for its employer's ability to grow and expand.

Public sector unions are not subject to these sorts of limitations. That is probably why they have been so successful. Today, about 37 percent of government employees belong to a union, which is five times the unionization rate in the private sector. So it is easy to see why Big Labor pulled out all the stops to recall Governor Walker. Public sector unions are the future of the labor movement. Because of the long, steady decline of private sector unions, Big Labor knows it must maintain the strength of public sector unions in order to remain relevant. Yet at the same time, the States that employ them face incredibly difficult budgetary decisions in the coming years and I believe without the ability to be able to get them under control because of the controls of the major parties.

Let's be clear about what it would mean if public employee unions prevailed in these fights. It means that instead of reducing spending, States will have to raise taxes. It means that instead of eliminating government waste, States will have to maintain the status quo, and, ultimately, it means States will have to make a choice between paying their bills on the one hand and growing their economies on the other.

Going forward, it is absolutely vital that more States follow Wisconsin's example. States should not have to choose between educating their kids and paying the full freight of public employee pensions. During such difficult economic times, they should not have to raise taxes in order to keep their employees from having to pay a reasonable share of their own benefits. In short, States should have the ability to balance budgetary priorities without being thwarted at every turn by public employee unions that are only concerned with their own interests.

Last night and this morning, the pundits were in full gear, dissecting the results in Wisconsin and prognosticating about the election's long-term impact. To me, this exercise in democracy demonstrates two things. First, the failure of the unions and the national Democratic Party was not a failure of messaging or money. It was a failure of ideas.

Richard Weaver once wrote that ideas have consequences. That is absolutely true. The ideas that Governor Walker proposed were reasonable ones that addressed a critical fiscal situation without undermining essential services in his State. Second, it is clear the Democratic Party of Franklin Roosevelt, a party of blue-collar, private sector workers, has morphed into a party dominated by white-collar, public workers.

The American people, beginning with Wisconsin, are rejecting this Democratic Party and the priorities of its most influential stakeholders. The silent majority that gets up every day and goes to work in the private sector is losing its appetite for allowing public employee unions to dictate the Nation's fiscal policy.

There is one video going around of an opponent of Governor Walker's near tears and saying that democracy was denied tonight. Au contraire. Democracy is alive and well in Wisconsin and around the Nation, and the American people are going to have their say. Last night's results should serve as a reminder of the need to face our perilous fiscal situation honestly and squarely.

It should also remind us that the American people will not punish leaders who stand and do the right thing, even in the face of powerful and vengeful opposition.

My hope is that the experience in Wisconsin will be replicated around the country.

To borrow from one of Wisconsin's patron saints, Vince Lombardi, "Winning is a habit. Unfortunately, so is losing."

The unions have now had three bites at the apple since Governor Walker was first elected. Each time they have come up short. By prevailing, Governor Walker and Republicans in Wisconsin should stiffen the spines of conservatives who might have been previously unwilling to take on these public sector unions—public employee unions, if you will. By losing, those unions have shown themselves to be increasingly desperate and out of touch with the sentiments and concerns of everyday citizens and taxpayers.

Mr. President, I commend Governor Walker and his efforts to secure a prosperous future for the citizens of Wisconsin. His courage in the face of significant opposition is a model of statesmanship, and I look forward to working with him for many years to come.

Look, we all know the public sector unions have been out of control for a long time. Throughout the country, benefits paid to public employees have outpaced those in the private sector, and that includes Federal Government employees where the average pay is \$80,000 a year compared to \$50,000 for the private sector. We all know that is justified in the eyes of some because it is "so expensive" to live in Washington, DC, or nearby. Why is it that expensive? Because we have built the

Federal Government at all costs, and we allow it to spend and spend rather than find more ways of living within our means.

There is a part of me that wishes we could move a number of these agencies out of Washington and put them out with the real people throughout our country who have to live within their means, and who don't have huge Washington, DC, salaries, which are huge to the average person, but not always to the people who work in this very expensive town. There they can mingle with the everyday people in this country who are paying the freight.

By the way, we all know that according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the bottom 51 percent of all households don't pay any income tax or freight. There is a method in that madness, it seems to me. But it is the wrong method. Sooner or later we are all going to have to help pull the wagon and not just sit in the wagon and take advantage of everybody else. It ought to be done on a reasonable and decent basis.

But, once again, we all know the public sector unions are out of control. The States where they have the biggest problems are the States where the public sector unions have dominated their elected politicians over and over and over again, so the elected politicians are afraid to take them on, afraid to do the things that would straighten out their States, as Governor Walker has said.

Instead of finding a lot of fault with Governor Walker, if I were a Democrat, I would be saying: Thank God, somebody stood up. The fact is he has stood up, and he should be given credit for that not condemnation.

Frankly, I am very proud of the people of Wisconsin for standing up the way they did. I think other States are going to have to do that, too, or there are going to be problems like we have never seen before. We can name the States that have the problems. In almost every case they are blue States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it has become sort of a personal tradition of mine to come to the floor each week to report on the status of the dangers to our Earth and climate from the relentless carbon pollution that we have to face, and this is a bellwether week. This is our first week back in session in the Senate since our break last week, and during that time we have had a first. There were reports from the atmospheric measuring station that the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere broke 400 parts per million.

The Christian Science Monitor has reported on this, stating monitoring stations across the Arctic this spring are measuring more than 400 parts per million of the heat-trapping gas carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The number

isn't quite a surprise because it has been rising at an accelerating pace.

Years ago, it passed the 350 parts-per-million mark that many scientists say is the highest safe level for carbon dioxide. It now stands globally at 395.

The story continues, saying it has been at least 800,000 years—probably more—since Earth saw carbon dioxide levels in the 400s, according to the climate scientists involved. They point out that the Arctic is the leading indicator in global warming, both in carbon dioxide in the air and in its effects.

Pieter Tans, a senior NOAA scientist, says this is the first time the entire Arctic has been that high. He calls a 400 number "depressing."

The Christian Science Monitor also reported that global carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels hit a record high of 34.8 billion tons released in 2011.

Another report from the Sustainable Business News said readings are coming in at 400 parts per million and higher all over the Arctic. They have been recorded in Alaska, Greenland, Norway, Iceland, and even Mongolia; and 400 parts per million is beyond what scientists consider "safe" in terms of human society.

It goes on saying in reporting of a 2009 paper in the journal *Science*, researchers concluded "the only time in the last 20 million years that we find evidence for carbon dioxide levels similar to the [then] modern level of 387 parts per million was 15 to 20 million years ago, when the planet was dramatically different."

It also says:

How different? It says that "Global temperatures were 5 to 10 degrees Fahrenheit higher than they are today. The sea level was 75 to 120 feet higher than it is today, there was no permanent sea ice cap in the Arctic and very little ice on Antarctica and Greenland."

According to NASA's leading climate scientist, James Hansen, "that level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable, and 20 to 50 percent of the planet species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk."

So this was a somber benchmark to have passed. As I have said before, we have had the experiences—human-kind—of living within a bandwidth between 190 and 300 parts per million of carbon dioxide for about 800,000 years, which is going back into the very early days of our species—even before then.

I think the famous Lucy, the prehistoric human, was 150,000, 160,000 years ago. So this goes way back before then. We started agriculture about 10,000 years ago. Before then, we were picking things off of trees and hunting small animals. We weren't even farming yet.

When we go back 800,000 years, that is basically for as long as we can imagine on this planet, without going back into previous geologic eras. That has been the bandwidth—800,000 years, 190 to 300 parts per million. We rocketed

out of that and blew through 350 several years ago, and now we have gone through 400, at least in the Arctic, and that is where we will go global-wide if this continues. There is no reason it will not continue because we keep increasing the amount of carbon pollution we emit into the atmosphere.

I regret I have to come here every week and continue to bring grim news, but that is the fact, and the day will come when we are going to have to deal with it. I hope it is not too late for us when we finally get around to it. There is the prospect that it is too late because once the carbon is up in the atmosphere, it continues to do its work.

The campaign that has been deployed to try to diminish the science of climate change, to try to confuse the public, and try to create a disabling measure of doubt has been reprehensible. It is based on falsehood. It is steeped in impropriety and special influence. It is inhibiting the ability of the Congress to do its job for the American people—not because there is any real doubt about the science but because the special interests that benefit from the status quo have entirely inappropriate levels of influence in this body, and they are insisting either directly or through phony front organizations, such as the Heartland Institute, which has recently put itself in jeopardy by comparing people who think climate change is actually happening to the Unabomber—now, there is a responsible public debate. That blew up in their faces because they had gone too far. The lying, the phony science, taking money from the polluters, and the phony operation they ran didn't go too far. The comparison to Ted Kazinski, the Kazinski billboard was that one step too far.

There is some pushback on that, but that doesn't lift the burden on the polluting industries that are manipulating and maneuvering in Washington to prevent us from doing what needs to be done and doing so through false and phony organizations. Even if the Heartland Institute is gone, there are plenty of others, and the process continues.

I think it is going to be a very harsh judgment that history brings to bear on this generation of Representatives and Senators that, as a body, we were willing to step away from our duty when the signal was clear. We were willing to listen to the siren song of special interests. We put their money in our pockets. We put our consciences on hold. We put the blinders on about the facts, and we marched forward foolishly when we should have been preparing.

I am going to continue to do this. I hope the point comes soon when we can begin to realize that putting a price on carbon pollution, developing American clean energy that creates American clean energy jobs and begin to take care of this world as it increasingly sends us warnings about the damage that we are doing is the right and wise and proper thing to do.

With that, I yield the floor.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

CALIFORNIA CASUALTIES

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to 27 servicemembers from California or based in California who have died while serving our country in Operation Enduring Freedom since March 1, 2012. This brings to 351 the number of servicemembers either from California or based in California who have been killed while serving our country in Afghanistan. This represents 18 percent of all U.S. deaths in Afghanistan.

Cpl Conner T. Lowry, 24, of Chicago, IL, died March 1 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Corporal Lowry was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 11th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

SPC Edward J. Acosta, 21, of Hesperia, CA, died March 5 in La Jolla, CA, of injuries sustained December 3, 2011, when his vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device in Wardak province, Afghanistan. Specialist Acosta was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 5th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 1st Armored Division, Fort Bliss, TX.

CPT Francis D. Imlay, 31, of Vacaville, CA, died March 28 from injuries received in an accident involving an F 15 aircraft near a base in Southwest Asia. Captain Imlay was assigned to the 391st Fighter Squadron, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID.

Cpl Michael J. Palacio, 23, of Lake Elsinore, CA, died March 29 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Corporal Palacio was assigned to Headquarters Battalion, 3rd Marine Division, III Marine Expeditionary Force, Okinawa, Japan.

Cpl Roberto Cazarez, 24, of Harbor City, CA, died March 30 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Corporal Cazarez was assigned to the 1st Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

Cpl Alex Martinez, 21, of Elgin, IL, died April 5 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Corporal Martinez was assigned to the 1st Combat Engineer Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

CN Trevor J. Stanley, 22, of Virginia Beach, VA, died April 7 while deployed to Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti. Constructionman Stanley, a Seabee, was assigned to Naval Mobile Construction Battalion 3, homeported in Port Hueneme, CA.

LCpl Ramon T. Kaipat, 22, of Tacoma, WA, died April 11 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Lance Corporal Kaipat was assigned to 1st Light Ar-

mored Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

CW2 Nicholas S. Johnson, 27, of San Diego, CA, died April 19 in Helmand province, Afghanistan, when his Black Hawk (UH 60) crashed. Chief Warrant Officer Johnson was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 25th Aviation Regiment, 25th Infantry Division, Wheeler Army Airfield, HI.

SSgt Joseph H. Fankhauser, 30, of Mason, TX, died April 22 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Staff Sergeant Fankhauser was assigned to 7th Engineer Support Battalion, 1st Marine Logistics Group, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

SPC Manuel J. Vasquez, 22, of West Sacramento, CA, died April 24 in Paktika province, Afghanistan. Specialist Vasquez was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 28th Infantry Regiment, 172nd Infantry Brigade, Grafenwoehr, Germany.

SGT Moises J. Gonzalez, 29, of Huntington Beach, CA, died April 25 in Balkh province, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when his vehicle rolled over. Sergeant Gonzalez was assigned to the 509th Combat Service Support Company, 504th Battlefield Surveillance Brigade, Fort Hood, TX.

SSG Andrew T. Britton-Mihalo, 25, of Simi Valley, CA, died April 25 in Kandahar province, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained from small arms fire. Staff Sergeant Britton-Mihalo was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group, Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

LT Christopher E. Mosko, 28, of Pittsford, NY, died April 26 while conducting combat operations in Nawa district, Ghazni province, Afghanistan. Lieutenant Mosko was assigned as a Navy Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Platoon Commander to Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force, Afghanistan. He was stationed at EOD Mobile Unit 3, San Diego, CA.

MSgt Scott E. Pruitt, 38, of Gautier, MS, died April 28 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Master Sergeant Pruitt was assigned to I Marine Expeditionary Force Headquarters Group, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.

PFC Christian R. SanNicolas, 20, of Anaheim, CA, died April 28 in Kandahar province, Afghanistan, of injuries sustained when his vehicle encountered an improvised explosive device. Private First Class SanNicolas was assigned to 1st Battalion, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, NC.

Sgt John P. Huling, 25, of West Chester, OH, died May 6 while conducting combat operations in Helmand province, Afghanistan. Sergeant Huling was assigned to 7th Engineer Support Battalion, 1st Marine Logistics Group, I Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Pendleton, CA.