

Christian message of second chances to those in prison, and he saw countless lives changed by his compassion and example.

His voice of moral clarity was an inspiration to millions of Americans and made him an invaluable counselor to leaders in government and business. I will always count it a privilege to have been able to call him my dear friend and mentor. His dedication to moral integrity, serving his fellow man and his steadfast faith have always and will always be an inspiration to me and my family.

Karen and I offer our deepest condolences to Patty, the whole Colson family and to all who mourn the loss of Chuck Colson.

CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first let me suggest that I join with my colleagues in honoring the memory of Chuck Colson, a man who also meant a lot to me as an individual. Those of us who come from California and remember Richard Nixon coming out there over the years and remember the great work that Chuck Colson did for our prison community in California, we're very grateful for that. He taught us really the true meaning of Christian compassion. I personally was a beneficiary of that knowledge and that spirit that he helped us understand and develop within our own hearts. So I would like to join my colleagues in that.

But today I rise to call attention to the hundreds of millions of public dollars we have spent and continue to spend in the form of foreign aid to the People's Republic of China—better known as Communist China to those of us who have spent years trying to fight that oppressive regime.

Our national debt is over \$15.7 trillion and is growing. We are spending \$1.5 trillion more every year than we are taking in. Forty-three cents out of every dollar we spend is borrowed money, and Communist China is the single largest foreign holder of United States debt.

The interest we pay on this ever-growing debt is increasingly squeezing out spending on other worthwhile programs. Why, then, are we borrowing money from the Chinese Communist Government—to be repaid, of course, with interest—and then using that borrowed money to finance programs in which we are giving money to these various programs that go to China, the country from whom we are borrowing?

Remember, the government of this aid recipient considers the United States its enemy. They are happy to loan us the money and they are happy that we are stupid enough to give it back to them in terms of aid and, yes, other types of programs, including giving it back to them in investments.

We are strengthening the government that considers us an enemy. As

we look into this situation, we know that they see the U.S. as their enemy, just as Japan saw us as their enemy before World War II—the Japanese militarists—just as Nazi Germany saw the American people as their enemy, and just as the communist governments that threatened the world for over four decades after World War II, just as they saw the United States as their enemy.

Yes, we are the enemy of tyrants and vicious regimes that are expansionary and threaten the peace and the freedom of the world. We can be proud of that. The Chinese know that. The Communist Chinese know that. That's why they don't like us. That's why they consider us their enemy.

China is the world's largest human rights abuser. China's Government smashes those who advocate freedom of the press, freedom of religion. Those who, of course, suggest that the Chinese Government should be accountable to its people are arrested and thrown into jail, or murdered.

It arrests Chinese practitioners of Falun Gong, for example. Falun Gong is a Chinese religious movement which stresses yoga and meditation. Beijing has these devout and passive people, practitioners in a simple religion that is meditation and yoga. These people are arrested and they're thrown into prison where they are murdered. And then the Chinese Government, after murdering these people for their religious convictions, sells their organs and body parts. It doesn't get much more ghoulish than this.

On the international scene, China is responsible for promoting and facilitating the proliferation of nuclear technology between North Korea, Pakistan, Iran, and others. China is responsible for empowering the Burmese junta that imprisoned Aung San Suu Kyi for years. It has allied itself with rogue regimes all over the world, like Sudan and Venezuela and other regimes that are tyrants in their own country and threaten the security of their neighbors and of the United States.

China's aggressive foreign policy and hostile naval actions are threatening the sovereignty of American allies like Japan and the Philippines. It is Communist China that has stolen and is currently stealing most of our prized military and commercial secrets. China has stolen the designs for every one of our nuclear warheads.

Chinese cyberspies have stolen all of our trade secrets. All of the money we put in to invest in research and development they steal and utilize. No wonder they're as far ahead in their rocket program as they are when they took the technology from us; they stole it from us. They have infected our critical electronic technology infrastructure with malicious viruses and then they, of course, break into our classified systems.

It is China which has embarked on the most significant arms buildup since the Cold War. And I ask: Who do they

think is their enemy? Who do they think is their enemy? The United States of America. While we not only become susceptible to them, not only do we put ourselves in an inferior position by borrowing money from them, but we also end up giving that money back to them in aid programs.

□ 2120

And that is what I would like to talk about tonight, the fact that how can we possibly borrow money from the world's worst human rights abuser, a country that looks at us as their enemy. Then we become vulnerable to that country. But at the same time while we are becoming vulnerable, we then increase our investment in the private sector of that country. But also we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in aid programs to the communist Chinese regime.

Well, with that in mind, I asked the Congressional Research Service to assemble a list of programs that the Congress funds that go directly to supporting development and the economy of China. It is a partial list because there are so many programs that, after weeks of work, they could not even find them all. This list that I am about to read is of projects that are funded and have been funded over the last 3 years, at the same time, while the Obama administration was spending \$1.5 trillion more annually than we're taking in.

So while we're spending more than we're taking in by \$1.5 trillion, we are spending on programs that are going to China, and it's China who's lending us the money in order to spend that extra \$1.5 trillion. This is an insane policy.

And this spending on China is ongoing. I'm just giving you the facts from the last 3 years, and it is ongoing.

To make sure we all understand exactly where we are spending or sending our taxpayer money, I am going to read a list of programs that we have funded in China, and ask, as we are going through this list, after every time I go through the money, couldn't we have spent this money better in the United States? Or wouldn't it have been better not to borrow it in the first place and add this to \$1.5 trillion every year for the last 3 years that we've been putting our people into debt?

So every one of these things that I read, ask yourself that question: Is this in the best interest of the United States? Is it in the best interest of our children who we're putting more in debt by borrowing and giving it to China and having to pay the interest? They're going to have to pay off the loan and the interest to China in the future.

So here's a partial list, and I'm going to round off the figures to an understandable number. And many of these deal with "environment."

Why are we trying to make the environment in China better so that the people of China can basically out compete us in our business dealings? That

should be part of the cost of production in China. But, no, we are picking up that cost. Not only that, our people are investing in China and building their factories.

Why did the EPA give, for example, \$141,000 to the Institute of Environment and Sustainable Development in Agriculture to reduce greenhouse gases in China? In China.

Why did the EPA give \$125,000 to the Eastern Research Group that reduces greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the National Science Foundation give \$63,000 to Siena College for Neutrino Physics at Daya Bay in China?

And let me add, some of these will be repeats because we did this, this is over a 3-year period, because we have several programs over the years where we're giving money to the same group in China; and that spending continues, let me add.

Why did the EPA give \$150,000 to China for Coal Information Institute for reducing greenhouse gases?

Why did the EPA give \$100,000 to Guizhou International Corporation Center for Environmental Protection for reducing greenhouse gases? That's in China, of course.

Why did the EPA give almost \$300,000 to the Ministry of Environment Protection in China for reducing health risks? Don't we have health risks in the United States? Don't we have some needs of our own? Why are we giving this money to China?

Why did the EPA give \$150,000 to Tsinghua—I'm sorry I can't pronounce this right—University Department of Building Sciences for Environmental Governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Asia Foundation almost \$2 million, it was \$1.7 million, to build environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give \$500,000 to the American Bar Association to build environmental governance in China? Don't we have some things in the United States where we could use a \$500,000 grant for some of our local communities? Couldn't they use some help? Instead we sent it to China. But first, of course, we borrowed it from China. So to give it to them, we'll have to repay China and the interest in order to give it to them.

Why did USAID give \$300,000 to the University of Massachusetts to improve the quality of judicial education in China? We're giving them \$300,000 in order to improve judicial education in China?

Why did USAID give \$200,000 to the University of the Pacific to advance the rule of law in China?

Why did USAID give \$55,000 to Nexant, an NGO, to be an administrator of China program evaluations?

Why did USAID give \$2 million to Winrock International Institute for Agriculture for sustainable livelihoods in China? I guess we don't need any help in our farm belt. I guess our farmers don't need my help in California

where they're going broke because the water has been cut off to them in order to protect some delta smelt. Our guys are going crazy and going broke, our farmers are, but we're going to find \$2 million borrowed from China in order to give back to China in order to aid the Institute of Agriculture so that they can have sustainable livelihoods in China.

Why did USAID give \$2 million to the Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, an NGO, for sustainable livelihoods in China? Think there are any Americans that need sustainable livelihoods?

Why did USAID give \$2 million to the Institute of Sustainable Communities to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Oh, yes. We need to make sure we pay all of China's environmental expenses; otherwise, they won't accept global government like our government expects us to accept.

Why did USAID give \$749,000, almost \$750,000, to the ICF International to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did USAID give \$500,000 to the Asia Foundation for humanitarian assistance to China?

Why did the USDA give \$10,000 to Texas Agriculture Experiment for biological control of forest insects in China? Do our forests not need this?

Why are we borrowing money when we can't afford to do these things in our own country?

Why did the USDA give almost \$100,000 to Rutgers State University for climate change adaptation in China?

Now isn't that great? We're paying for them to adapt to climate change. Then, of course, they'll join the global government which these same people are trying to force on us. But then we are under a mountain of debt, our children, in order to pay for their adaptation to climate change. Not, of course, to say that anybody in the United States, our farmers or any other industry, doesn't need to adapt to the different changes that go on in the climate, even if they are natural changes in our climate.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$2.5 million to the University of Michigan for the U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center? Shouldn't we be developing our own clean energy in the United States? Instead, we borrow money from China in order to spend it in China, and then we have to pay debt, interest on that debt, and pay back the debt. Our children will, of course, be doing that.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$2.5 million to West Virginia University for a U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center? Again, a research center, perhaps the same research center, but the next year. So that makes it \$5 million that we've given to that research center in China.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$1.2 million to West Virginia University for Long-Term Environmental and Economic Impacts of Coal Liquefaction in China? That's \$1.2 million to, yes, spend through West Virginia Uni-

versity. Don't we have coal liquefaction environmental studies going on in the United States that could use that money for research to make sure that our coal burns more cleanly and effectively here, rather than giving that money and information to China's benefit and borrowing it from them in order to give it to them?

□ 2130

Why did the Department of Energy give \$5.3 million to Brookhaven National Laboratory in the Daya Bay nuclear project in China? That's over \$5 million. By the way, that's \$5 million to this nuclear facility.

Let me just note that, in my district, we have a problem with a nuclear power plant that's going through some very serious problems right now, San Onofre. We maybe could have used that \$5 million to help us correct the problems at the San Onofre plant. But no. We borrowed the money from China to give it back to them to solve their problems while our children will be forced to pay that debt off. We get no benefit out of it except a load of debt on our children.

Why did the Department of Energy give almost \$400,000 to the State University of Albany to study climate change in China? Oh, yes.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$300,000 to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for the modeling of regional climate change in China? Again, it's using climate change as a vehicle to give them money that we are borrowing from them in the first place, which we will then have to repay.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$256,000 to the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute for research at the Daya Bay nuclear project in China? Again, another \$250,000 to this Daya Bay nuclear project. It could have been the next year because this is over a 3-year period. These are some of these. By the way, it's not anywhere near all of them over the 3-year period, but all of these are taken from a list over that 3-year period. Yes, we could have used some of that money to make sure that we didn't have a problem in our own districts.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$210,000 to Rutgers State University for Site Science for the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Mobile Facility in China? Why are we doing that? Why are we providing them that type of a foundation, a scientific foundation, so that they can prosper and so that they won't have to spend their resources paying for that type of scientific infrastructure?

Why did the Department of Energy give \$135,000 to the University of Maryland for the climactic effects of aerosols in China? There you go— aerosols. It's an issue from way back then, which some of us think was not entirely reported, but now we are still giving almost \$150,000 to check out aerosols in China for their benefit.

Why did the Department of Energy give over \$500,000 to the University of

Houston for a proposal to measure neutrino mixing at the Daya Bay nuclear experiment in China? Again, over a half a million dollars while we're having trouble with our own nuclear program.

We should be developing our own new generation of nuclear power which will be safe—and we can do it—but we don't have the money to do it. Why? We're giving millions of dollars to China and to others, money that should go to developing our own new technology here. Of course, we are borrowing the money from China in order to give it to them, which leaves our children in debt, and they'll have to pay it all off with interest.

Why did the Department of Energy give \$70,000 to Colorado State University for the climactic effects of aerosols in China?

Why did the Department of Energy give \$19,000 to Pennsylvania State University for factors influencing energy use and carbon emissions in China? Isn't that nice that we gave the University of Pennsylvania money to study this for China so they will have the information in China and will be able to use it for their benefit rather than studying things in the United States to help us so we can do better here.

Why did the EPA give over \$500,000—\$550,000 to be exact—to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost a half a million dollars to the Research Triangle Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China? This is basically making equipment more efficient. Why aren't we making our equipment more efficient? The Chinese should buy it from us rather than our having to relocate our manufacturing plants in China. Yes, let them buy it from us—how about that?—and give our own people jobs rather than borrowing money so that they could have the technology. We are going in debt so that they can have the technology, and our children will have to pay the debt back with interest, and they will sell us the equipment. The Chinese will sell it to us in a generation.

Why did the EPA give \$300,000 to the Energy and Environmental Development Research Center to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost \$250,000 to the Research Triangle Institute again—probably a second year of their grant—to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost \$200,000 to the China University of Petroleum in Beijing to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Can't any of our people use this research money to help our country and our technology become cleaner and more efficient? No. We're giving it to China, and then they will sell that technology back to us after they manufacture it years ahead of us because we subsidize their R&D.

Why did the EPA give almost \$200,000 to the China Urban Construction De-

sign & Research Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Again, here we are spending money to help them design houses in China. Wonderful. None of our designers need any help.

Why did the EPA give almost \$300,000 to the Eastern Research Group to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give over \$100,000 to Guangzhou City, China, to reduce greenhouse gases?

Why did the EPA give \$110,000 to the Guizhou International Cooperation Center for Environmental Protection to reduce greenhouse gases in China? Do we have no need for this money in the United States? Does our equipment not need to be more efficient? Should we not be investigating putting money into the development of cleaner energy sources here? With all this money we're giving away, we could be developing clean energy sources, if nothing else, for the new generation of nuclear power plants, which is starving for research money. No, we're giving it to China.

Why did the EPA give almost \$100,000 to the China University of Petroleum in Beijing to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give \$200,000 to California State University at Fullerton to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give \$85,000 to ICF International to build climate change management capacity in China?

Why did the EPA give \$135,000 to Information Institute to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give over \$50,000 to Advanced Resources International to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give \$31,000 to the Energy and Environmental Development Research Center for biogas development?

Each and every one of these items I am talking about is an item on which we spent money out of the Federal budget. We took it out of the taxpayers' pockets—or actually, we borrowed it from China—and then left them with the debt in their pockets, the IOU in their pockets, and we gave it to China rather than taking that money, those resources, and spending it in the United States to develop the technology here.

Like I say, I've been struggling for years to get the new generation of nuclear power developed here. It has been starved—it has not been given what it needs—and we're giving away these hundreds of millions of dollars to the Chinese, which we, of course, are borrowing. In the end, we will pay them for the technology because they will be sending the manufactured items here.

Why did the EPA give \$30,000 to the China Association of Rural Energy Industry to reduce greenhouse gases in China?

Why did the EPA give almost \$800,000 to the China State Environmental Protection Administration to reduce transboundary air pollution? Well,

that's great. We have to pay for everybody's air pollution in the world. We are borrowing money from China, but we have to pay for their reduction of transboundary air pollution.

Why did the EPA give almost \$200,000 to the Chinese Ministry of Environmental Protection to build environmental management capacity?

Why did the EPA give \$120,000 to the Tianjin Environmental Protection Bureau for water pollution management? Now, there is something we don't need any money for around our country—water pollution. I live in a coastal district. We could use that money for water pollution. We've got sewer pipes and water purification systems that need to be upgraded. But no. We're borrowing money from China to give it to China rather than having that money spent in the United States.

Why did the National Science Foundation give \$62,000 to Sienna College for neutrino physics at, again, the Daya Bay nuclear project in China? Well, we're not spending the money here to develop our own clean nuclear energy.

□ 2140

Why did USAID give Management Systems International almost \$500,000 to improve environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give Vermont Law School—get this—\$1,725,000 for improved environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Institute for Sustainable Communities half a million dollars to save energy and reduce greenhouse gases in China? Can't we put this use in these structures in the United States?

Why did USAID give the University of the Pacific a half a million dollars for environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the American Bar Association \$500,000 for environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the University of Massachusetts \$420,000 for environmental governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development \$150,000 for development assistance in China?

Why did USAID give Management Systems International \$50,000 for development assistance?

Why did USAID give the Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors \$2 million for sustainable livelihoods in China? Don't we have people in the United States who need money like that? Don't we have people, indeed, here who need a sustainable livelihood? Why are we giving it to China and borrowing it from them in order to give it to them and leaving our kids in debt?

Why did USAID give Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors \$400,000 for sustainable livelihoods in China?

Why did the USDA give the University of Science and Technology of China \$150,000 for research? Don't our

universities need money for research for things that we can use here in the United States to make our life better?

Why did the USDA give the SB Group Consultants \$25,000 for education in China?

Why did the USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International \$40,000 to improve forest health in China? We don't need any help with our forests here, do we?

Why did the USDA give Yangzhou University \$36,000 to improve biological controls in China?

Why did the USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International \$8,000 for administrative purposes in China?

Why did the USDA give Utah State University almost \$400,000 for biomass research in China? I happen to know American companies and people who are investing in biomass research. Why are we giving almost \$400,000 to help the Chinese in biomass research, which will compete with our own companies that are trying to develop this very important and unique energy source? Which by the way for the environmentalists who are watching, who think that I may be making light of climate change, I support biomass and other clean-energy programs that make sense. This one makes sense. Our companies are investing in it, and yet we're borrowing money from China in order to give it to them to do biomass research to compete with our own people and put them out of business.

Why did the USDA give Tetra Tech EM \$325,000 for administrative purposes for environmental programs in China?

Why did USAID give the Institute of Sustainable Communities—get this—another \$500,000 to save energy and reduce greenhouse gases in China? Don't we have the need in our communities to do things in a sustainable way in the United States? No. They don't have that money now. It's in China. We borrowed it from China to give to them. Now we're going to have to pay the bill back after we've given it to them.

Why did USAID give the University of the Pacific \$500,000 for environmental governance in China? Again a half a million dollars.

Why did USAID give the American Bar Association \$500,000 for environmental governance?

Why did USAID give the University of Massachusetts \$420,000 for Environmental Governance in China?

Why did USAID give the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development \$150,000 for Development Assistance in China?

Why did USAID give Management Systems International \$47,484 for Development Assistance in China?

Why did USAID give Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors \$2.4 million for Sustainable Livelihoods in China?

Why did USAID give The Asia Foundation \$1,025,000 to improve Disaster Management in China?

Why did USDA give the University of Science and Technology of China \$150,000 for Research?

Why did USDA give Guangzhou Dxccl Advertising \$18,500 for Administrative Purposes in China?

Why did USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International \$40,994 to improve forest health in China?

Why did USDA give Management and Engineering Technologies International \$7,973 for administrative purposes in China?

Why did USDA give Southern University \$300,000 for improved Education in China?

Why did USDA give Colorado State University \$300,000 for improved Education in China?

I will end my remarks tonight by suggesting that what we are doing is insane. America will never survive with such a mindset with these mind-boggling giveaway programs where we're giving away money, we're giving this type of support to a country and a government that is totalitarian, that kills Christians and other religious people, who hates the United States and is our biggest potential enemy. That is not the Chinese people. That's the Chinese Government.

The Chinese dictatorship has cover today, and the reason why these policies go on is they have cover from some of our most powerful corporations. We have permitted overly subsidized American corporations to set up manufacturing facilities in China, and now they need to stand in the good graces of the Chinese Government. When I come up and say things like this, corporations in the United States try to provide cover for the Chinese dictatorship. We should not be providing aid to the Chinese. We should not be encouraging our corporations to go there and become vulnerable to the Chinese in order to make a quick profit.

I would suggest over the last 10 years, since most-favored trading status has been given to China, we have put America in a very vulnerable spot. We at the very least should reassess our relationship with China, but at the very least cut off any aid programs that go to this communist regime, this totalitarian regime that looks at us as their enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4310, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-485) on the resolution (H. Res. 661) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4310) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 14, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2668. To designate the station of the United States Border located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the 'Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station'.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, May 17, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6021. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Pomegranates From Chile Under a Systems Approach [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0024] (RIN: 0579-AD38) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6022. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Pitaya Fruit From Central America Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0113] (RIN: 0579-AD40) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6023. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Clementines From Spain; Amendment to Inspection Provisions [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0036] (RIN: 0579-AD27) received April 18, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6024. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John E. Sterling, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.