

stunning number. We have 5,188,000 fewer full-time jobs today than in December of 2007—5 million fewer. That equals a decrease in full-time employment of 4.3 percent, even though our population is growing.

At the same time, part-time employment has grown by 3 million over this same time period. That is an increase in part-time jobs of 13 percent. So make no mistake, the total number of jobs since 2007 is down, and for the people who are finding work, the work they find too often can only be part time.

Now 77 percent of the people who got a job since January of this year got a part-time job, not a full time job. When we see, colleagues, the reports of 190,000 jobs, 200,000 jobs, remember, 77 percent of those are part-time jobs. Those numbers hide the reality of the danger in our workforce.

Nearly 90 percent of the increase in part-time work represents people who, according to the Labor Department, "could only find part-time work." In other words, they would like full-time but could only find part-time work. At the end of 2007, this number stood at 1.2 million. However, the most recent data shows that this population has grown by 127 percent to 2,714,000—a 127-percent increase in this number.

Job growth in the economy since 2007 has been principally in part-time work. We are becoming a part-time economy.

The President's health care law, without any doubt—I don't believe any economist, even if they try to sugar-coat it the best they could, would deny that the President's health care law is playing a major factor from the shift from full-time work to part-time work. As we all know, part-time workers don't enjoy the same health, retirement, vacation, and other benefits as full-time workers do. It is exceedingly hard indeed to succeed in this economy and in a career with only a part-time job.

We must recognize one of the biggest contributors to the decline in full-time jobs is the health care bill we have been debating. As others have observed, it is destroying the 40-hour workweek. That is what a union leader said: It is destroying the 40-hour workweek. It is even an assault on workers.

Let me tell my colleagues about one constituent who wrote my office. Linda Askew, from Sheffield, AL, wrote in July, asking Congress to do something to help. Ms. Askew has a small neighborhood business. She employs less than 10 people. According to Ms. Askew:

We have been here for almost 50 years. We have tried to help our employees have health care for over 10 years now . . . The new premiums are \$590 per month for single coverage and \$1,520 for family coverage. . . . These costs are almost becoming unbearable for our company. More troubling than that, in the letter—

she got a letter from her insurance company—

was that part of the reason for this increase was blamed on a new health care reform fees

and taxes that health insurers must pay on behalf of all their groups . . .

So to reduce the cost of health care in America, the health care bill raised taxes on the insurance companies that provide it. It gets passed along.

She continues:

Small businesses cannot keep up with these increases.

In the coming days, as I document the conditions facing American workers, I will also address the many causes of this economic deterioration—and there are many. There are many causes for the deterioration in the economy. Republicans and Democrats need to heed these problems I have stated, including a decline in wages, beginning in 1999 through a different administration.

The question is, What are we going to do about it, Republicans and Democrats? We need to consider these issues and deal with them.

What we are seeing is immensely troubling. As Washington grows larger, Washington grows wealthier and more powerful, American workers are being impoverished, sidelined, and marginalized. We see the numbers showing that the only area of America that has been showing raised growth is Washington. Washington! The government class is being enriched at the expense of the middle class. From deficit spending to Federal regulation to the immigration bill, Washington is pursuing policies that benefit lobbyists, the well-connected, government employees, regulators, and bureaucrats, but that are reducing the wages and job opportunities for everyday American workers. The numbers are clear.

Both parties need to shut out the special interests, work to develop policies that will restore our history of dynamic economic growth—and we can do so—growth that benefits all the people of our Nation.

What is the response we get from the governing class? What do they tell us the problem is? On the deficit, what do they say the problem is? We haven't spent enough money. It is your problem, American people. Just send us more money and we won't have deficits anymore. Trust us. Send us more money. The President proposed a \$1 trillion tax increase in his budget. It was rejected, but that is what he proposed and that is what he advocates for. So they want to spend more.

They believe they can invest. We give the government more money, and it is going to invest in the economy and everybody is going to be better off. But we have seen that movie. It has been going on for 5 years, to a degree unprecedented in the history of America. They say, Don't worry, borrow and spend. Don't worry about the debt. We can just borrow more and spend more and that will stimulate the economy.

They say we need to regulate more. We need to block more American energy and import more, I suppose, from Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and that is going to improve our economy. Really?

We are going to drive up the cost of energy and coal and that is going to improve jobs in America? That is going to help a working person who now has to pay \$200, \$250 a month for his gas bill to commute? That is supposed to be good for us?

All we have heard is more taxes, more regulation, more government, more debt. That is the policy we are seeing here. I haven't seen anything that has the power to produce the growth and prosperity that we need.

So I say we have to get over this. We have tried this. It is not working. These policies have made it worse. We have to get back to classical American policies that validate individual responsibility, that allow people to progress and make more, that don't drive us to import more oil, that don't put regulation by massive numbers all over the economy, driving down productivity and driving up costs. That is the kind of thing we need to be doing. If we will do that, and if we will allow the vitality of the American spirit to flourish and flower and get this burden off the backs of our people, I think we will be surprised how much better things can be.

It is a serious crisis. This trend has been going on far too long. We can't ignore it. We can't say it is just the recession. We have been going along like this since 2007. We have not seen the growth we need. The tax and spend and borrow policies haven't worked. It is time for us to confront that. I hope my colleagues will.

I will continue to examine the data we are seeing out there and share it with my colleagues and maybe we can surprise ourselves how much good we can do in the long run.

Thank you, Madam President. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me and allowing me to follow the Senator from Alabama whose remarks I agree with.

I am disappointed in what happened this week. Those of us in the minority learned another lesson for the minority, is to get to a bill we wanted to get to, the majority then has the votes to amend that bill unless some of the majority would happen to side with us. And they did amend the bill in ways that I didn't agree with, taking the provisions out that would have defunded the move toward the health care plan that I think we are going to see more and more of the country isn't ready for. But the bill did go back to the House. The bill was changed from the bill the House sent over.

So the bill went back to the House, and they have a chance to see what else they might be able to do—hopefully, in the next few days. But between now and the end of the fiscal year—which is Monday, by the way—

hopefully, we will find a way to make the system work better, will do what we should have done in the budget debate process.

As I said here on the floor just a day or 2 ago, the great disappointment is that over and over we have failed to let the process work. Over and over we have failed to bring the bills to the floor, offer amendments, and set the priorities for the country.

So here it is, the last Friday of the spending year, the last Friday of our budget year, the last Friday of the fiscal year, and the Senate has not passed one single appropriations bill—except the 6-week CR that says we cannot decide how to do anything new, so let's just do for another 6 weeks what we did last year. Surely that is not good enough, and we need to get beyond that.

The vote today, taken on the Senate floor, did not send a bill to the President to be signed. It sent the bill back across the Capitol Building to see what the House of Representatives may want to do next, and I look forward to working with them and with my colleagues here in the Senate to see what that might be.

I want to talk for a few minutes about the debt ceiling itself. The White House announced just in the last few days that we reach that debt ceiling in about 3 weeks. That number always seems to me to be pretty much a number that can be worked with. It is not like the end of the fiscal year. But it is a date that the Secretary of the Treasury has said we need to look at.

The President said he would not negotiate on the debt ceiling. That is a very interesting position to take, and it is what is wrong with the government right now. I suppose the Congress could now say: And we will not negotiate on the debt ceiling either. So maybe that just means we do not have a debt ceiling increase because nobody wants to negotiate.

Then the President said to a group in Washington this week that—I think he said that nonbudget items have never been attached to the debt ceiling before. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the Washington Post of just a few days ago by Glenn Kessler who actually looked at that. Is that really accurate? Is what the President said accurate—that we have never done this before? This is totally new? This is a new demand that no Congress has ever made before—except, by the way, the Budget Control Act 2½ years ago that the President signed and a few other things that have happened?

It has happened before, and I want to talk about that a little bit.

This is not new moment for us. When Members of the Congress have been concerned about spending—certainly since the 1970s Budget Act, but even before that—when the debt ceiling had to be increased, Members of Congress wanted to talk about spending and

other things that they could not get attention to any other way.

In 1953, during the Eisenhower administration, fiscal conservatives in the Congress—at that time led by a Democrat from Virginia, Harry Byrd—did not believe we would be able to fund the Interstate Highway System. So they used the debt limit vote, the debt limit debate as a place to try to find out what they could do about the Interstate Highway System and how it was going to be funded. In 1953—that was a long time ago; almost longer ago now than the lifetime of most Members of the Senate—that is how it was used then.

In 1973, when Richard Nixon was President, Democrats in the Senate sought to attach a campaign finance bill to the debt ceiling. This was during Watergate and, of course, I guess that would certainly meet the definition of a “nonbudget item”—a campaign finance bill that there was a great effort to do in 1973 and to add to the debt ceiling legislation.

In 1993, a study of the politics of the debt limit, for Public Administration Review, said that “during this period, the genesis of a pattern developed that would eventually become full blown in the mid-1970s and 1980s: the use of the debt ceiling vote as a vehicle for other legislative matters.”

So certainly that is something we could talk about. Some would have economic consequences, others would not. I know one thought is, let's not move forward with the individual mandate in health care. Now, if you do not move forward with the mandate, there may be significant advantages in the pressure that takes off the spending in the exchange. But whether it is an economic issue or not, it is a fairness issue.

The President, who now has suspended the requirement that businesses offer insurance in 2015—it seems to me the only fair thing to do, if you take the obligation off businesses to offer insurance, is to take the obligation off individuals who the law would require to have insurance if they did not get it at work. You have just taken away the requirement for businesses. Surely you cannot justify saying businesses do not have to pay the penalty but individuals do.

I think that is a fair debate to have. It is a fair debate to have either over the weekend as part of how we move forward with funding the government or a fair debate to have if we are going to increase the Federal Government's ability to borrow money. We ought to talk about things that are going to result in spending lots of money.

Remember, the requirement for the individual mandate that the President also waived was the requirement to prove income. Now, why does that matter? On the exchange, depending on how high your income is, you get a taxpayer subsidy for the insurance you buy. But the President said the requirement to verify income will not be

there in the way the law envisioned for this first year.

So again, how is that fair to the taxpayers that the taxpayers are subsidizing somebody's estimate of income? We just got through with the taxpayers subsidizing a lot of mortgages that could not be paid because that structure allowed people to estimate what their income would be on their mortgage application without submitting anything but their estimate of what their income could be. As it turned out, when people were trying to buy a house and prove they could make a mortgage payment, a significant number of people estimated they would make more money than they made. I think it is going to be equally true when it comes time to qualify for taxpayer assistance, a significant number of people may estimate—maybe even on some level of good faith—it could work out that way, that I am going to make less money than I made last year or less money than I am likely to make this year, but I am going to have a level of income that allows me to have a higher subsidy. I think it is certainly a possibility.

One of these two things is happening right now. We need to look at the equity and fairness of having an individual penalty and the President saying we do not have a penalty for businesses that do not provide insurance.

Let me get back to a few more examples.

In one of the debt limit debates, major changes in Social Security were attached. An amendment in one of the debates was to end the bombing in Cambodia. Twenty-five amendments that were nongermane to spending were in this discussion between 1978 and 1987.

The President maybe is proving here more than anything else that you better be very careful when you say something has never happened, particularly if it has happened over and over, and particularly if you think that somehow, as President, you can decide that the future of the country is nondebateable, that you can decide that how high the debt limit is is nondebateable. Whatever the Secretary of the Treasury says, that is what we need. And what would the President say about that? He would say, well, that is because we have already obligated this money. The fact that this money may be already obligated does not mean we should not look at every other way we are spending money or every way we control spending and do what we need to do about that.

In 1982, the Senate majority leader at that time, Howard Baker, said we will have a free-for-all on the debt ceiling legislation, and 1,400 nongermane amendments became part of that debate. They included limiting Federal jurisdiction over school prayer and other things.

In 1980, the House and Senate rejected a central part of President Carter's energy policy—an oil import

fee—as part of the debt ceiling discussion. No bigger stretch than not going forward with the individual mandate as part of the debt ceiling discussion.

Less than 10 percent of the debt limit bills passed between 1978 and 2002 contained amendments not related to the debt or budget. But many of them contained an amendment that was related to how we spend our money. When you are spending too much money, when you already owe \$17 trillion, it is time to talk about: How are we spending this money and what can we do to do something about it before we further extend the line of credit?

If any of us went to a banker and said: We have spent all the money we have already borrowed. We still have a lot of bills coming in, and we need to borrow a lot more money, frankly, under any of the rules that this Congress has passed in the last several years, the banker could not loan you money, and if they could loan you money without saying: Tell us again, what are you trying to do to get your spending under control so you are not back here in a few days or a few months asking for more credit.

The thing we know is, under almost any imaginable circumstance, this is not the last debt ceiling increase we will ever make. So if we are going to be back in a few weeks, a few months, a year—however long this debt ceiling extends to—asking for more money, we ought to be talking about how we are spending the money we have.

October 17 will not be as far away as it might seem. It is very close to us now. The Secretary of the Treasury says that the country will have only approximately \$30 billion to meet our country's commitments. But on October 17, money does not stop coming in. On October 18, you might be able to arrange the books in a way where you do not have quite enough money to pay all the bills coming in, but this is not a government shutdown scenario.

We need to solve the problem of this weekend and early next week and then get to the debt ceiling. Whether the President wants to debate it or not, it is going to be debated. I think it is going to be negotiated. The idea that this is going to be a so-called clean debt limit increase that will not be negotiated because it impacts the full faith and credit of the United States of America—we are going to pay our bills. I think we all know that. We have paid our bills since the founding of this government. But we are not going to pay our bills, we are not going to get another advance on our allowance, without somebody saying: Exactly how are you spending this money as fast as you are spending it? And why are you back again saying you need more of it?

The American people have overwhelmingly rejected the idea that this should not be negotiated. According to a new Bloomberg poll out this week, Americans by a 2-to-1 ratio disagree with the President's contention that

the Congress should raise the debt ceiling without conditions. Instead, 61 percent said that it is “right to require spending cuts when the debt ceiling is raised,” and they said “even if it risks default.”

The American people want us to fight—as we have this week and we will continue to—to try to defund a health care system that will not work. But they also want us to fight, to be sure that the money we are spending that we get from taxpayers—the money that we obligate future generations to, the bills that we are building up for somebody else to pay—to have the kind of debate, the kind of negotiation, the kind of important view of the future that they deserve to have.

I would urge the President and the majority leader of the Senate to sit down with leaders of the House and others and try to work this out as soon as we can. Understand, frankly, that whether you want to negotiate or not does not matter. There is nowhere in the Constitution that says when we owe more money than we pay, the President can decide whether there is going to be a discussion or not. That is not how this system works. It is not how it is going to work over the next 2 weeks or the next month or whatever it takes to resolve the debt limit. Hopefully, we will all be working hard over the next 2 days to do whatever it takes to keep the government of the United States working on October 1. Just because we have failed for the entire year to do the work the Senate is supposed to do does not mean we can continue to fail in a way that punishes the American people by not having a government that is functioning on the first day of the spending year.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 2013]

OBAMA'S CLAIM THAT NON-BUDGET ITEMS HAVE “NEVER” BEEN ATTACHED TO THE DEBT CEILING

(By Glenn Kessler)

“You have never seen in the history of the United States the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt being used to extort a president or a governing party and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt.”

—President Obama, remarks to the Business Roundtable, Sept. 18, 2013

When a president makes a lawyerly comment, it's time to start looking for the trap door. At first President Obama uses a sweeping “never in the history of the United States” but then he concludes with a caveat: “nothing to do with the budget and nothing to do with the debt.”

The issue at hand is the Affordable Care Act, aka Obamacare, which many congressional Republicans would like to repeal or delay as part of a vote to extend the debt ceiling—even though establishment Republicans, such as former Bush aide Karl Rove, regard the effort as a kamikaze mission with little hope of success.

Generally, raising the debt ceiling has been routine and not especially controversial. But, as we have noted before, starting in 1953 during the Dwight Eisenhower administration, fiscal conservatives in Congress at

times have used the debt limit as a way to force concessions by the executive branch on spending. Eisenhower, a Republican, had particular trouble with a Democrat, Sen. Harry F. Byrd of Virginia, over the debt ceiling because Byrd was skeptical of Eisenhower's plans to build the national highway system.

That dispute was about a budget issue, which the president seemed to exclude in his comment. But unfortunately for the president's claim, there are other, compelling examples that contradict it.

THE FACTS

In 1973, when Richard Nixon was president, Democrats in the Senate, including Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), sought to attach a campaign finance reform bill to the debt ceiling after the Watergate-era revelations about Nixon's fundraising during the 1972 election. Their efforts were defeated by a filibuster, but it took days of debate and the lawmakers were criticized by commentators (and fellow lawmakers) for using “shotgun” tactics to try to hitch their pet cause to emergency must-pass legislation.

President Obama said that GOP lawmakers now are trying to “extort” repeal of the health care law via the debt limit, but that's also what Democrats wanted to do with President Nixon, who opposed the campaign-finance reforms.

Indeed, Linda K. Kowalcky and Lance T. LeLoup wrote in a comprehensive 1993 study of the politics of the debt limit, for Public Administration Review, that “during this period, the genesis of a pattern developed that would eventually become full blown in the mid-1970s and 1980s: the use of the debt ceiling vote as a vehicle for other legislative matters.”

Previously, they noted, the debt limit bill had been linked to the mechanics of debt management, but now anything was fair game. Major changes in Social Security were attached to the debt bill; another controversial amendment sought to end the bombing in Cambodia. Kowalcky and LeLoup list 25 nongermane amendments that were attached to debt-limit bills between 1978 and 1987, including allowing voluntary school prayer, banning busing to achieve integration and proposing a nuclear freeze.

In 1982, Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker unleashed a free-for-all by allowing 1,400 nongermane amendments to the debt ceiling legislation, which resulted in five weeks of raucous debate that mostly focused on limiting federal court jurisdiction over school prayer and busing. The debt limit only passed after lawmakers decided to strip all of the amendments from the bill.

One of the most striking examples of a president being forced to accept unrelated legislation on a debt-ceiling bill took place in 1980. The House and Senate repealed a central part of President Jimmy Carter's energy policy—an oil import fee that was expected to raise the cost of gasoline by 10 cents a gallon. Carter vetoed the bill, even though the United States was close to default, and then the House and Senate overrode his veto by overwhelming numbers (335-34 in the House; 68-10 in the Senate).

“Foes of the fee succeeded in linking the two measures to gain added leverage for killing the fee,” The Washington Post reported on Carter's stunning defeat. “The Treasury Department immediately announced it was resuming the sale of bonds, which it suspended Thursday night when the debt ceiling expired.”

To be sure, the success rate of attaching nongermane amendments to a debt-limit bill is relatively low. Anita S. Krishnakumar, in a 2007 paper for the Harvard Journal on Legislation, said that less than 10 percent of the

debt limit bills passed between 1978 and 2002 contained amendments not related to the debt or budget. Only twice—in 1980 and in 1995—did Congress successfully pass amendments opposed by the president. But as Carter's defeat shows, Congress has used the debt limit to repeal a key legislative priority of a president.

In response, the Obama White House provided us with information on the negative impact on the economy during the 2011 debt-ceiling impasse, but did not comment on the examples listed above.

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

Cleary, Obama's sweeping statement does not stand up to scrutiny, even with his caveat. Time and again, lawmakers have used the "must-pass" nature of the debt limit to force changes in unrelated laws. Often, the effort fails—as the GOP drive to repeal ObamaCare almost certainly will. But Kowalcky and LeLoup speculate that one reason why Congress has not eliminated the debt limit, despite the political problems it poses, is because lawmakers enjoy the leverage it provides against the executive branch.

There's an old reporter's rule that you want to avoid using the word "unprecedented." Otherwise, a professor might call or e-mail the next day to dispute it.

Let's add this rule for politicians: Never say "never."

Mr. BLUNT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. I ask consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HELIUM STEWARSHIP

AUCTION AMOUNTS ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to engage my colleagues Senator WYDEN, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator MORAN in a colloquy regarding legislation the Senate adopted yesterday for the modernization of the Federal helium reserve. I first would like to commend the leadership of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee for their commitment to this effort and to thank my friend from Kansas for his partnership in this process. I know how long and hard the Chairman and Ranking Member and their staffs have worked on this complex piece of legislation, and they deserve our appreciation.

I think it is important that we discuss one of the aspects of the proposed new auction program. The text before us today creates an auction and Section 6(b)(5)(A) allows the Secretary to auction less than the statutorily mandated amount if the Secretary deter-

mines the adjustment necessary to minimize market disruptions. The Secretary may make such adjustments only after only after submitting a written justification to the congressional committees of jurisdiction. I wish to ask Chairman WYDEN whether he believes this provision will be exercised?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Connecticut for his help in crafting this bill and I appreciate that he has taken the time to raise this issue. One of the primary goals in drafting this legislation was to ensure stability of supply. The Senator is correct. The Secretary may lower the amount of helium that is auctioned if he or she determines the adjustment is necessary to minimize market disruptions that pose a threat to the economic wellbeing of the United States and only after submitting a written justification to Congress. I expect the Secretary would exercise this provision if those criteria are met.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I again wish to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their tireless efforts and their willingness to work with us on these important issues. I yield the Floor to the Senator from Kansas, Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise to echo the Senator from Connecticut's comments and to ask the Committee leaders for one more clarification.

The issue is the definition of "excess refining capacity" and its requirement that it be made available at commercially reasonable rates as a condition of continued participation in the sales and auctions provided for in this legislation. I ask Senator MURKOWSKI if it is the intent of the legislation that the BLM consider the economic impacts of defining "excess refining capacity" once the auction level reaches 100% of the Federal helium reserve.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Yes, it is our expectation that BLM will consider economic impacts throughout the implementation of this bill and develop regulations for this and other provisions in the bill accordingly. I do not anticipate that the definition of "excess refining capacity" would change over the course of the law's implementation, however. Our intent is to ensure that refiners with excess refining capacity make that capacity available at commercially reasonable rates. As the auction system is phased in, I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues and the BLM to ensure that market disruptions are avoided and American taxpayers are protected.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I thank the Committee leadership for their dedication and cooperation, and I yield the Floor.

REMEMBERING MARYLAND NAVY YARD VICTIMS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, the fatal shooting at the Washington Navy Yard last week is a senseless tragedy. I mourn the loss of life and offer my

prayers to all who have been affected by this heinous act, especially the families of the victims. Our Navy and their civilian colleagues work day and night to protect the American public. An attack on the people tasked with keeping this Nation safe is unacceptable. I thank our Federal, State and local first responders and law enforcement for swiftly and dutifully responding to this appalling attack despite the personal dangers. I thank our dedicated doctors, nurses, and staff at the MedStar trauma center who helped care for the injured that day.

Today I want to remember the six Marylanders who died in this terrible tragedy, and to express my condolences to their family and friends.

Sylvia Frasier was 53 years old and lived in Waldorf, MD, in Charles County. She was a computer expert and served as the enterprise information assurance manager at Naval Sea Systems Command. And she worked a second job as well, working several evenings a week as a customer service manager at the Wal-Mart in Waldorf. The assistant manager at the store said she often gave co-workers rides home, and he once asked her, "How come you work a second job?" She just said, "I love it. I like working with people." Her co-worker said that Sylvia could talk to customers and turn negatives into positives, and that they will miss seeing her smile and gold-colored hair at the store. She leaves behind her two parents and six siblings.

John Roger Johnson was 73 years old and lived in Derwood, MD, in Montgomery County. He was a civilian contractor and performed environmental assessments of systems used to located mines. He also provided support to the NAVSEA's Command Information Officer. He often greeted colleagues with a "How ya doin', buddy?" He leaves behind a wife and four daughters, and his 11th grandchild is due in November.

Frank Kohler was 50 years old and lived in Tall Timbers, MD, in St. Mary's County. He was a computer systems specialist. Frank had been the president of the Rotary Club. He had earned the nickname of "King Oyster" for his service, and received a crown and robe, leading the national oyster shucking competition. He leaves behind a wife and two daughters.

Vishnu Pandit was 61 years old and lived in North Potomac, MD, in Montgomery County. He was born in Bombay, India, and moved to the United States in his early 20's. His family said in a statement that "He took great pride in being employed by the United States Navy, which he very proudly served in various capacities as a civilian for over 25 years. He felt extremely privileged to have contributed to the superiority of the U.S. Navy and the country that he served." He leaves behind a wife and two sons.

Kenneth Bernard Proctor was 46 years old and lived in Waldorf, MD, in Charles County. He worked as a civilian utilities foreman, and had worked