

Mr. HATCH (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. INHOFE (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Ex.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—34

Alexander	Grassley	Portman
Barrasso	Heller	Risch
Blunt	Hoeven	Roberts
Boozman	Hutchison	Rubio
Burr	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Johanns	Shelby
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Cochran	Kyl	Toomey
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	McConnell	Wicker
Crapo	Moran	
Enzi	Paul	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Coburn	Hatch	Inhofe
--------	-------	--------

NOT VOTING—7

Ayotte	Kirk	Murkowski
DeMint	Lee	
Graham	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 34, 3 Senators responded "present." Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. COBURN. We just disallowed one of the best candidates for the appellate court in my 8 years since I have been in the Senate. Magistrate Judge Bob Bacharach is a stellar individual rated "very highly qualified" by the American Bar Association. What has happened is we are in the position today because of games that are being played, political games.

Let me just put into the RECORD what is going on. There are three judges ahead of Bob Bacharach in line. We have had a Leahy-Thurmond rule for some 20 years. I have been quoted saying I think it is a stupid rule. But the background is that protecting the prerogative of the Senate is one of the

most important things the majority leader can do.

What we have seen happen with the lack of agreement this last holiday season over the moving forward of judges and their approval was the unconstitutional usurpation of power by the President of the United States in the appointment, during our pro forma sessions, of four individuals, one to CFPB and three to the NLRB.

Quite frankly, if we look at what Madison wrote in Federalist 51:

The great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same branch of government consists in giving to those who administer each branch the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachment of the others. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place.

So started the saga in January of this past year, where the reaction of my colleagues on my side of the aisle was to shut down, in response to the President's move, all circuit court confirmations.

I stood in my caucus and fought that. I thought it was the wrong action then. I still think it would have been the wrong action. But I convinced my caucus not to go that direction. To do that, I agreed I would consent to the Leahy-Thurmond rule in this election cycle. But I hope this is the last election cycle we use the Leahy-Thurmond rule.

Because on the other side of the constitutional issues is that a duly elected President does have the right to have their nominees considered, whether I agree with them or not. To prove this, that this was a stunt rather than anything other than that, and Bob Bacharach becomes the pawn in that, is that we had an agreement on judges. Then we had cloture filed on fourteen district court judges, of which there was no real controversy.

All of those district court judges, after that cloture was filed on them and then withdrawn, have henceforth been approved. To the American public, the game is politics and not policy for our country. To me, it saddens me. It frustrates me that we are at this state because it is not a whole lot different than what we see in the playground at a kindergarten.

The person who most has spoken in favor of the Leahy-Thurmond rule is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Yet we find this impasse today. So what we ought to all do, every Member of the Senate and the Judiciary Committee during the break after this election, is work together to try to resolve this so this does not happen to any other President and does not do damage to the Senate and the integrity of the Senate and the game on judges. The President gets elected, with their home State Senators, they make a selection. We should not use the filibuster, unless a judge is highly questionable or biased in their viewpoint.

I regret that we are in this position. I think this was just a vote to delay

Bob Bacharach's eventual confirmation. If President Obama wins the election, I fully expect Judge Bob Bacharach will be approved. If he does not win the election, I plan on standing and fighting for this judge for this same position under a Republican President because he is exactly what we want on a court, someone who is right down the middle in terms of what the law means, what the Constitution means. He has stellar intellectual capabilities, and he has the qualities we all would want, both from the right and the left, as a fair decider of the facts. That is what we want in judges. He will make an ideal appellate judge, regardless of his political affiliation.

If we cannot get there then what that says is the partisan politics of today, as everybody outside Washington recognizes, is killing our country.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

CYBERSECURITY ACT OF 2012

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 3414 is agreed to and the clerk will report the measure.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3414) to enhance the security and resiliency of the cyber and communications infrastructure of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of debate only on S. 3414, and that this will go forward until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, July 31; further, that at 2:15 p.m. on that date, Tuesday, I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Just a question through the Chair to the majority leader. I had planned to make a statement on Judge Bacharach, and the Senator is saying we will have debate only. Will that preclude a unanimous consent for speaking as in morning business?

Mr. REID. The Senator can do that. It is totally appropriate.

Mr. COBURN. I thank the Senator.

I have no objection.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, if the majority leader is finished, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, if I could ask my friend to withhold for a brief moment.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. That is fine.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that Senator COBURN has been waiting around for a while to talk.

The Senator is OK waiting?

Mr. COBURN. Yes.

Mr. REID. OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Thank you, Madam President.

I come to the floor this evening to talk about an amendment I have filed to the Cybersecurity Act, S. 3414. This is the fourth time I have filed this amendment, and it is not on the Cybersecurity Act per se, although it does address energy use, which is one of the critical challenges we face as we are trying to address cybersecurity in this country.

This is an amendment that is the substance of S. 1000, the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, of which the other sponsor is Senator ROB PORTMAN, and he is a cosponsor on this amendment.

What the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act and the amendment I filed does is create a national energy efficiency strategy for the United States. So this amendment is the same language Senator PORTMAN and I filed to the Bring Jobs Home Act and the Middle Class Tax Cut Act, and it is one we are going to continue to file because we think it is important for this amendment and this legislation to have an opportunity for a vote from this entire Senate because we think this is bipartisan legislation that has broad support among our colleagues.

This legislation is based on two important premises I have already spoken to in the Chamber: first, that the American public desperately wants Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to address this Nation's energy needs; and, second, that energy efficiency is the fastest, cheapest way to meet our energy challenges. Not only does it help us develop a strategy around energy, but it is a strategy that can be supported whether you live in New England, as I do, whether you live in the West, whether you live in the South. It is a strategy that is important whether you support fossil fuels—oil and gas—whether you support nuclear, or whether you support wind and solar. We all benefit from energy efficiency. It is also a strategy that creates thousands of good jobs.

There is evidence that the American public wants to see the Senate act on energy efficiency legislation. I think that evidence is overwhelming because last week I started an online campaign asking people to sign a petition calling on Senate leadership to bring this bill to the floor. The text of the petition is what we see here—small print so it is

hard to read, but it asks people to support the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill.

I just wish to read a section of it. It says:

The Shaheen-Portman Act would help make the United States a global leader in the fastest and cheapest method we have for addressing our energy needs, energy efficiency. Energy efficiency is within our grasp. It uses proven technology that we can manufacture here at home to lower energy costs across all sectors of our economy.

In just a matter of days, we have already collected over 4,600 signatures from supporters across the country, and that number continues to grow. Anyone interested in signing the petition and in learning more about the many benefits of energy efficiency can easily do so by visiting my Web site at shaheen.senate.gov.

While drafting the bill, Senator PORTMAN and I met with a number of stakeholders so we could better understand the obstacles the private sector faces when they are trying to deploy energy-efficient technology. So we had discussions with people from energy-intensive companies, from trade groups, from those representing the real estate community, from environmental advocates and from financing organizations.

The feedback we received about ways to remove these barriers and drive the adoption of energy-efficient technologies became the basis for this legislation. As a result, we have a bill that provides a variety of low-cost tools that will speed this Nation's transition to a more energy-efficient economy.

The bill addresses three major areas of U.S. energy use: residential and commercial buildings, which consume 40 percent of all energy used in the country; the industrial sector, which consumes more energy than any other sector of the U.S. economy; and the Federal Government, which is the country's single biggest user of energy.

Highlights of the bill include: establishing advanced building codes for voluntary residential and commercial buildings to cut energy use. I would emphasize that those codes are voluntary. We worked with the real estate and the building industries on those codes.

Second, the legislation helps manufacturers finance and implement energy-efficient production technologies and practices because that is one of the biggest obstacles to retrofitting buildings for energy efficiency.

Third, the legislation would require the Federal Government to adopt better building standards and smart metering technology.

Our legislation is bipartisan. In addition to the thousands of signatures on this petition, it has support from well over 200 businesses, environmental groups, think tanks, and trade association. Those groups include: The National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Environmental Defense Fund, busi-

nesses such as Johnson Controls, Honeywell, United Technologies Corporation.

This broad coalition of supporters recognizes that the legislation is an easy first step that will make our economy more competitive and our Nation more secure by reducing our dependence on foreign oil and still meeting the demand for energy saving technologies for individuals and businesses alike.

I think it is important to point out that there are real economic benefits. A recent study by policy experts at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy found that the legislation will achieve savings for consumers and businesses. Specifically, their study found that by 2020, the bill could save consumers \$4 billion a year once it is enacted. It would add 80,000 jobs to the economy.

In a time when we are worried about growing the economy, when we are worried about the fragile recovery, this is the kind of legislation that will allow us to create good jobs with off-the-shelf technologies. With the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency bill, the Senate has an opportunity to provide the American people with exactly what they want, an effective bipartisan approach to addressing this Nation's energy needs that also creates jobs and grows the economy. I hope we will be able to persuade leadership and my colleagues that this is legislation that merits full debate and a vote on the floor and that we will be able to bring S. 1000 or this amendment to the floor for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume, and that when I finish, the Senator from Ohio be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

APOLOGY

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I wished to come to the floor to talk about two or three subjects. The first is to issue an apology to the majority leader. I do not apologize for my frustration with this place, but occasionally my words are harsh and inaccurate. This past week, I used words that were inappropriate in describing his actions in the Senate, and for that I offer a public apology.

I do not apologize for how I think the Senate is being run and the damage that I think is being done to the country, but as an individual, he has a very difficult time and I understand that and to him I ask his forgiveness.

FISCAL CLIFF

Madam President, if I was coming to the floor with intelligence about an imminent threat to our national security, Americans would demand that our government and this body take immediate action. If an Army was on our border,

if missiles were about to be launched at our territory or if there were a terrorist plot in motion, doing anything less than uniting in the face of that threat and taking decisive action would be seen as cowardice and foolishness.

Yet that is precisely where we are today, which brings me to my frustration with the majority leader. The threat, though, does not come from traditional armies or terrorists, the threat comes from our unsustainable spending and this body's refusal to unite and take action. It is not just the conservatives who are sounding the alarm, the warnings are coming from our military leaders, diplomats, and statesmen on both sides of the aisle, as well as the international financial community.

ADM Mike Mullen, the retired Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, while he was still Chairman, said the greatest threat to this Nation is its debt. We have done not one thing since January to address that problem. We are having spats over judges. We are having spats over all the small things. But the greatest imminent danger to our country, we are doing nothing about. I believe we have less than 2 to 5 years to act to make a significant change in our path.

No one knows when this Nation will cross the point of no return. We may have already. But there is a point where we will lose control of our own destiny. It is coming. The fact that the Senate, this year, has had fewer votes than at any time since 1947, according to the Congressional Research Service—why is that? Because we have a political year. We don't want to take votes. We don't want to have to explain to our constituencies why we voted yea or nay on something. So the whole goal is to not vote.

Ultimately, the whole goal is to not address the very pressing issues facing this country. What do you think is going to happen to the Defense Department with no Defense authorization bill? They are in la-la land. Where do they go? We are not going to give them the direction with which to spend the largest discretionary amount of money in our government—\$600 billion. They are going to be coasting, flying by the seat of their pants. They are not going to have radar or anything. There is not going to be any stealth. Yet we refuse to do that.

We have spent a larger amount of time in quorum calls—37 percent of the time this year—nothing but quorum calls. Less than one-third an amount of the time available to the Senate has actually been on the business associated with the country, and most of the business we have addressed isn't this critical risk in front of our country.

Last week, Vanguard, the largest private owner of U.S. bonds—\$186 billion they own of U.S. bonds—said we have until 2016 to act. If we don't act, we will go into a debt spiral. Bond investors will revolt, they will drive up

prices—drive up interest rates and drop prices. We already know from CBO that the entitlement programs are on the brink of insolvency. Social Security disability—we have added 3.2 million people to those rolls since January 1, 2009. That system will be bankrupt in less than 18 months; 8½ million people depend on that. And there has not been a comment from the leadership in addressing a trust fund that will be out of money in less than 18 months.

Our Founders believed that republics that lived beyond their means don't survive. They talked about it. History is full of examples. Europe is reminding us of that today. The euro in Europe, as we know it, is on its deathbed. Every month, every week there is a new set of resuscitative efforts that are not working. What is the real problem? The real problem is they spent money they didn't have on things they didn't need.

If you want to see what America will look like in 2 or 3 years, just look at Europe. Look at the demonstrations, look at the crying out of the masses to say: How did we get here? The pain of fixing it is too great. That is why we should be addressing our problems now.

The reason America looks good is that we are the least wilted rose in the bud vase. The only reason we look good is because they look so bad. We are at 103 percent debt to GDP. It is costing us at least 1.2 million jobs in new job creation every year. We are at historical interest rates. Our interest costs per year would be over \$1 trillion. The interest rates are falsely low because of what the Federal Reserve has done.

The price to pay for that is coming in the future. What is the contrast? I ask seniors all the time: Do you think we ought to save Medicare?

They say: Yes.

I say: Do you think we ought to save Medicare just like it is.

They say: Yes.

I say: If we save Medicare just like it is, do you know that your grandchildren will have a standard of living that will be one-third lower than yours was?

Then they say: No.

America is used to doing hard things. It is just that the Senate right now will not do the hard things, will not come together, will not make the sacrifices. We value our positions more than we value the country we live in. The consequences are showing.

We have an 8.2-percent unemployment rate. If we use the same statistics we used in 1980, our unemployment rate is above 9.6 percent—just measuring it the same way we did it 32 years ago. Now that we are measuring it differently, we don't see the real impact.

Today we are dangerously close to a global great depression. Let's remember the last time the world saw a great depression. That depression was a leading cause of the global war that killed 60 million people—2.5 percent of the world's population. Do we dare go down

that path by putting politics ahead of principle and policy?

Fortunately, many of our leaders see this threat and are calling on us to take action. Consider this exchange between former Secretary of State James Baker and current Secretary of State Hillary Clinton last month on "The Charlie Rose Show":

Secretary Baker:

I know one thing. We are broke. We can't afford wars anymore. We can't afford a lot of things, and the biggest threat facing the country today is not some threat from the outside—Iran, nuclear weapons, or anything else—it's our economy. We better darn well get our economic house in order because the strength of our Nation has always depended upon our economy. You can't be strong politically, militarily, or diplomatically if you are not strong economically.

He is giving us a foreshadow of what is coming.

Secretary Clinton said this in response:

Well, amen to that, because I have had to go around the world the last 3½ years reassuring many leaders both in the governments and the business sectors of a lot of countries that the United States was moving forward economically, that we were not ceding our leadership position, and that we are as powerful as ever. But we recognized that we had to put our economic house in order.

If former Secretary Baker and Secretary Clinton can agree, why can't we? They both see the same thing. The only problem is we haven't put our economic house in order.

I know it is the Senate majority leader's position to try to protect both his incumbent President and his Members. I know that conventional wisdom says we cannot get anything done in an election year. But I want to tell you that isn't good enough anymore—not good enough for the country. The country deserves better.

By doing nothing, we are pushing our children and grandchildren off a fiscal cliff. By doing nothing, we are guaranteeing the very tax increases and cuts in entitlements that both sides say they want to avoid.

If you are an unemployed American right now or someone struggling to make ends meet, when is the right time for us to act? Is it a perfect political moment that is always a mirage beyond the horizon of the next election or is it today or this week? The American people have lost their confidence in us because we refuse to act even as we call on others to do things that we will not do ourselves.

Today we are asking our soldiers to risk their lives for our country. Why can't we do the same? Why are we allowed to play it safe when we ask others to make the ultimate sacrifice—especially when we as elected leaders have so much less at stake.

I believe the American people want us to do hard things and will actually reward us for demonstrating leadership and courage. The problems before us today can all be solved, but delay means the pain that comes with the solution is much greater. Yet to delay—

that is the path we have chosen in the Senate; that is the path the President has chosen—to not face the real issues, the coming and impending bankruptcy of Medicare, and the fact that the average Medicare couple will take three times more out of Medicare than what they put in, and the fact that the baby boom generation will overwhelm the trust fund that pays the hospital bills the worst-case scenario is that in 4 years the Medicare trust fund will be bankrupt. I know that sounds like a lot of things. Let me show the American people some examples.

We hear mindless, partisan rhetoric about which side is to blame, just like the debate we heard before the vote on Judge Bacharach. The truth is both sides are to blame, both Republicans and Democrats, when Republicans had the chance to restore limited government, and we helped double the size of government.

Meanwhile, the leaders today—their chief complaint is we didn't overspend enough. I know the Senate majority leader has a tough job and the burden of leadership, but he is refusing to accept the responsibility that is truly ours today. This Congress will be measured by our actions.

At the end of this week, for 5 weeks, the Senate is going to take off, and we are going to be just like Rome. Actually, what should happen to every Senator as we leave this place at the end of the week, we should each be handed a fiddle so we can all fiddle while the government and the financial situation and the economic chaos that is ours today grows unabated.

Real leadership isn't about being right, it is about doing the right thing. We are not doing the right thing in the Senate today. We are not reforming the Tax Code that is 90,000 pages and takes 110,000 IRS employees to administer. We are not addressing the impending bankruptcy of Medicare. We are not assuring the solvency of Social Security and increasing payments for those on the very low end of the totem pole. We are not addressing the key issues facing our country.

Why are we here if we are not going to address those issues? We are addressing every issue but those. Again, it is evident my frustration is high. I want the Senate to return to the body it was when I first came here. I think we can do that. I think Senator REID can lead us to do that. Every day we waste, every day we are not fixing the real problems, the disease that faces our country means we are responsible for a significant increase in the pain and disruption that is coming. Let it not be so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

OLYMPIC OMISSION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I rise today because there was an obvious omission in the Olympic opening ceremony on Friday.

Forty years after 11 Israeli Olympians and a German police officer were

murdered in the 1972 Munich games, the London games opened with no acknowledgement of this tragedy. There was neither mention nor a moment of silence for those victims of the Munich massacre.

Forty years ago, on September 4, five Palestinians stormed the apartments of the Israeli national team in the Olympic Village, murdering 11 Israeli team members. Yet, again and again, the IOC has rejected requests to hold a moment of silence for the Munich 11 at the opening ceremonies.

I thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her resolution calling on the IOC to hold a moment of silence at the opening ceremonies to remember the 1972 Munich massacre.

I remind the International Olympic Committee that it is not too late. We can still pay tribute to these Olympians. These athletes were not random victims. They were targeted because of the country they represented and the beliefs they held.

Jacques Rogge, the IOC President, has said:

We feel that the opening ceremony is an atmosphere that is not fit to remember such a tragic incident.

That is the best he can do.

On the 40th anniversary, I cannot think of a more appropriate moment to remember and honor these 11 Olympians.

The Munich massacre is part of the Olympic story. We can't erase it, and we should not overlook it. After all, we know what happens when we avoid the past. Of course, we cannot afford to repeat it.

I ask we all do everything we can to convince the IOC to step up and do the right thing.

Let me explain why this especially matters for people in my home State of Ohio—in greater Cleveland, the part of Ohio which I call home. In Beachwood, OH, a suburb east of Cleveland, there is a national memorial to David Berger, an American citizen and one of the 11 Israeli team members killed in Munich.

As a Nation, we honor his memory and the memory of his Israeli teammates, but we also have a moral responsibility to hold accountable those responsible for his death. Holding them responsible includes those who supported and financed the terrorists who perpetrated these actions.

We had the chance to hold Libya accountable. Yet during negotiations that led to the 2008 U.S.-Libya claims settlement agreement, Mr. Berger was not included, despite widely accepted evidence that Libya played an important role in the massacre.

We know the Qadhafi regime financially supported terrorist groups such as the Black September organization. It supported them and it welcomed the bodies of the dead terrorists from the Munich massacre back to a hero's tribute.

Seeking justice and compensation for victims of global terrorism sends a powerful message to those who may be

seeking to do further harm. The window of opportunity to engage the new Libyan Government has never been greater. Libyan Ambassador Ali Suleiman Aujali said earlier this month in an op-ed in the Washington Post that he hopes "that Washington considers an enterprise fund for Libya" and that "we would work closely with the U.S. Government on its creation."

Those are the words of the Libyan Ambassador. Such a fund should include all those who deserve restitution for the losses they suffered. This includes the Berger family.

This is about letting violent extremists know they and their supporters will be pursued until justice is served—sending a clear signal to those contemplating terrorism as a political tool.

As we all cheer on the American athletes in the next couple of weeks, I ask that we all take a moment to think about the Munich massacre, about David Berger, and about what more we can do to preserve their legacy and resolve to thwart those who by their use of terror and violence would undermine all that the Olympic games are supposed to represent.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING REPRESENTATIVE DEWAYNE BUNCH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, with sadness I rise today to mark the passing on July 11, 2012, of former Kentucky State Representative Dewayne Bunch. As a teacher and State representative, Dewayne served the people of the Commonwealth, especially those in Whitley and Laurel Counties, with distinction. He also proudly served our country in Iraq as a member of the Kentucky National Guard. Elaine and I send our condolences to his wife Regina, his family, his many friends, and all those at Whitley County High School who knew and loved him.

A Corbin resident, Representative Bunch died at age 50. He is survived by his wife Representative Regina Bunch, and he was the father of three daughters. Though his life was cut short, it was characterized by a dedication to serving others in his community, State, and country. Representative